

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Fifteenth Legislature**  
**23rd Day**

**Monday, March 8, 1965**

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

**QUESTION RE PRINCE ALBERT AREA AND DROP IN WHEAT PRICES**

**Mr. Martin Pederson: (Arm River)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. I would first of all like to welcome him back from his trip east. I always notice that he leaves a very wide gap in the front bench when he is away.

In view of the statements that have been appearing in the press regarding the purpose of his trip to Ottawa, in connection with the Prince Albert area being declared a depressed area, and some facetious remarks regarding elections up there, I was wondering if the Premier would care to make a statement to the house regarding this matter, and also the question of the drop in wheat prices.

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher: (Premier)** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the government is anxious, of course, to take any steps, including having the Prince Albert area declared a depressed area, in order to get new industry. We have made representations, and I am hopeful that some action will be taken in the not too distant future.

With regard to the second question of the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson), in connection with wheat prices, I feel quite confident, after talking to members of the federal cabinet, that the government, which last year had the highest wheat sales of any government in history, and the government which gave the biggest final payment of any government in history, will look after the interests of the farmer in the near future.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTION RE STATEMENT OF MR. SHARP**

**Mr. I.C. Nollet: (Cut Knife)** — Mr. Speaker, did the hon. member (Mr. Thatcher) find out whether the statement attributed to Mr. Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce) that there would be no guarantee price, is correct?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. Sharp, was in Calgary on Friday so I was not able to meet with him. I did meet him, however, at the airport on Thursday evening but, I say again, the federal cabinet, as usual, will be taking every step necessary to see that the prairie farmers are given a good return on their grain.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. Dave Boldt: (Minister of Social Welfare)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to introduce a group of students from the town of Langham in the Rosthern constituency. This community has been identified on several occasions in this house and it is just too bad that we could not debate some of the problems concerning this area, while they are here. They are accompanied by their teachers, Miss Ryan and Mr. Schmidt, and a number of parents. I am sure that the house will welcome them and will hope that their stay here will be an enjoyable one.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.H. McDonald: (Minister of Agriculture)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw your attention, and the hon. members' attention, to a group of grade eleven and twelve students, in the west gallery, from the town of Grenfell. My friend from Rosthern may have some potash in his constituency but some of the people closely associated with this industry tell me that we might have some in ours as well. The town of Grenfell has not needed a potash development to get their name on the map. It is considered the gate-way

**March 8, 1965**

to the park region of Saskatchewan, and I am sure all hon. members are very, very pleased to have students from Grenfell with us on this occasion, and I hope their stay will be pleasant and their visit to the legislature will be both educational and enjoyable.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

#### **QUESTION RE RECAPTURE OF LUCIEN RIVARD**

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina West)** — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could address a question to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald). I wonder if he could advise the house whether the government has received any communications either from the Federal Department of Justice, or from Senator Gelin, respecting the recapture of Lucien Rivard?

**Hon. D.V. Heald: (Attorney General)** — I will be glad to take that as Notice of Question, Mr. Speaker.

#### **WELCOME TO CURLING RINK**

**Mr. Frank K. Radloff: (Nipawin)** — I would like to draw attention Mr. Speaker, to a rink of four people in the gallery. They are in the Legion Curling Play-offs for north-western Saskatchewan. This rink comes from Nipawin and it is skipped by Curly Stefan. I wish them every success in their efforts.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

#### **MOTION TO ADJOURN ON MARCH 15 to MARCH 17, 1965**

**Hon. Douglas T. McFarlane: (Minister of Municipal Affairs)** moved:

That when this assembly adjourns on Monday March 15, 1965, it stand adjourned until Wednesday, March 17, 1965, at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in moving the above motion that appears under my name on the order paper. The purpose of moving this motion at this time is to give all the members of the legislature a chance to attend the convention of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities in Saskatoon.

I am sure that all members realize that this is the Diamond Jubilee Anniversary of our province, and of our SARM, and because of that fact, the SARM have requested and have received permission from the government to honor that association at a banquet on the night of Tuesday, March 16th.

It may be well to point out, at this time, that in Alberta the time of the municipal conventions does not conflict with the time that the legislature sits, because in Alberta they have their annual convention in November. In the province of Manitoba, the same is true because they have their annual convention in the month of November also. In this province, for many, many years, it has been the custom to have the SARM conventions in the month of March and of course, that is during the time that our legislature sits in Saskatchewan.

However, on at least three occasions in the past, the government of the day saw fit to adjourn the house so that members of the legislature could attend the SARM conventions. Years ago, the convention used to alternate between the cities of Regina, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon and Prince Albert. Although the journals in the legislature would not show this, when we checked the newspaper files of March 9th, 1936, we found that adjournment of the legislature was permitted so that the members could attend the SARM convention held in Prince Albert on March 9th, 1936. Then on March 7, 1938, two years later, we find that the same thing was done by the legislature of the day. They adjourned for eight days so that the members could attend the SARM convention in Saskatoon. Then on March 9th, 1942, the same thing happened again. The legislature was adjourned so that all members could attend the SARM convention in Saskatoon, and I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time, the conventions usually alternate between Regina and Saskatoon. However when the conventions are held in Regina, probably the need is not as imperative, because it is easier for members to get down to the halls or wherever the convention is held. But, when it is held in Saskatoon, as it is every second year, I am sure that a lot of members in the legislature, over the past

years, would have liked to have been able to go to Saskatoon, but many thought that they could not get away.

I know, when we were on the opposition side of the house, we used to try and make arrangements whereby two or three members could go up for a day or two, but in order to do that many of the members were prevented from having the opportunity to go up. On this side of the house, we have many members who have been connected with municipal work for many years. In fact, we have three former mayors of cities and some who have been reeves of their municipalities and many who have been councillors. I know it is the same on the other side of the house. One of the members for Regina east (Mr. Baker) is the mayor of this city. The deputy leader of the opposition (Mr. Brockelbank) and the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, the member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) have been connected with municipal work. I would think that they would be quite interested in having the opportunity to spend a day at the convention.

I know, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that we all have a common bond with local governments, that those of us who represent the senior government, would appreciate the opportunity to be with the representatives of local government for at least one day. It is my information, that this year they expect to have at least 1,400 delegates at the SARM convention. This should be one of the largest in history, and so, with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, and having pointed out that in the past the government of the day has seen fit to adjourn the house for a day to allow the members to take in these conventions, and I take great pleasure at this time in moving, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt).

That when this assembly adjourns on Monday, March 15th, 1965, it stand adjourned until Wednesday, March 17th, 1965, at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Fred Dewhurst: (Wadena)** — Mr. Speaker, there are a few words I would like to say on this motion. Personally, I am opposed to the motion. I do not feel that it is the responsibility, or the duty of the legislators here to over-burden an over-crowded convention as it is.

The Minister moving the motion said there would be 1,400 at that convention. I know the accommodations of the hotel. It does not accommodate that many as far as convention space is available. So, personally, I do not think that we should bother invading the convention. I do not think an official invitation from the association has been extended to us. If so, I have never seen or heard of it.

Another point, which I do not think is right in this motion is if the house is going to adjourn, it should adjourn on Friday and not come back here for Monday. The members from the north would have to come back here for Monday, go back up there for Tuesday, come back on the Wednesday, and that is a lot of driving. If the house is going to decide that they adjourn, I would like to see the government consider adjourning both Monday and Tuesday, rather than have the members running back and forth. Personally, I do not think we should adjourn at all.

**Mr. J. H. Brockelbank: (Acting Leader of the Opposition)** — Mr. Speaker, before the motion was introduced, the Leader of the house was good enough to take this question up with me. I suggested to him, after discussing with some of our members on this side of the house, that the suggestion made by the member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) be considered, that this would change the motion to read

When this assembly adjourns on Friday, March 12th, it stand adjourned until Wednesday; March 17th.

Because a great many members go home on the week-end; and those from the north will have to come back on Monday and then go back on Tuesday, I would ask that the government consider making that change in the motion. I would be very happy to adjourn the debate for the purpose of giving them time to consider whether they want to do it, or if they want to carry on with it now, and put in the amendment. It is O.K. with me.

**Hon. D. Steuart: (Minister of Health)** — I think if the hon. member wants to adjourn it, we can discuss it.

**Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey)** — All right, Mr. Speaker, I move

**March 8, 1965**

to adjourn the debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) has asked leave to adjourn the debate.

Is leave given?

Debate adjourned.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the hon. Mr. Coderre — that Bill no. 10 — an Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation (Accident Fund) Act, 1955 — be now read the second time.

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina West)** — Mr. Speaker, some days ago when I adjourned this debate, I adjourned it primarily to give one or two members on this side of the house an opportunity to say something, so I held the bill on the order paper for that purpose.

The bill, as I appreciate it, is one which widens the powers of the Workmen's Compensation Board to enter into agreements with neighboring provinces, or rather with other provinces. The Act, as it previously stood, was restricted to neighboring provinces and the change will give power to enter into agreements with all provinces. And that is a principle with which I would agree.

I do believe that the Act might have gone farther, and I would commend to the consideration of the Minister, at some future time, a review of the general problems which arise with respect to employees who are working in Saskatchewan for firms in Alberta; or work in Saskatchewan for firms in Ontario, or Manitoba, as the case may be.

Where the employing firm has a place of business in Saskatchewan, few problems arise, but where there is no place of business in Saskatchewan, there are a number of problems which do arise — there are some particularly acute ones with respect to travelling salesmen. I am aware of one case where a travelling salesman, who worked for a firm out of Lethbridge, was injured in the course of his employment. The employer did not have a place of business in Saskatchewan, with the result that he was not registered with the Saskatchewan Board. The employee accordingly cannot collect under the Saskatchewan Act. He similarly, was not protected under the Alberta Act because the employer, following the Alberta legislation, did not report employees who did not work in Alberta at all. If the situation had been reversed it would have been the same in Saskatchewan. Our employers do not report employees who do not come into Saskatchewan at all. The result is that this employee found himself without any coverage. And this is a very common situation with respect to travelling salesman. They are not a large group — that is, salesmen who work for out-of-province employers without a place of business in Saskatchewan. But they are a group who I think deserve the attention of the Minister. It is very difficult — and I certainly am not being critical of anyone here — it is very difficult making these insuring statutes comprehensive in their coverage when the employees move from province to province, relatively freely. It is particularly difficult where the employer may not have places of business in all the provinces.

I believe there is a small gap in our legislation here and I would hope that the powers given under sections 54 and 56 would be available for use in expanding the coverage to fill these small gaps, which I perceive still exist.

The other comment which I wish to make was with respect to schedule two of the Act, which is amended by section six of the amending bill. It adds some additional diseases, or conditions as pensionable or compensable. I am by no means sure that it goes far enough. As I understand it, the diseases which are added by the legislation are ones which are, in fact, now covered by regulations, so the effective coverage is, as I understand it, not increased. There are a number of other health conditions from which people suffer, or conditions of ill-health from which people suffer, as a result of working in industry. It is always going to be tough to know which ones ought properly to be covered by Workmen's Compensation, particularly for those people who work in health institutions, and who turn up with all sorts of ailments, which it can reasonably be argued were contributed to by their conditions of employment, and certainly staphylococcus infections, which are added here, are a good example. When somebody who works in a hospital, or a nursing home, turns up with this, it can be fairly argued that he probably acquired it because of exposure during employment.

I think the same principle could be applied with respect to a number of other conditions, and again, it is not easy to know where to draw the line. But I think as we increase our coverage, our general social security coverage, we should take a somewhat broader view of what conditions ought to be covered by Workmen's Compensation. Where there is genuine doubt, I think that previously it was resolved in favor of the employer, because it was argued that the employer should not be general insurer of all the community. And this is probably not a bad principle.

I think that an argument can be put up that the onus is switching the other way, because whether the employers are the insurers through the Workmen's Compensation Board or the employers together with some other groups, offer a general insurance coverage through some other legislation, it is perhaps only a matter of degree what liability the employer assumes.

As we broaden our coverage, it strikes me that we ought to be less picayune in our decisions as to whether a particular condition is due to employment. Accordingly, I would commend to the Minister a consideration of some other conditions which would fall into the same category as the staphylococcus infections.

I would, in resuming my seat, simply wish to say that I certainly have no quarrel with the legislation. All the steps which it contains are steps in the right direction. I welcome these, and would welcome a consideration of further steps as the Minister and the Workmen's Compensation Board believe they may be merited.

**Mr. W.G. Davies: (Moose Jaw City)** — Mr. Speaker, I would like also to make one or two comments in respect of this bill. First of all, may I agree with what my colleague, the member for Regina west (Mr. Blakeney) has said about the bill generally. I can support it to the extent that it provides some further improvement in the existing Act.

I would like to talk about at least two of the principles, however, that are contained with the bill. First of all, I think I can thoroughly agree with the idea of extending the entering into agreements with other provinces so that Workmen's Compensation protection can be afforded in a more general way, especially to our own workmen, who are moving around and about the country. I think, also, that the proposal with regard to common-law wives and dependents is an improvement over what has existed in the Act heretofore.

There have, of course, been some progressive amendments made in this regard, Mr. Speaker. I, personally, think that an extension of the principle beyond what is proposed would also be suitable at this time, but I welcome the step that is proposed at this time.

Mr. Speaker, another principle suggested in the bill is to increase the so-called minimum amount of compensation that is payable on a full-time disability basis with appropriate amounts, I presume, to be reckoned in the case of partial disability cases. Now, without wanting to intrude at this time on committee discussions, I believe that the fundamental change recommended should be examined to insure that the amount that is to be proposed is adequate and just. Of course, the exact amount that is recommended is a proper matter for the committee and I do not want to enter into a discussion at this time of the relative clause.

The principle, Mr. Speaker, obviously suggests the wish to get a minimum which has some relationship to average pay conditions, or at least to something that would not be very far below average pay conditions. I would suggest that the basis of the proposed amendment falls somewhat short of this objective, and I would ask the Minister at this time if he would not look at this whole matter again, with a view, perhaps to proposing something that goes beyond the principle that has been suggested in the bill. I would like to say again that the principle that should be realized is a rate which recognizes average pay conditions. These have changed considerably, as the Minister is probably aware, in the last decade.

The average weekly wage, of course, at this time in the province is some \$82 a week, as I recall it — the industrial composite weekly wage. So I am just suggesting that the principle that we should follow here is to observe something that comes not too far short, (I am not suggesting it should be the average weekly wage) but something that is a good deal better than the one that has been proposed here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is also the question of the relationship

between the amount that is proposed and the amount that is suggested by the weekly minimum wage of the province of Saskatchewan. Whatever is done with respect to this matter, I would like to suggest here that the minimum for compensation should not be less than whatever minimum wage is payable in the province of Saskatchewan. Here again, I think this might be a matter that the Minister might take a look at.

Finally, on industrial diseases, I would again concur with what the member for Regina west (Mr. Blakeney) has had to say on this matter. I would think that this is the time when the principle that we are talking about in the extension of the industrial disease schedule, might be extended. We might broaden it a bit beyond what is proposed. The other shortcoming, as I see it here, is that the amendment proposed does not give due regard to workmen who do not directly enter into the servicing of patients or the institutions where the industrial diseases mentioned in the bill, are affecting the workmen concerned.

If you are indirectly affected, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the amendment, you would not be able to claim compensation coverage. For example, if you were a workman who is a maintenance workman, and you contracted an infection such as ones that are mentioned here, I would presume that you were not directly affected or it could be claimed that since you were not in direct contact with the patient that the coverage did not apply so far as you were concerned.

There are other examples that may come even closer to the point that I am now making. That is a workman who comes in, say to a hospital institution, and at that point comes in contact with the disease concerned only casually, but for enough time to contract the ailment, and going from the institution finds that he has this ailment and claims compensation. But because he is not in direct contact with it, he finds he cannot claim workmen's compensation. I would say that ordinary justice would indicate that a workman of this kind should properly be able to claim and to get compensation.

So, I am making two points on this, Mr. Speaker. Again, that we might at this time broaden the principle and include further industrial diseases of the type requested on many occasions by various bodies, and that we might, so far as the amendment itself is concerned, do more in the way of making it cover all those who contract the diseases that are mentioned in this amendment, but who do not, by reason of the wording of the amendment, find themselves able to claim if they contract the diseases that are mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, these matters can be discussed in specific detail in committee. I would at this time, suggest that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) might take a look at the points that I have raised so that we might be able to discuss these in more detail at the proper time.

**Mr. G.T. Snyder: (Moose Jaw City)** — Mr. Speaker, just a word or two in connection with the legislation that is presently before us. I am not sure that there is a great deal I can add. I concur in what has already been said by the members who spoke on this side of the house.

As Canadians we are well aware of the fact that the cost of living index has been travelling upwards for the last number of years. I believe one of the clauses to which I shall not refer on second reading, shows an increase from \$30 to \$32.50, and I think we recognize full well that this is something that deserves careful scrutiny in the way of keeping in line with the increase in the cost of living for people who are on disability or partial disability pensions.

In respect to the general application of the legislation, I had hoped that tuberculosis would possibly be included in the industrial diseases. At present it is a matter of gaining this right to have tuberculosis included as an industrial disease, under the terms of collective bargaining agreements that some trade unions have been fortunate in having included when tuberculosis is contracted by an employee as a result of being in close contact with tuberculosis patients, by virtue of the kind of work these employees are doing. I had hoped that, and I hope that sometime in the future, this may be considered as one of the industrial diseases covered under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mention has been made already in connection with the difficulties that have been encountered from time to time with such people as commercial travellers, travelling outside of the province of Saskatchewan, and being injured at a point outside of the province, I am aware also of some other peculiar situations which have arisen in connection with railway workers,

with whom I have been associated. One of the very real problems is the fact that employees, normally resident in the province of Saskatchewan, work on a regular basis, between terminals such as Moose Jaw, travelling west as far as Medicine Hat, and as far east as Brandon. Under these circumstances, over the last number of years, there have been situations arise where an employee who is normally resident in Saskatchewan and makes his home in Saskatchewan, suffers an injury at a point outside of the province. Under those circumstances, this employee is governed by the conditions and terms laid down by the Workmen's Compensation Act of the province in which he is injured. I realize full well, why this change was made. I understand some of the circumstances surrounding the building of the South Saskatchewan dam and the Squaw Rapids plant, where a large number of workers were imported from outside of the province making it somewhat more convenient to look after the difficulties of these workers who were temporarily making their home at these construction sites.

But I hope that the Minister will also keep this in mind for future reference, and recognize that an employee who is working in the province of Saskatchewan, when he is unfortunate enough to have a misfortune or an accident beset him when he is living outside of the province, then he, immediately, is placed in a position where inferior regulations and inferior coverage, under the Workmen's Compensation Act in one of the two neighboring provinces, become a real factor for him. In a couple of instances that I am aware of, this has meant a matter of several hundred dollars to employees who find themselves in this position.

I want to say, that I concur in the main with the amendments that are set forth and I trust that further remarks that I have to make will be more appropriate in the Committee of the Whole, but I must want to say that I concur generally with the provisions which are laid down in the proposed bill no. 10. I hope that the Minister will keep in mind and consider the suggestions which have been made from members on this side of the house this afternoon, and on the other occasion when members had an opportunity to speak on this bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must draw the attention of the house to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak, he must do so now or be precluded from doing so.

**Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Labour)** — Mr. Speaker, I have very few remarks to make insofar as this bill is concerned. I think that most of the questions raised can possibly be dealt with more thoroughly when the bill gets into Committee of the Whole, although I can assure the members of this house, that from time to time, all the program of the Workmen's Compensation Board is reviewed by representatives of both management and labor, and the recommendations brought in at this time, are those that have been recommended by a committee of review that was appointed by the former administrations, and all the recommendations that have been made are now brought into effect.

I can also assure the members of this house that this report will be made available to them as soon as we can have it printed.

Some mention was made of the many diseases that were not included in the present amendments to the Act. I was wondering what they have been doing these past few years. They should have brought coverage for these when they had the opportunity to do so.

Some concern is also raised about T.B. not being brought into the scope of the Act. Under section nine and section ten of the Act, people who are working in areas where T.B. is a direct cause of the disease, this can be brought under the scope of the Act. How can anyone anticipate the number of diseases that can become a hazard in the industry? Surely the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, are not asking for treatment for what they call "seal fingers"? This is a disease which is usually found in the handling of seals and seal products. Many, many diseases are found only in British Columbia or only in Ontario, depending on the type of industries. I am sure that the committee of review, which I say is representative of labor and management, know that they can certainly give the proper recommendation and the government would be more than happy to comply with the requests they make from time to time, as well as those that I have not normally covered.

Some mention was also made of the minimum wage. The maximum allowable, in the province of Saskatchewan and the province of Ontario, was \$6,000 of which seventy-five per cent of that can be claimed for one hundred per cent disability for persons earning up to \$6,000. Of course, when you

**March 8, 1965**

get down to the \$32.50 from \$30, which is quite an increase at this particular time, this would be only applied to those who are in the minimum wage category and this would be about seventy-five per cent of the minimum wage they now receive. This is the lowest that they can possibly receive, based on the disability. If you are one hundred per cent disabled, receiving in the minimum wage category, you would be receiving \$32.50 or in proportion to that.

We must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that when we are giving a minimum, where the Workmen's Compensation Board is also very much involved in a rehabilitation program, and very often a person is rehabilitated that is receiving more after his disability than he would receive before being properly rehabilitated. We will find that the Alberta minimum wage for a total disability compensation is the only one that is higher than Saskatchewan. British Columbia, Manitoba, Nova Scotia, Ontario, are all below Saskatchewan. So that we find that we are the second and not the third or fourth, as it was last year, Mr. Speaker. We will be the second highest province in the dominion of Canada — second only to the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, most of this can be dealt with in Committee of the Whole, and with that in mind, I now move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Davies:** — May I ask the member a question before he takes his seat?

**Mr. Coderre:** — Yes.

**Mr. Davies:** — I was going to ask, Mr. Speaker, whether I heard the Minister right in saying that all the proposals made by the committee of review are included in this bill? Would you like to reconsider that statement?

**Mr. Coderre:** — In one form or the other. Most of them. Yes, that is right.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

## **SECOND READINGS**

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Fuel Petroleum Products Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the government considers this to be one of the important bills this session because we think it will put in the pockets of our farmers just under \$4,000,000.

The main amendment to The Fuel Petroleum Products Act will be to give legislative effect to one of the major tax cuts announced in the Budget Speech. That is, the one that will allow farmers to use purple tax free gas.

All trucks registered under the Vehicles Act as farm trucks will be able to consume purple gas. Proposed amendments to the regulations made by the Highway Traffic Board under The Vehicles Act, were, I understand, published in the Gazette on Friday, March 5th. The intent of the proposed amendments to the regulations is to confine the use of purple gas to legitimate farmers, legitimate ranchers, or market gardeners, in connection with their marketing operations.

Farm truck licenses will only be issued to trucks equipped with two axles. This should cover the majority of farm trucks used in connection with normal farming operations. Under the Department of Highway regulations, the maximum gross weight allowed for a two-axle truck is 28,000 pounds gross weight. This will cover all trucks up to and including three tons, as rated by manufacturers.

The other day, the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) asked me a question. To clear up some misunderstanding, I have been informed that some manufacturers have rated some two-axle trucks higher than three tons. But for purposes of administering the Vehicles Act, a farm truck license will be issued to any legitimate farmer who owns a truck equipped with two axles and which does not exceed 28,000 pounds gross weight.

A farm truck license will not be issued for passenger cars, for station wagons, suburbans, ranch wagons, window vans, travel-alls, and so on, or any cars designed or converted to carry more than a driver and two passengers. Such vehicles will be required to be registered as passenger vehicles and must use clear fuel.



In addition, a farm truck license will not be issued this year to any truck equipped with more than two axles. Three, four, and five axle trucks, now registered under the farm truck classification, will be required to register as a commercial vehicle and will be required to use taxable fuel. Also, any vehicle equipped with permanently mounted equipment or machinery designed for drilling wells, for mining, moving logs, timber, lumber, for use in the construction or repair of roads and buildings, will not be eligible for a farm truck license. It is intended to restrict the issue of a farm truck license to a bona fide farmer who intends to use the truck in connection with the operation of a farm, ranch or market garden, owned or leased by the owner of the farm truck.

Mr. Speaker, the Highway Traffic Board regulations attempt to define a legitimate farmer by requiring the farmer to hold a minimum amount of land. This will be spelled out later. A legitimate farmer is also one who makes use of the land for the purpose of growing crops or fodder, the raising of livestock, or for the growing of fruit and vegetables for sale. The regulations establish a minimum size of operation for farmers who are engaged in the operation of a poultry establishment, a fur farm, a piggery, a dairy establishment, a feed lot, or an apiary for bees.

**An Hon. Member:** — Apiary.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We are not talking about the CCF tonight.

The regulations will permit the owner of a properly licensed farm truck to transport his neighbor's farm products. In addition, the owner of a farm truck will be able to use his truck as a personal conveyance without any mileage limitation within the province, provided that it is not used as a personal conveyance in connection with any line of business, other than farming. No farm truck shall be used or operated for commercial purposes such as the hauling of gravel for compensation, the hauling of milk or cream, or milk or cream cans owned by a person other than the person named in the certificate of registration. He can use his truck for that purpose but he cannot use purple gas in it.

I think this next provision is rather important because there has been some misunderstanding throughout the province. Any vendor, including bulk stations, will be prohibited from installing pumps to dispense purple gas and diesel fuel directly into the fuel tanks of farm trucks and special farm trucks. If vendors were allowed to dispense purple gas through pumps, many errors would arise in the dispensing of fuel to the public. As a result, purple fuel could be sold to operators of cars and commercial vehicles, in error, thereby creating an offense under the Act. The normal practice now is for a farmer to buy in bulk at a price advantage, and to fuel his truck from his own farm storage tank.

Two major changes in the sections of the Fuel Petroleum Products Act dealing with offense are being proposed. First, the minimum fine on first offense for the illegal use of purple gas in a vehicle will be raised from \$25 to \$40. In addition to this, we propose to remove the automatic impoundment of the vehicles contained in the present act, where any person is found guilty on first offense. Today, under the act, if a farmer is caught using purple gas, his automobile is automatically seized. That will not be the case under the new act. A vehicle will be impounded only if the fine and costs remain unpaid at the expiration of the time set by the convicting provincial magistrate or at the expiration of thirty days, whichever is a longer period.

In cases where a vehicle which is subject to impoundment on second or subsequent offenses, has been sold prior to conviction, the minimum fine has been increased to \$75 and the maximum fine to \$150. This is a change from the present act, where the minimum fine is \$50 and the maximum is \$150.

Another proposed amendment is to allow the use of purple gas in motor boat engines used in the waters north of the southern boundary of the northern Saskatchewan administration district. This is another tax change announced in the Budget Speech designed primarily to encourage tourist development in our north and to offset to some extent, the higher cost of fuel in the far north.

At the same time, the proposed amendments to the Fuel Petroleum Products Act will enable the prosecution of any person using purple gas in boats or other water vessels in the province except those operating in the northern areas that I have mentioned. For many years, it has been illegal to use purple gas in motor boats. I must say that this provision will be very stringently enforced in the coming year and the act will provide for a

minimum fine of \$50 and a maximum fine of \$200 to persons convicted of this offense.

The proposed amendments will also clarify the intent that purple fuel may only be used in trucks registered as farm trucks, or special farm trucks, and to unlicensed trucks operating exclusively on farms or in connection with mining or quarrying. The present wording of the act has permitted individuals or firms regardless of occupation, to use purple fuel in registered trucks engaged in all highway operations. It was always the intent that registered trucks use taxable fuel, regardless of the fact that such trucks may at times be used in off-highway operations. The proposed amendments will make it clear, and I hope very clear, that contractors operating on off-highway projects, for example, the South Saskatchewan dam, will be required to use taxable fuel in their trucks regardless of whether they operate on or off the highways. Also, the present act has enabled Air Canada to apply for a refund of gasoline tax consumed in licensed trucks, operated exclusively on their property. The proposed amendments to the Fuel Petroleum Products Act would require these trucks to consume taxable fuel.

There are other technical amendments to the Fuel Petroleum Products Act, which I would be pleased to provide an explanation for, when the act is considered in the Committee of the Whole. However, I think I have outlined the major proposed amendments to this act. I hope that most of the questions, Mr. Speaker, can be in Committee of the Whole.

I want to say again, Mr. Speaker, as I said during the Budget Debate, I know of very few measures that have been introduced into this house in recent years that have met as wide acceptance from the farmer as this particular bill has done. Some hon. members opposite may say that \$4,000,000 is not a significant amount. It is not perhaps, a large amount, but it is certainly more than a gesture. It indicated that this government is anxious to do something in a tangible way to help the farmers of Saskatchewan. And I challenge the hon. members opposite to vote against this particular measure.

I move second reading of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I have just been reminded that I have not proposed the question. The question before the house is on the motion of the hon. Premier, that Bill no. 36, An Act to Amend the Fuel Petroleum Act be now read the second time.

**Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey)** — I want to say, first of all, that we certainly do not oppose this kind of a measure . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Changed, Brock? You opposed it for twenty years.

**Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey)** — No. I am quite willing to see the hon. Premier introduce this measure, but I do think that some of his statements are very much exaggerated. With all the restrictions that surround this provision, it seems to me that \$4,000,000 is a very, very high estimate of what it will mean.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of those things where the Premier can say it is \$4,000,000 or \$6,000,000 or \$10,000,000 and nobody will be able to prove him wrong. There will not be any measure to prove whether he is right or not, because comparing the revenue of the tax this past year with the coming year will not prove anything at all because of other changing conditions. But I do think \$4,000,000 is very, very high when you consider that it's only going to be for the smaller trucks and there are some restrictions on those. He said they could be used for personal conveyance in connection with farming. There is a need for some kind of clarification there. Is going to a picture show or going to the exhibition, in connection with farming?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It's all right.

**Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey)** — Well, it is a personal conveyance for the people who own and operate a farm truck and anybody else he likes, to pick up and give them a ride to any place in the province of Saskatchewan, I take it.

Many farmers, at least quite a few of them, where they have small

trucks, have built a kind of a van which is really sleeping accommodation, and they slip this into the body of the truck and fasten it there, and then they can go on a fishing expedition or any place they like and they sleep in this. I was not sure from the remarks of the Premier, whether or not this would be eligible for the use of purple gas, or whether it could still be registered as a farm truck or a special farm truck.

Another question which comes to mind is, will farmers have to live on the farms or may they live in a town or city, as long as they have the farm land and are bona fide farmers or ranchers? I would presume that it would not make any difference where they lived, as long as they are actually farming.

There are not many more remarks I want to make about it, except I want to emphasize again, the importance given to this by the Premier as a means of curing the ills of agriculture, is much exaggerated, because this, I think, will be far from \$4,000,000 in what it will save farmers — more like \$1,500,000 probably and certainly this will not be a great deal but every little bit, I suppose, will help. We will see what effect it has.

Um

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst: (Wadena)** — Mr. Speaker, I think that the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) has outlined some of the thoughts I had in mind.

The Premier, in moving the bill, stated the regulations as to what constitutes a farm, trucker, and so forth. If I recall right, it was printed in the last Gazettes. I think it would have been well if we had one of those Gazettes tabled here, because our Gazettes go to our home address and we do not see them unless we go home. Now we don't have the regulations. It is very difficult for us to look through the regulations and see how the regulations define a bona fide farmer.

I do not like to adjourn the debate at this time because I do not know if that will help the situation but I was hoping that this information would have been supplied to us before we perused this bill so that we would know what was a bona fide farmer. The points which the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) raised, whether they have to live on the land or how many acres constitute a farm, are all problems which at this time, are urgent, so that we will know what we are talking about. I will have more to say in committee on this bill, as to other groups that should have been included in the bill, but I won't bother with it at this time. But I wonder if the Premier could see that we have some of this information before he asks us to put this bill through second reading.

**Mr. Gordon T. Snyder: (Moose Jaw)** — Mr. Speaker, only a few words from me in connection with this bill on second reading. I want to say first of all, that I too, am not in the position where I intend to oppose the bill on second reading. I think we will be in a position where we can assess the value of the proposition in the time ahead and have a look at some of the inherent problems that have been mentioned in the house already.

I think the manner of describing a bona fide farmer falls within the definition of having twenty acres and I can see some particular problems in this connection. I think the door has been opened rather widely and I think the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) has pointed that out when he mentioned that courting on purple gas is just as sweet as courting on red gas, or something to that effect.

I wonder if this is not one of the problems which may arise from the legislation that is before us? I have a real serious reservation in connection with one proposal that was mentioned and this is the only matter I want to talk about tonight — that is in connection with the fact that the small service station operator will not be allowed to dispense purple gas through his pumps. This will put the farmer in the position where he will be obliged to install some kind of a gravity feed tank on his farm.

The problem, as I see it, in this connection, revolves around the volume of business some of the small service station operators, who operate on a rather marginal basis, have done with rural customers in the past. I have had the opportunity, since last spring, to talk to a number of these operators. Some of them have told me that they have done as much as \$400 worth of business a month with rural customers. These customers, I presume, will now be taking advantage of the purple gas situation and installing their own dispensers. I think this is indeed unfortunate and I fail to see the problem that the Premier anticipates, in having tax free purple gas dispensed indiscriminately, unless it is done deliberately, of course. I cannot see

anything accidental about putting purple gas into a motor vehicle that is not entitled to it. I think there are all kinds of safe-guards that could be built into this legislation to present this. I have had expressions of concern from a number of the small service station operators who have difficulty in operating the year around and who have to subsidize their winter operation by having an excellent summer during which time they have a large volume of sales due to a tourist business, and this sort of thing. It is necessary for them to carry over some of their profits of the summer months into the winter operation because of the very difficult time that they have during six or seven months out of the year. I think this is indeed unfortunate from the standpoint of the small business man who is having difficulty in earning a living from the selling of gasoline and petroleum products. I would hope that the Premier and his people will take another look at this.

I had hoped, before the legislation was introduced, that the Premier might even consider the possibility of giving some kind of assistance to the small operator to provide another pump for this purpose. They tell me that putting in a pump, along with the excavation and the tank in the ground, with a cement apron and everything involved, would run around \$5,000 which would make it almost prohibitive from the standpoint of the small operators. I hope that sometime during this session, the Premier and the members of his department will give some kind of serious consideration to allowing some of this volume of business to be offered to the small service station operator rather than the bulk dealer, who will otherwise be the only one who will in any way profit from this. I hope this will be considered and I hope the Premier will see fit to give consideration to this and perhaps comment on it before the debate on a second reading comes to a close.

As I said at the offset, I do not intend to oppose this measure. Members opposite have indicated that this was an election promise and they suggest that this is an obligation as far as they are concerned. I am not convinced that this is a good argument. If the people who voted for the members opposite represented the largest portion of the voting population, I would suggest that this might be the case. In effect, the true case as far as voting figures are concerned, is that less people voted for members sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker, than those who sit to your left, so I hardly think that this argument is a valid one.

I think there are some inherent problems that the government is going to have to tussle with. From my personal point of view, if they find it within their hearts to extend this privilege, then this is fine with me. I think it is unfortunate, however, that a number of other small operators, carpenters, and people who also use half ton trucks in the operation of their business, will not be extended this kind of assistance. I do not intend to oppose the motion. I trust the government will be able to wrestle with the inherent problems in the months ahead.

**Mr. I.C. Nollet: (Cut Knife)** — Mr. Speaker, these amendments to the act certainly involve very sweeping changes in the act itself, which I feel require a very careful definition of what is a farmer. I would ask the Premier if he would define what a farmer is for the purposes of this act.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think that if the member rises and answers the question he is closing the debate, and I see two other members who are trying to get into the debate.

**Hon. D. Boldt: (Minister of Social Welfare)** — Mr. Speaker. I would just like to make a few remarks on this bill.

I was rather surprised to see one of the members from Moose Jaw rise up and speak on behalf of the farmers. He was arguing the point that the small dealer would be harmed by the farmer purchasing his fuel from another agent. Well, I am a farmer and I think I can speak with authority, having had the experience.

Down in my own community the co-op store has the pumps and they also have a truck with a tank on it. They deliver the purple gas to the farmer, and the business will stay right with the co-op as it always has done. The only thing is with this truck, he cannot purchase purple gas through the pumps. His argument certainly will not hold true.

The member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) says that it is hard to analyze just how much it will save for the farmer. I think the \$4,000,000 is way below what the saving really will be. The average farmer will drive

at least 5,000 miles with his truck and I do not think that he will make more than ten miles a gallon, so this amounts to 500 gallons of gas at 14 cents a gallon. This would amount to \$70 savings for this farmer. We have somewhere around 80,000 farm trucks in the province. This would be a total savings to the farmers of \$5,600,000.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky: (Cumberland)** — Liberal arithmetic.

**Mr. Boldt:** — I know my greatest expense on the farm is the gas for the farm truck. We use the farm truck for picking rocks, roots, and at combining time, we never even cross a municipal road. We use tanks and tanks of gas and we pay 14 cents a gallon for which we have absolutely no benefit by using a road. When I was home during the weekend in the small community of Rosthern, I was told that the G.M. dealer in Rosthern had orders for forty half ton trucks.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Sure.

**Mr. Boldt:** — This bill is certainly well taken by the farmers. This is the best piece of legislation that will come before the house in this session.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — And I would just like you to stand up and vote against it as you have done in the past, just to show your color. We have introduced a resolution in the house on numerous occasions, while you were sitting on this side of the house. You always had excuses to vote against it and you are certainly not for it at the present time. If you are going to vote for it, you know that there is only one reason — it is political.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on behalf of the farmers in my constituency and I have a great number of them — quarter section farmers, half section farmers, and others of course. The hon. Premier knows they are really up against and they cannot get consideration from the government at Ottawa. But anyway, in reference to what the hon. Minister just mentioned a few minutes ago, I want to make it clear that we have never opposed reduction of taxes of any kind, that includes . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Oh, oh!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — . . . taxes on farm fuel, but not as political promises for one segment of society. We have always felt that there were other people entitled to reduction just as well as farmers and this is what is lacking in this particular legislation.

I would like to point out to the hon. members of the government that many of our farmers all across the province live in towns and villages — people like myself who go to the farm every day. We commute back and forth every day and we do not use a truck for transportation of the employees to work on the farm. A dealer brings the gas out to my farm but I do use a truck to move stones, as the hon. member has said, as well as roots, and we do a little bit of work during harvest time, hauling grain to the granary. But I doubt that during the year, I use more than 300 gallons or so in my truck, and I only have one truck. I haven't got as much land as the hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt). He just bought a section the other day, they tell me. He is a pretty big farmer and it will help him a lot more than it would help me, but I will say that there are a lot of people that travel back and forth, who are bona fide farmers and who live in the villages and towns. What consideration has this government given to those farmers? Why can I not use non-taxable gasoline in my car, for my industry? I know it is difficult to legislate, but there are thousands . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . You had twenty years.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Now, it's quite true that most farmers use their trucks for hauling grain and cattle and one can add all the work that is performed on the farm — I am satisfied that the average farmer, (and I have seen some of their annual income tax statements) does not use any more than 200 to 300

**March 8, 1965**

gallons a year. I am talking about the kind of people that we have in my country. If you take the number of farm trucks in Saskatchewan, and multiply these by the figures that were given to us by the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt), you will find that the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) was absolutely right — that it will not be any more than \$1,500,000.

There are other weaknesses in the policy. In all these little communities across our province, there are dealers who have been trying to eke out a living by selling gasoline to farmers and other people, but mostly farmers. These small operators are about to lose their chance to make a decent living, because farmers will not be able to buy untaxable gasoline out of the pumps. If I understand the Premier correctly, they will put many of these people out of business. Now, I would suggest that if this legislation is going to really mean something for the farmers of our province, then the government should take some time and think it over and allow these small dealers in our province to establish pumps. I don't care what kind of pumps. It could be a drum with a pump in it and let a farmer fill up if need be. But to deny people that are selling gas, to sell gas to make their living is denying something to the citizens of this province that they are entitled to and that is an income. That is where the government is failing in this legislation.

I have already had a number of my friends who operate small service stations complain to me that this is what is going to happen to them. They are very much concerned and I am seriously suggesting to the government to take another look at the legislation and not forget these small operators .

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . by the Anglo Rouyn bill?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — If you want me to talk about the Anglo Rouyn mine then I will tell you a great deal about Anglo Rouyn and you will not like it. But I will be out of order if I do.

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, we will forgive you.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Your Liberal party has the record of trying to fleece people and this is another way you are trying to fleece the people of this province, and you know it.

It has been suggested that this legislation is going to help tremendously in the north and that tourists coming into the northern part of our province will not have to pay the tax on gasoline. It will help and I am glad of this. It is going to help some of our operators, but I am going to suggest to the Premier and to the government, that many people who are coming in from the south have their own outfits. They have their own motors and they are not going to use purple gas. They are going to bring the gas right out of the south into the north and you are not going to help any of those people. The people that you are going to help are the operators, as I have said, which is good.

But when you look at the whole situation, Mr. Speaker, you will find that it is unjust — only a political promise. It is bad legislation because it does not cover a majority of people. It is not making the farmers too happy. It is not going to resolve all of our problems. It is not really resolving any of our problems. When I have a deficit of \$1800 Mr. Speaker, \$30 or \$40 is not going to help much to save me. I am voting as a farmer.

**An Hon. Member:** — Are you voting for it?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I'm not voting against the principle.

**An Hon. Member:** — Why not?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I'm not voting against it, I said.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You have for twenty years.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Yes, even that little bit helps, Mr. Speaker, but I'm voting against the injustices of this legislation for the chap who has a service station and others who will not be able to make as good a living as they did in the past.

**An Hon. Member:** — Vote against it.

**Mr. Martin P. Pederson: (Arm River)** — I would like to put on the record the attitude of the party that I represent, in this particular bill . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You're for . . .

**Mr. Pederson:** — I want to remind the hon. members opposite that the Conservative party had this offer to the people of the province in their platform back in 1958, and I want to remind hon. members opposite also, as well as those on this side of the house, of something that I reminded them of the other day — to be a little cautious in their sweeping gestures in referring to people on this side of the house — 126,000 people voted Conservative and we do support purple gasoline for farm trucks.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — But I want to leave facetious remarks aside for a moment, Mr. Speaker. The opinion that has been expressed by various members on this side of the house in connection with the sale of purple gas through service station pumps, is a matter that concerns me as well. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier has not given, in my opinion, a full explanation of why it is necessary to bar service station operators from selling purple fuel through a special pump. I believe that the point is well taken — that it will, in fact, substantially reduce the income of many small service station operators, who unlike the organization referred to by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) do not have a bulk outlet. The vast majority of these operators do not have a bulk outlet and are dependent purely and simply on the sales through their pumps, be it red, or bronze, or purple gasoline. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there does not appear to be a sufficient reason for barring service station operators from selling this through the pumps. The onus can be placed on them that it must not be put into vehicles other than those bearing a farm license plate — a relatively simple matter, and I hope, that when the Premier adjourns the debate, that he will give a detailed explanation of why they feel it is necessary to deprive these people, as has been stated by many members on this side, of the right to earn this revenue through the sale of purple gasoline.

I seriously believe that it will, in numerous cases, work a considerable hardship on the small service station operator who is dependent, purely and simply, on a small amount of servicing and the sale of gasoline.

**Hon. D.G. Steuart: (Minister of Public Health)** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words on this bill. It really amuses me to hear members opposite, especially those of the Socialist party, talk about the small business man and cry crocodile tears for him. They are the same group of people that put the millstone around the retailer's neck by the Retailers Act and did not have the intestinal fortitude to give it Royal Assent. Don't stand up in your places, and say what you have done for the small retailers in this province — the small business men. You nearly put most of them out of business in the twenty years you were in office.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — We cannot be a little surprised wondering how the hon. member representing the great Conservative party voted, because he voted against the budget, as did everyone of those people over there, and they have lost their nerve now. They know they want to vote against this but they haven't got the nerve to vote against it because they know that not one of their rural members will be returned in the next election if they do. But they stood up for twenty years, year after year, when we . . .

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst: (Wadena)** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is this in the principle of the bill that we are debating?

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, of course, do you think I would talk about anything else?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — I am sure you would.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — I am raising a point of order.

**March 8, 1965**

**Mr. Steuart:** — I am shocked, Mr. Speaker, to think he would think that I would ever stray off the principle of the bill. Where was I? Oh yes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — What principle was I on?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — Their principles.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, they talk about what this bill is going to do to the small fellow running the service station. Well, I'm not a farmer, but I know that ninety-five per cent or ninety-seven per cent of the farmers buy their fuel in bulk. They do not buy it through filling station operators. So this is not going to affect the filling station operator one bit. As a matter of fact, if anything makes the farmer more prosperous, it is bound to make the small town, the small retailer, the small merchant and the filling station operator more prosperous in the process.

But it really amuses me to see them standing up now. They must have had a change of thought since last week. Everyone of them voted against the budget — voted against our tax cuts — and now they are standing up and saying, "I am going to vote for it, Mr. Speaker, but . . ." — and then they string off a whole long rhyme as to why they are against it. Why do you not have the intestinal fortitude to back up what you really believe and vote against it?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — If you are against it, stand up and say so! You know you haven't got the nerve to do it. Mr. Speaker, of course I will support this bill, as would every fair minded individual thinking of the good of the farmers of this province.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member for Watrous was trying to say something a few minutes ago.

**Mr. E. Kramer: (The Battlefords)** — Whom did you see, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I beg your pardon?

**Mr. E. Kramer:** — Whom did you see?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member for Watrous.

**Mr. E. Kramer:** — Oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You may rise.

**Mr. H.A. Broten: (Watrous)** — Mr. Speaker, speaking of people that have more to do with doing away with small business men, the reason that the small business man has had quite a problem in this province is that when you think of the costs of production, which has gone up 100 per cent since 1947, and the price of wheat which has gone up seven per cent . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Are you voting for it?

**Mr. Broten:** — This is what has hurt the small business man. What has federal Liberal government done? This is the answer to that. When I think of gas-tax money, I always think of roads. I think of highways. I think that roads and highways should be fairly closely associated with gas-tax money. As far as I am concerned I am voting for the bill for the simple reason that it is a tax relief, but I think it is not really a good bill. I see, too, people in Saskatchewan who have no roads to get out on to the grid roads or to the highways . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — You had twenty years to do it.

**Mr. Broten:** — I see, too, many people that still have to haul their children to the school buses and I think that government grants would have been



appreciated by the municipalities and would have been more acceptable and probably just as popular, as tax-free purple gas. The reason I say that is, if it isn't said now, it won't be said, as far as I am concerned.

I think this is a fact. Just as an example, I went to buy some cattle this fall with my hired man. When we went to the farm where we were getting these cattle, we went on the grid road, but there had been a considerable amount of rain, and we had difficulty on this road as there was a lot of gravel and water on it. Returning, we went on the highway which was completed this summer and was very good. On going back for the second load of cattle, I asked him, (knowing that he had been brought up in a different political atmosphere) "Is there any reason why I should not be paying taxes to drive on this highway?" The highway was good and was quite impressive. I asked him, "Is there really any good reason why I should not be paying the gas tax?"

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You can still pay it if you want to.

**Mr. Broten:** — He said, "No". Then I said, "When the gas-tax bill is in effect, I will be driving on this highway but I won't be paying the tax. Would you not say that this was political bribe?" He replied, "Yes, I am afraid I will have to agree with that."

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That was a good one, Hans!

**Mr. Broten:** — These are some of the thoughts one gets when he thinks about honesty. I will say the thing has a certain romance involved with it — driving without taxes and this type of thing and getting out of something when some people cannot. As far as politics is concerned, and men being what they are, there is a certain attraction. I do believe that consideration should be given to extra grants to people, through the municipalities, that do not have the opportunity of getting out to the highways and grid roads.

**Mr. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current)** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this debate if I may. I believe that the amendments to this act, which we have before us, are going to be appreciated by a good many farmers in my area.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — I am certainly going to vote for this amendment. I would like to point out to the hon. member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) however, when he is talking about the attitude of the people on this side of the house concerning retailers, that he must have his sides mixed a little bit. He referred to the Retailers' Act which was brought down by the government of this province a few years ago. He is no doubt well aware, as a retailer himself, that the retailers of this province were very happy about that act.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You say twenty per cent were. It was about five.

**Mr. Wood:** — The Retailers Merchants Association . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — That is five of them — all five of them.

**Mr. Wood:** — I think there are several thousand retailers in the province . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Quiet.

**Mr. Wood:** — I think that this is a well recognized fact that this government has done a good deal for the small retailer in the province — I mean the government that was represented by the members on this side, and we make no bones about it. We are proud of our record in this regard.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — I feel that there is a good deal of good in these amendments,

**March 8, 1965**

as has been pointed out and I think a good deal more study should be given to them. It would appear to me that this abatement of taxes, so far as the farmers are concerned, is going to be at least that much assistance to them. It is not something that the members on this side of the house have never considered. We did not . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You never did anything.

**Mr. Wood:** — . . . We did not bring it down in legislation but it was not something that we did not think about. The reason that we did not bring it down in legislation was because we felt that, insofar as the farmers of the province were concerned, that rural roads were just as important or more important to them than a cut in the price of their gasoline. What is the use of having a car to run on tax-free gasoline if you have no place to go with it? For eight years, Mr. Speaker, the CCF government was turning back to the municipalities a good deal more money than what would have been saved for the farmers by this legislation before us.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . roads too?

**Mr. Wood:** — I will come to that, Sir. But I am saying that this was the position we took, of turning back the gasoline tax money to the municipality in the form of grants for road building. We considered this well spent money, and I think the farmers of this province agree with us.

The city people, at that time, did not get this kind of assistance. The last two years, we brought in changes whereby we were also giving assistance to urban municipalities. The farmers got this assistance for their grid roads which was not given to city or town dwellers, but where a highway went through a town or a city, we paid half the cost. In the last year or so, we were also paying half the costs in regard to the main thoroughfare in the cities and the towns, but where a highway went through a rural municipality, we paid all the cost. They were not expected to pay any part of the cost of the highway. We gave this extra \$5,000,000 or so to the municipalities in regard to grid roads. It would be closer to \$6,000,000 that we gave in an average year which was more than what we were taking away from them by this tax. I think this was good business for many of the farmers concerned. If you saved the money for them and they did not pay it out in taxes, then if they got stuck in the mud, they would have to get a tractor and drag themselves out. This is the sort of thing the farmers put up with in Saskatchewan for years, and they were pleased indeed when the government that was represented by the people on this side of the house, brought in this plan, whereby we would assist them with their roads, and we would collect these taxes and help them with the roads. It is not something that has not been thought of, Mr. Speaker. But there was a better solution.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You thought so.

**Mr. Wood:** — There is another thing that we thought about in regard to this act. We did not feel it was entirely fair even for farmers themselves. The hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) has pointed out one of them. The fact was that many farmers did not have half-ton trucks and such. A good half-ton truck costs money and many farmers could not afford this. They still had to drive an old beat-up jalopy of some kind. By this legislation, you will be giving this assistance to the people who have the new half-tons, but you will not be giving any assistance to the farmer who cannot afford that type of a vehicle.

I have to point out too, Mr. Speaker, that there are other people who are self-employed who we felt, were entitled to this sort of thing. So this is another reason we shied off. But now that it is before us, I am sure that we are not going to vote against it. I am sure that as long as the government is prepared to maintain the grants and assistance to the rural municipalities, even though this tax is taken away, I can see no reason why we should not vote for this. But if it is the matter of this, or going back to the old system where we did not have roads, I would surely think I was doing well to vote against this legislation. But I trust that the government opposite is not going to do that.

They have said that they are going to give continued grants to the municipalities. They may show a little decrease this year, but we trust that they will keep these things up. We are hopeful that they will, even though

they do have this cut in revenue in regard to the farmers themselves.

Now, as I say, I represent a city as well as the farmers around Swift Current, and there are many people there who are self employed and drive trucks and cars that they have to use in their work. I trust that the government opposite is not going to forget them. As I said, this is one reason why we did not bring it in, because we felt there was some unfairness. This government has taken this step and are bringing it in. I trust that they will bear in mind that there are other people who are possibly just as much entitled to this sort of treatment as the farmers and that they will, at a not too distant date, see to it that these people also receive this kind of assistance that was given here.

The hon. member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) stated that he has already found that the truck dealers in his area cannot get enough trucks to supply the demand. This is just pointing out one thing of which I am a little afraid in regard to this legislation. You will be able to tell a farmer, from now on, by the fact that he is driving a truck, not a car. It has a tendency, if I may say so, to reduce our farmers to second class citizens.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Oh! Oh!

**Mr. Wood:** — This is so! Instead of paying their taxes, the same taxes that other people do, we give them a rebate on the taxes. Then they don't drive cars like other people, but they drive trucks. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be much better for all concerned, if the farmers got their fair share of the income of this Canada of ours.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — I am just saying that this is the approach that I would rather see. I am not saying that this is wrong, but I say there is a better way. I say that if the farmers of this country got their fair share of the income then they would be able to pay their taxes the same as every other person in the country.

I will certainly support the amendment, but I think they should continue to give some attention to see that others have the benefits that are set out in this bill and that they do their utmost, with the government at Ottawa, to see that the farmers get their fair share of the income of this nation of ours.

**Mr. E. Kramer: (The Battlefords)** — Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart), the Minister of Health, rose in his place and peeked over his desk a few minutes ago, he accused us of not being the friends of the retailers.

I trust that I can say something about this, and I suggest that maybe we are not the friends of the retailers, but we do not have trading stamps in Saskatchewan yet, as you would probably like to see. And I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that this was a move that was friendly to the small retailers and possibly a bit of a road block to the big monopoly chains.

However, getting to the bill at hand — I will not be out of order any further, Sir. Getting to the bill at hand — this legislation however beneficial it is to a number of operators, and however beneficial it is to a number of large operators (the larger the operator, the greater the benefit in this legislation as in other legislation that has been passed in recent weeks) — this bill will discriminate against thousands of farmers in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that they own only a car and they cannot afford to buy a truck. These are the little people that are back in the woods with a large family, on small holdings, milking a few cows, and raising a few chickens to supplement small incomes. They take their cream and eggs to town in the trunk of their car, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest this is discriminatory to these people, to force them to buy trucks in order to cut fuel costs.

Certainly, the least of them ought to be taken care of, not the largest but the least. The least of them are going to gain, not benefit, as it has been pointed out before, and I want to emphasize, they are not going to benefit one jot or tittle from this legislation, and they are among this so-called 90,000 people that were quoted by the Premier, as beneficiaries of this legislation. I am concerned about these people, because these are people on the fringe. These are the people that need this help.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You had twenty years to do it.

Why didn't you do something?

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, there was plenty done. If you want examples, people are able to travel on good roads instead of having to battle their way through the mud and paying three prices to get to market. It is costing them on an average, not half as much to travel as it did twenty years ago, or ten years ago, because today they have roads to travel on, as the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) has said. We have done plenty for them. We have done plenty too, in those same fringe areas, in providing tremendous grants to education, Mr. Speaker. The mill rate, compared to grants in that same area across the northern fringe of Saskatchewan, the mill rate runs at 75 to 80 mills — more than half their taxes, one and a half times the taxes they pay, is payable in education grants alone, so plenty has been done. And I say this, there is nothing being done for this group of people who don't own trucks, and therefore, it is discriminatory to the people who need help the most. I suggest, Sir, respectively, that if you were going to do something for all of the farmers — you have helped some of them here — but the one reason why it has been left alone was:

1. The rural municipal association, year after year, voted it down and said, "We want the money for roads, and we think you had better leave purple gas alone."
2. No matter what you do, Sir, it is going to be unfair. "It is hell if you do and it is hell if you don't", in plain English.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — It was unfair before, because a good many people were taking advantage of purple gas, before the legislation ever existed. They took a chance and some of them got away with it. Therefore, there was one unfair area.

**An Hon. Member:** — They are a lot worse now.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Prior to this, we had an unfair situation. The unfairness is going to be multiplied now because the people who need assistance the most, are getting the least. The people who run the smallest unit, even if they do have a half ton truck or a small truck, are going to save very little. The larger operator who can probably afford to pay the most, who is going to be on the road with his big unit and using and destroying the road, is going to get the greatest benefit from this. Therefore, I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that while this is a help to a certain segment of the farmers, it is discriminatory to a great many of the smaller people, the people who do not own trucks, and the people who use trucks to a limited degree.

There is another party who is hurt by this legislation — the small commercial trucker who is trying to make a living. There are hundreds of them through the small towns in this province, scattered here and there. They make a living and raise their families by operating this small commercial business. They are already having quite a time competing against the cheap farm truck license. This man is going to have even rougher competition. That same farm truck license is going to be hauling his neighbors cattle on purple fuel.

And then there is the small service station operator who hasn't got access to bulk sales who is certainly going to suffer.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this bill has some advantages, but it has some pitfalls. I think it is quite proper that we raise these points and we hope that you will have some means of helping the man that does not have a truck. Give him a free license on his car. That is the least you can do.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Oh! Oh!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That's your best for the night.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Yes. Mr. Speaker, if you can afford to give the big operators 14 cents a gallon on his gas, and the more he burns the more he gets, certainly you can afford a \$10 bill for a license for the farmer and for the laborer.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Why didn't you do this in the

twenty years you were in?

**Mr. Kramer:** — We built the roads, Sir, — plenty of them, and highways to boot. We did plenty. The foundations were laid and laid well, and the only reason that it is possible to introduce this legislation today, is because of the situation you inherited — a prosperous, well-managed treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that we have certain areas here that disturb me from the standpoint of fair play. When I see more legislation being brought into this house every day that discriminates against the poor, I am rather upset and I hope that something is done to correct this.

**Mr. D.W. Michayluk: (Redberry)** — Mr. Speaker, I was amazed at the manner in which the hon. Premier made the statement, when he first brought this matter into the house during the budget debate. He made a sweeping statement, “The farmers of the province of Saskatchewan will be able to use and to operate their trucks anywhere in the province”. This is a good statement. A farmer could drive, in his truck, from the village where I live, to Madge Lake on a Sunday and find himself stuck without being able to purchase a gallon of gas to get back home.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — He can take some with him.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Well, yes. I was just going to come to that, Mr. Premier.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Take a barrel.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — I was just going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that from now on, as the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) stated, there is a possibility of the sale of forty half-ton trucks in the community of Rosthern. From now on we will see scores of half-ton and one-ton trucks on our provincial highways, with barrels of purple gas at the back.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the financial or the economic position in which some of our small service station operators find themselves. I come from a village where three service stations operate. It so happens that only one of these service stations sells gasoline by the bulk. There are scores and scores of communities where service station operators have been vending gasoline from tanks for cars and trucks. They do not sell bulk sales. This is going to hurt a large number of these operators in the province, with a net loss in revenue. Many of these operators are barely able to exist now. This may force many of these small service station operators out of business.

Now, I remember that during World War two, we had gasoline rationing, from seven in the morning until seven at night only. This is the precise situation in which these farmers will find themselves with their trucks. They leave home, only to find that they will be forced to put a barrel on the truck, to refill the tank. Mr. Speaker, if the government were to allow vending of purple gas through tanks by all operators in the province, the farmers could travel all over and they could buy gas at all times of the day and at all times of the night, and, of course, there would be a larger loss to the provincial treasury . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — There would be a larger loss.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Yes, this is to prevent a large loss of the gas tax. This will force many of these half-ton and ton trucks, to stop at service stations and buy gas that is taxed.

Now, the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) said the other day, that courting was just the same on purple gas as it was on taxed gas . . .

**Mr. A.C. Cameron: (Minister of Mineral Resources)** — No, I didn't say that at all. I said, sweet.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Oh, just as sweet, yes. The hon. Premier mentioned that they will be allowing apiarists, that is people that are in the bee business — wonder whether regulations will permit me to use purple gas as I have six hives of bees. But I understand, the regulations state 200 hives.

**March 8, 1965**

Now, to compensate for further loss, the Premier mentioned that penalties for the use of purple gas have been increased. This, too, will compensate for a certain amount that will be lost by allowing the tax-free purple gas in farm trucks. I certainly would be the last one to vote against this. I think this is a good thing . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Not good enough.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — . . . but I think that it is not good enough. There are people connected with bricklaying, carpentering, plumbing, people that are in business, who own small trucks and drive into the city to buy groceries. I think we could have extended the use of purple gas to more users.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this bill.

**Mr. I.C. Nollet: (Cut Knife)** — Mr. Speaker, when I got up before, I asked the hon. Premier a question, and he began to answer it, and I took my seat again. Then someone else jumped up. Would that forfeit my right to speak . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Pardon?

**Mr. Nollet:** — Did I forfeit my right to speak when I asked the hon. Premier a question and then sat down, waiting for a reply? May I speak now?

**An Hon. Member:** — Go ahead.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Just a few words then, Mr. Speaker. I probably would have had a lot more to say, had the Premier seen fit to get on his feet and give me the definition of a farmer under this act. We would then be able to determine whether or not this act was, in fact, going to be equitable and fair, or whether it would lend itself to a great deal of abuse, and not take care of the farmer, to which it is directed.

In general, Mr. Speaker, I never saw so much guffawing in all my life from the hon. members opposite. I suppose we could record this as one promise kept by the Liberals — one promise kept, and may I say, Mr. Speaker, one political promise, and this is exactly what every farmer in Saskatchewan knows it to be. Our friends opposite are not fooling anybody at all. They are not fooling the farmer. Surely he knows that if you are going to keep up with your grants to municipalities, if you are going to keep up our grid roads and expand the grid road program, that you have got to find the money some place. It has to be found somewhere.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You watch . . .

**Mr. Nollet:** — There is no dodging this at all, and farmers know this. It will have to be paid for some other way, either through some other taxes or by an addition to the land tax, and I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the government is going to have difficulty in financing if they intend to go on with this program and many others that are going to call for more expenditures. I predict that they are going to start borrowing money as they already did this year, when the province was experiencing one of the greatest booms in terms of economic expansion and revenue in its history.

Well, if they are borrowing money now, and let us assume that things are not so good a year from now, and assuming that revenues are down another year, then they may have to borrow more money. But I cannot understand a government that is borrowing money now, when it is a time when it should not be borrowing. We ought to be borrowing money when there is a recession, because that is the time to be borrowing money if you are going to do it. I question this, Mr. Speaker. This is a political promise, and I hope to make a few responsible remarks in connection with it.

This legislation is pregnant with all kinds of difficulties. The inequities in it are going to be multiplied and I say that farmers are not going to be relieved of anything, but they are going to pay it. There are terrific difficulties in administration compounded by the fact that now our farmers are not only allowed to use tax-free gas in connection with farm operation, but they can travel all over the province — and I assume his children, his hired man, and everyone else, can do the same.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Are you against it?

**Mr. Nollet:** — I am pointing out some of the problems that are going to occur in connection with this. The hon. Premier is not putting any words in my mouth. I do not appreciate his high elation at having kept a political promise. But the farmers voted for this. Maybe they will have some second thoughts in the future, when they see their assistance for grid roads, and other services diminishing. But for the members opposite to sit there and guffaw, as though we had not done anything for the farmers, I remind the members opposite of the rural electrification program, the grid road program, the increased grants to municipalities for many purposes. I remind them of all these and the farmers know this to be a fact.

Mr. Speaker, I question too, whether or not this will be an equitable tax in terms of ability to pay. This is another factor which we must seriously consider when we either reduce taxes or raise taxes. We will give it a try, Mr. Speaker, and see how it works out. Believe me, there will be a good deal of criticism from me if we run into all kinds of difficulty, which I think we will, particularly in connection with future financing of the provincial government's responsibility, and increasing responsibility for taking financial loads off the municipalities.

I remind the Premier that he has another promise to fulfill and that is to reduce land taxes, and we are holding you to that promise too, Mr. Premier.

Would you still answer my question, Mr. Premier?

**Mr. Harry D. Link: (Saskatoon City)** — Mr. Speaker, I propose to support this legislation. I believe I understood the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) to say that this was the most important legislation that would come before this house. I hate to think of what will be the worst. However, I represent some 110,000 urban people, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that they will be interested in his statement that this is the most important legislation to come before this house. I am sure the people on social aid in Saskatoon will appreciate tax-free purple gas. I am sure the unemployed in my constituency will appreciate this, and I am also sure, Mr. Speaker, that the young people in Saskatoon will appreciate this remark and no doubt, the senior citizens will be delighted that somebody is going to get tax-free purple gas.

I also have, in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, a large number of carpenters, plumbers and electricians. People who use a half-ton or three-quarter ton truck in their small businesses, will be delighted, absolutely jumping for joy, to realize that the farmers are going to drive with tax-free purple gas. The painters and the T.V. repairmen also use trucks and I am sure all these people will be interested in the hon. Minister of Social Welfare's remark (Mr. Boldt), that this is the most important legislation to come before this house.

The small service station operator in my constituency, I am sure, will be looking forward to this with great anticipation. As far as the amount of savings is concerned, we have been told this will save the farmer some \$4,000,000, and I am in no position to question that figure. I do know that many people will remember that they already contributed \$5,000,000 more in extra medicare taxes and therefore I am not so sure that they will be quite so pleased with this reduction.

However, not being a farmer, I am certainly in no position to vote against anything that is good for a farmer. I think if it is good for a farmer, then this is what we should do. All I am trying to say is that the people in an urban riding should also have been considered, and particularly those people that have to use trucks in their business.

**Mrs. Marjorie Cooper: (Regina West)** — I am not going to say very much on this. I have sat in the legislature for a number of years, and I have listened to the arguments, pro and con, about purple gas. I have always felt that the arguments against were very much stronger than the arguments for, and I still feel that way. I feel it is discriminatory and I feel that the money could be spent in much better ways that would help the farmers just as much, and still not discriminate against other people. So I intend to vote against this.

**Hon. Douglas T. McFarlane: (Minister of Municipal Affairs)** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure tonight to see this piece of legislation brought in, because I have had the opportunity over the years to introduce this motion, "that the farmers be allowed to

use purple gas", year after year.

There is quite a history behind this motion. I recall the resolution that was passed at the Farmers' Union Convention, year after year, asking that the farmers be allowed to use purple gas in their farm trucks. I remember the Vice-President of the Farmers' Union, at that time, getting up at the union conventions and putting this resolution through, and then after he became a member of the NDP government, and sat on this side of the house, when the resolution was introduced, he, along with all his colleagues, got up and voted against it. Then he was successful in talking the Farmers' Union out of adopting this resolution, so it was discarded from their platform.

I remember the rural municipalities and the stand they had to take. They were led to believe that if they wanted to have the farmers have the use of purple gas that there would be no money for grid roads. I am surprised at the statements made by some of the members on the other side of the house tonight, saying that one of the reasons that they had voted against letting farmers use purple gas in their farm trucks, was because they would not have any rural roads.

Mr. Speaker, I have only been the Minister of the Department of Municipal Affairs for some nine months, and I am going to assure my friends on the other side of the house, that even after they had sat in this government for twenty years, some of the roads in this province are still in a deplorable condition. I am going to suggest further that they never told the farmers, and especially the municipal men, during the past few years, that one of the reasons why they never got the money that they should have had for rural roads, and for highways and grid roads, is because year after year, when those people were the government they sat on this side of the house and they taxed the people of this province more in gas taxes and in licenses than they ever spent on highways and grid roads. Last year was a good indication.

Mr. Speaker, when you add up the amount that they took from the people of the province last year in gas tax, and in license fees, you find that they kept \$6,000,000 unto themselves, that never went into the highway system or the grid road system, or the rural road system of this province. There is the equivalent of the amount of money they had been spending on grid roads, so the people of Saskatchewan have not had it brought to their attention the way these people on the other side of the house have been fleecing them for the past twenty years.

So I say, it is no credit to them . . .

**Mr. Wood:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think this is quite a parliamentary term — to say that we were fleecing them — raising the money in one way and using it to the good advantage of the people of the province another way. These are pretty strong words.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Mr. Speaker, the figures still speak for themselves. You were taking \$6,000,000 more from the people of this province than you ever returned to them by way of monies back into grid roads and highways. Then, what about the ranchers of this province who are going to get the benefit of the tax-free gasoline in their farm trucks at the present time? I suggest to you that there is no segment of your agricultural population, or your economy, which is going to benefit more by this piece of legislation than your ranchers in the southern part of the province.

Then, when you stand up and ask for the definition of a farmer, I suggest that you look around among some of your colleagues. It is not too many years ago when the Department of Municipal Affairs had a real problem on their hands, and why? Because one of your colleagues went outside the city, bought seventeen acres of land, and then because that did not qualify him as a farmer, the acreage was increased up to about twenty acres, and so he became a farmer, and so maybe you will have to deal with this later on.

I want to assure you again, that every time I introduced the resolution in the house, every member on that side of the house, that was in the house at that time, stood up and voted against it. I can go back through the years. I can read off their names. They get up in their place and say, "Mr. Speaker, we will be losing revenues to the province". Sure, you were losing revenues to the province. You were losing revenues by two sources. In the first place, you wanted to tax and gouge, and get as much money as possible out of the farmers as you could. The second way you got the money out of the farmers was by catching them using purple gas in their farm trucks, and by virtue of the money you extracted by way of fines.



Then, to go further than that, you had your inspectors out about harvest time. It was not enough to not allow them to use tax-free gasoline, or to fine them, but you impounded the farmer's truck right in the most important season of the year, and if you check this legislation, you will find on the first offence, the farmers won't have that to contend with.

We heard them stand up day after day, when they were speaking against the resolution and say, "well, maybe the farmers would go to church on Sunday in their farm trucks." Tonight we heard a member on the other side of the house complaining because he will not be able to get gas after he gets to the beach, or goes to church. I suggest this, there is no disgrace for a farmer, or any person, to go to church or go to the beach in his farm truck.

Mr. Speaker, if we can help them out in this way, we certainly will. But to listen tonight to some of the ridiculous arguments that are being put forth by the other side, I suggest, they are only coming up tonight in support of this piece of legislation because they have found how attractive it has been to the farmers of Saskatchewan during the past two or three weeks. I am going to invite them to check with the estimates that are brought down this session, and see how much is going to be spent on highways in the year ahead. I am going to invite you to look into the estimates of the Municipal Road Assistance Authority, and see, when the whole program is presented, if it is not one of the best and largest programs ever undertaken in Saskatchewan. We have increased our highway program. We have maintained our grid road program, and at the same time we have given the farmers a tax cut that has been due to them for a good many years.

So, Mr. Speaker, having introduced this motion, as I have said on many occasions in the past, it gives me a great deal of pleasure tonight to see, at long last, this piece of legislation come down and benefit the farmers of our province.

**Mr. C.G. Willis:** (Melfort-Tisdale) — Mr. Speaker, I must apologize for arriving late at the session tonight. I did not hear all the remarks of the Premier who brought in this bill. I did arrive, though, to hear him say that there would be no sale at pumps, of purple gasoline.

I must say that I am very surprised at this. I can well recall the Premier. saying, as has been mentioned by the member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk), that there would be no restrictions on travel over the whole of this province . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — There isn't.

**Mr. Willis:** — . . . as far as farm licensed trucks are concerned. Mr. Speaker, I also heard the Premier say tonight, that farmers could take gas along with them, in the back of their truck, replenish their truck whenever they ran out of fuel. So I imagine he is right when he says that farmers can go all over the province if they have a farm license. They can go all over the province, not only if they have a farm license. but also if they have a barrel of gas in the back of their truck.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I were driving a farm track and had to take a barrel of gas with me everywhere I went, if I could not buy gas at the local service station, whether it is here or whether it is a hundred miles away, I would be very much put out. In effect, Mr. Speaker, this regulation, which the Premier has announced tonight, limits the use of farm licensed trucks to a radius of seventy-five miles from home. A farmer can not go more than seventy-five miles from home unless he has a barrel of gas in the back of his truck.

A truck holds approximately fifteen gallons, at ten miles per gallon, this is a hundred and fifty miles he can travel, away from home and back again. This means he can go seventy-five miles in one direction and then seventy-five miles back to his home. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this province are not going to be satisfied with this.

Mr. Speaker, I have found over the years, that the farmers have not been averse to paying taxes for the improvement of their roads. In the past, they have not objected to taxes on gas. They have seen the benefits derived by paying taxes, in the last twenty years. I was very much surprised when some of them on the other side, Mr. Speaker, said it has taken us twenty years to improve the municipal roads in this province. I admit it has taken us a long time, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you know, as well as I do, what those roads were like twenty years ago.

**March 8, 1965**

I have made statements in this house regarding the conditions of provincial highways twenty years ago. I can assure you that municipal roads twenty years ago, were much worse than the worst of the highways in this province.

In the winter time, farmers could not travel on municipal roads, even with horses. They had to get off the roads and out into the fields, even with a horse-drawn vehicle, in the winters in the past. This has disappeared, this is gone. In the years in which we were in office, we brought in a grid road program which is practically completed today. The people across the way, Mr. Speaker, seem to have the opinion that once this grid road system is built that there will no longer be any need for assistance to municipalities.

I want to tell them here tonight, Mr. Speaker, that they have not any more than started assistance to municipalities. Municipal people are not going to be satisfied with travelling on gravelled roads. In my own area, there are two municipalities which are very much interested in dust-freeing their roads. In one municipality, the reeve, about five years ago, talked to me regarding the cost of oiling roads. Even at that time he foresaw in the future, that the people of his municipality would want assistance given to municipalities in order that they could build dust-free roads and have the pleasure of driving on dust-free roads.

Another municipality, the municipality of Flett's Springs, has already started dust-freeing their roads. They used salt on three miles, as an experiment. First of all to find out just what is involved in the use of salt — what is the effect on their roads, and to find out the cost of applying salt and the cost of maintenance of such a dust-free road. I want to tell the people opposite that it will not be many years before municipalities will be requesting assistance to improve their roads, to even higher standards than they have now.

I am very much surprised at the remark of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane), here tonight. He was talking about a wonderful program which was going to be brought down here on estimates from the Department of Municipal Affairs. He has not made a very good start in impressing me with this program up to the present, Mr. Speaker. I looked at the estimates the other day and the estimates show that grants to the Municipal Road Assistance Authority are down this year by \$200,000 or \$300,000, and the reason given by the people across the way, whether it was in a speech or whether somebody just threw it into the air when someone on this side was talking, but the reason that was given for the reduction was that the grid road program is down. The grid road program would be completed in a year or two.

If the people across the way think that they can cut out grants to the Municipal Road Assistance Authority, with the completion of grid roads in the province, then they are mistaken. They certainly cannot do this.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane) talked about expenditures in the province last year — expenditures on roads, grid roads and highways. He made the statement that there was \$6,000,000 less spent on highways than was raised by gasoline tax and license for vehicles.

Mr. Speaker, he only mentioned the amounts spent on highways and grid roads. He did not mention anything regarding the amount spent by the Department of Natural Resources. We have spent money in the past building roads into the north. Buffalo Narrows is now connected with Green Lake by a road. The Hanson Lake Road is completed, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. D.V. Heald: (Attorney General)** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Will the hon. member please take his seat. I am rising on a point of order.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman is straying quite far away from purple gas. We have no wish to unduly restrict him in this debate, but I do think there is a point beyond which he should not be allowed to go. He is talking now about grid roads, and highways and so on, and northern roads, and I really think he is a long way from the debate on second reading of this bill.

**Mr. Willis:** — Mr. Speaker, on this point I would point out that I am merely replying to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane) who mentioned these expenditures on roads, highways and grid roads, as being \$6,000,000 less. He said it. Nobody rose on this side to contradict him. You did

not, Mr. Speaker. I insist upon having the right to reply to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane).

We not only spent money on the Roads to Resources program, but we have also spent money on the Highway Traffic Board, on law enforcement in this province, and Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Heald:** — On my point of order, he is resuming his speech, and I still submit that he is out of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, I think this is probably getting into the gray area. We have been there before, and I just did not want to limit the member's field of expression, but I hope he won't get too far off the road in the northern area and leave the province.

**Mr. Willis:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know where your heart is when it comes to roads. Your heart has always been in the interest of better roads here in the province of Saskatchewan, whether grid roads, highways, or other roads into the north.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane) also made the statement that he had been Minister for nine months and he boasted about the program which he was bringing in. If a reduction in grants for Municipal Road Assistance Authority is something to be proud of, Mr. Speaker, I can tell him that over the next few years, he is going to be proud. He is going to be much prouder than he is tonight because it looks very much as though the government across the way has decided that there are going to be great reductions in the Municipal Road Assistance Authority.

Next week, Mr. Speaker, when the people opposite have descended in force on the SARM convention, I hope that, in their lobbying, they quiet the fears of the municipal people that these grants will be cut down. I am sure they will have a lot of questions to answer next week, when they are up in Saskatoon.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — They invited us anyway.

**Mr. Willis:** — Mr. Speaker, they were invited two weeks after they said they were going.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Willis:** — I am sure that there will be plenty of questions from the municipal people as to their intentions regarding grants for municipal roads in the future, because this government opposite has promised, and this is one promise I hope they keep, they have promised to spend more than \$40,000,000 a year on highways in this province. They have increased the highway budget this year by \$8,000,000. Next year, they will have to increase it by another \$8,000,000. It looks very much as though they are going to get that increase from the Municipal Road Assistance Authority. I certainly hope they do not, Mr. Speaker. I hope they are able to build highways. I hope they are not only able to build highways to the extent that they have promised, but that they are able to keep up the grants to the Municipal Road Assistance Authority so that the municipal people here in the province will be able to build roads to the same extent that they have over the last twenty years.

Mr. Speaker, in the past I have opposed purple gas in farm trucks. I have opposed it because I believe there is a need for building roads in the municipality. I still believe that there is a great need for money for municipalities to be spent on municipal roads. But the Municipal Affairs Minister (Mr. McFarlane) has given us assurance that, after nine months, he has the best program that we have ever had.

The Provincial Treasurer assures us that there will be money to spend on highways and there will be money to spend on municipal roads in this province. I am going to take them at their word, Mr. Speaker, and over the next four years, if they are still sitting opposite, I am going to insist that they do spend this money. In the meantime, I am going to help them keep their promise to the people of Saskatchewan. I am going to vote for purple gas in farm trucks.

**Mr. K. Gordon Romuld: (Canora)** — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended

**March 8, 1965**

to rise and take part in this debate. I did not think it was necessary. I never thought we would go to this length.

I am quite surprised at the attitude of some of the members on the other side. I happened to list a few figures of the farmers living along the road to my farm. Our one half section is a half a mile south of Preeceville. We have a half section a mile south and three miles east; and we have a half section, a half a mile south and three miles west.

**Mr. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current)** — Pretty big farm.

**Mr. Romuld:** — No, it is not a big farm. It is six quarter sections.

Now, in those miles, which was it — seven or eight miles — there are sixteen farmers living along this road. So you can see the size of the farms. Of the farmers that live along there, everyone of them has a truck. There are only two that own a half-ton truck without a car. When I was home, they certainly did approve of this legislation.

I am surprised that a man that is as honest as the member from Swift Current, (Mr. Wood) did not cross over to this side. He admitted, he frankly admitted, that the NDP had thought about it but he failed to say that it took the Liberals to implement it.

I was also surprised that the member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) accused us of using it as a political bribe. I want to inform the members on that side that the people on this side of the house are here because they are motivated by a desire to serve the people and not a political party.

Being a farmer myself, I do not think that we are taking any business away from the small service stations. We have always bought our fuel in bulk for the farm. I would like to point out if the members on the opposite side had such an interest in these small service station operators, why did they direct practically everyone of their government vehicles to go to one service station? And you know what service station that is.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — I know myself, that there have been many of these small service station operators in the constituency of Canora who have said this is going to benefit them — the action that the government has taken on this side in regard to the public vehicles that the government operates — because this is going to offset the few sales that they made to farmers purchasing fuel from the service stations for their trucks.

As I said, I am going to speak on this very briefly because there has been so much said and it has all been a lot of balderdash from the other side. What I cannot understand is that for all the years they sat on this side of the house, and they had a chance to bring it in, they always opposed it. Now, they are standing up and in a sheepish manner, they are saying, “we are kind of opposed to certain things in the bill, but we want to stand up and support it because we are scared to go home if we don’t”. You could just as well have said it, because that is what your remarks implied to anyone on this side of the house.

Now, I would like to go back into the records a little bit. I do not want to take too much time, but I would like to read from the journals in 1961, when it was moved:

that in order to provide some aid in reducing farmer’s costs of production, “this house recommends for the consideration of the government, that the use of purple tax free gas in farm trucks be permitted”.

Now, I would like to go on but first I want to say, who voted with the ‘yeas’:

Thatcher, Barrie, McDonald, Danielson, Cameron, McFarlane, Gardiner, Foley, Boldt, Klein, Horsman, Coderre, MacDougall, Snedker.

This was in 1961 that they voted for this.

How did the opposition members vote, the government at that time? Who were the ones that voted with the ‘Nays’? The first one was the member from Wadena, Dewhurst. He calls himself a farmer but he voted against it.

Who is the next man? Williams. Well, I guess he was the member from Regina. I can see him not being too interested in it because he was worrying about his own seat. Then, the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank). He claims that he is a farmer. How did he vote? It says here “nay”. Maybe nay means yes but according to this book it means, no. Then we go to Mr. Lloyd. He represents a rural area. He voted “no”. Then the man from Hanley — the hon. member from Hanley, Mr. Walker. Another “no”, but then Mr. Dewhurst said that he was qualified to be a farmer because he had twenty-two acres of land. So therefore, we have to say that another farmer voted against it.

Then we come to the hon. member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet). Here again is a man who is supposed to be a farmer. He claims to be a farmer, but he did not have the farmer’s interest at heart because by the book here it says “nay” again. Now, we have the hon. member from Canora at that time, a former minister of the cabinet (Mr. Kuziak) . . .

**Mr. Stuart:** — What ever happened to him?

**Mr. Romuld:** — I think he is a municipal secretary at Jedburgh but he apparently does not like . . . I had better not go on to this. It has nothing to do with this debate. Well, now, he voted “nay”.

Then we have the two honest members on the opposite side today. Mrs. Cooper — she voted “nay”, and I am glad that she has the courage to stand up in this house tonight and say that she would object to the bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — There are many of you on that side that could take some lessons from her — that you could have the courage of your convictions.

Then, we see Mr. Willis. I guess he is going to vote “no” the way he talks. He voted “nay”. Brown, another member from a rural area, voted “nay”. Thurston, a farmer, another member from a rural area, voted “nay”. Blakeney, “nay”. I guess maybe he did not understand, although he is a very intelligent man. I think he knew the plight of the farmers. Then, see here — I should skip the next name, it is Mr. Erb. He voted “nay” too.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romuld:** — But at least, I can say this for Mr. Erb. He saw the error of his ways and it did not take him long to cross over to the members on this side of the house.

Now, we get to the hon. member from Elrose, Mr. Turnbull. I’ll bet he wished he had voted with the “yeas” because as a result of it, he is not here any longer. Then there is a member from Saskatoon, I believe — Mr. Stone, a city member. Next, Mr. Whelan, a city member. Then we have the hon. member from Kinistino, Mr. Thibault. I am sorry he is not here — oh, he is in the back there. I don’t blame him for moving as far back as he can get. By what I can gather in his remarks, he does not even want to use purple gas this year. But it is quite alright. We are not forcing you to do it. I would imagine, had the government at that time brought in this, they would have come out and said, “You are compelled to use purple gas in your truck”. But you are not compelled, Mr. Thibault. You can still go home and use the bronze gas and pay the treasury fourteen cents. We won’t object a bit.

Then, we get on to the hon. member from — what’s that seat up north?

**An Hon. Member:** — Cumberland.

**Mr. Romuld:** — Cumberland. Yes, that’s it. I am surprised the way he spoke. He talked as if the farmers up there do not have any trucks. They have trucks in my constituency where you hit the poor farming area, and I imagine from the way he talks it must be that his whole constituency is like that. Many of these farmers have 1951, 1952 trucks. This is the only means of conveyance they have. They make their living by selling perhaps three, four, or five cream cans a week. Now, if you can imagine that every time they fill the truck, they are going to save two dollars, and then the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) gets up and says, “It does not means a thing. It is not going to help the farmer”. I suggest that he go back and take a look at the farmers in his area and get acquainted with them, rather than

**March 8, 1965**

driving back and forth from his own farm to his luxurious little home in the town where he lives.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Still wrong.

**Mr. Romuld:** — There is not a thing wrong with this. We have not finished yet.

Now, we will go on to the hon. member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). He is an auctioneer and I suppose it doesn't mean much to him. He drives a big station wagon. I do not imagine he would like to ride in an old half-ton truck such as I have to. But if he did, I don't think that he would be too proud to put purple gas in it, even if he voted against it.

Then we see Mr. Johnson, another "nay". Mr. Meakes, a "nay". The last two failed to get back here. Thiesen, a "nay". I guess he isn't here either. Snyder, a "nay", but of course, that did not matter. It is a city seat! Stevens, — I have never had the pleasure of meeting him but he is not here or I should have met him by now. We have Kuziak, another fellow that hit the dirt some place. He is not back here. Dahlman, Semchuk, Perkins, and last but not least, Broten voted against it, but he always has something to tell his people in his constituency. Hans was telling me one day, that they have a lot of Scandinavian people there. And he said, "You were right. Most of them are socialist". I guess that is why he is back. But it is because of good legislation such as this, that I am down here.

Now, that is in 1961. I am not going to read 1962 because it is identical. But I would suggest that if you were against it then, that you should still be against it unless you are worried about the next vote, because it was just as beneficial to the farmers at the time you voted against it as it is now.

I am going to support it. I am sure you have gathered this by now. I would certainly like to see how the members on the other side are going to be counted when this vote comes before the house.

**Mr. Willis:** — Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Romuld:** — Sure. Any amount.

**Mr. Romuld:** — I noticed that the hon. member now is the farmer's friend. But when it comes to the reduction in the municipal grant, are you in favor, sir, of the reduction in the estimates here in the Municipal Road Assistance Authority?

**Mr. Romuld:** — There is not any reduction. It is just some figuring that you Socialists have done because you do not understand the budget.

**Mr. Willis:** — Oh, it isn't a reduction? Oh. Oh.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Surely, you've got no farmers.

**Mr. Ed. Whelan:** (Regina North) — Mr. Speaker, when the by-election was held in Hanley, there was a promise of purple gas. What happened? Every time I looked in the paper there was a story about purple gas. This looked like a good gimmick, but what happened in Hanley? Let us look at it for a moment.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What happened in the election?

**Mr. Whelan:** — What happened in Hanley? The majority was increased from two votes to 767 votes and they promised purple gas.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — I am going to say to the hon. member who just took his seat (Mr. Romuld) that if we ever get a by-election in Canora, the same thing will happen in Canora. Let's do without purple gas.

**An Hon. Member:** — You can have principles.

**An Hon. Member:** — They'll vote against it.

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, if they will permit me to, I will continue.

There is a province where they have had purple gas for quite a long time and I suggest that all hon. members opposite study that experience with care. The Financial Post carried a story on it recently. It said that the automobile dealers were opposed to it, in this particular province. The contractors were opposed to the idea.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — And the CCF.

**Mr. Whelan:** — The service station operators were opposed to it. The people who were administering it said it was an administrative nightmare.

I am worried, Mr. Speaker, about this legislation because when you look at the results in Hanley, three years from now we are going to inherit this administrative nightmare.

**An Hon. Member:** — Vote against it. Maybe you will win.

**An Hon. Member:** — Don't worry Ed. You won't have to.

**Mr. Whelan:** — I am anxious to see the farmers get good positive help. I would like to see them get more than just this kind of assistance. I would like to see them get it through the Wheat Board. I would like to see them get it through a subsidy . . .

**Mr. Willis:** — . . . federal government.

**Mr. Whelan:** — I would like to see them have a guaranteed price for wheat. I would suggest this, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of Saskatchewan have had more help because of the poor crops in China and the poor crops in the Soviet Union than they have ever had from a Liberal government federally or provincially.

Mr. Speaker, I worked in a capacity for a branch of the government where it was my privilege to call on farmers who were in desperate financial trouble. I worked for the Provincial Mediation Board as the chairman of the board, and re-negotiated 700 or 800 mortgage foreclosures or agreement cancellations every year. This took me into . . . Did you hear the remark from the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy)? The peeping tom, who can't keep his mouth shut — who is constantly interrupting people? If you will just allow me to continue, I will make my point and then he can have the floor if he wants it.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . for a politician.

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, I accept all compliments, even if they are left-handed ones.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers that I met were trying to, diligently, meet their obligations. They were people who were honestly and sincerely trying to pay their debts — people that negotiated in a very definite effort, to pay off their obligations.

Most of these people, Mr. Speaker, could not use purple gas for cars. They could not use tax-free purple gas for trucks. They could not use tax-free purple gas for motor bikes. Mr. Speaker, why? Because they did not have a car, a truck or a motor bike.

There is another group, Mr. Speaker, that I think we should look at and I am very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Shaunavon (Mr. Larochelle) has not spoken on their behalf in this debate. I have been waiting all evening for him to come to their defence, and make a plea on their behalf. The group that I am speaking of, Mr. Speaker, are the truckers.

We have subsidies for railroads. They get assistance from the federal government but no relief for the truckers. Now, in this particular

**March 8, 1965**

legislation, truckers will be able to haul for their neighbours all over the province. The truckers pay license fees for trucks. They will be paying tax for fuel. It is beyond me how the hon. member for Shaunavon (Mr. Larochelle) could sit quietly by and watch this political punch to the solar plexus being administered to the Truckers Association, without as much as a word.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at this legislation, I am asking all hon. members to remember the truckers, plumbers, and the farmers, who do not use trucks.

**An Hon. Member:** — How are you going to vote, Ed?

**An Hon. Member:** — Are you for it or against it?

**Mr. Arthur Thibault: (Kinistino)** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Go ahead, Arthur.

**An Hon. Member:** — Get 'em, Art. Get 'em.

**Mr. Thibault:** — Here is the fellow that was quoted as speaking against purple gas. I had my notes the other day, and I was quoted in the press as talking against purple gas. But I want to make it clear, I quoted from the book of the resolutions that are going to be presented at the SARM convention, the convention that is going to be invaded by a bunch of politicians.

**An Hon. Member:** — Next week.

**Mr. Thibault:** — That is what I heard. When I was a reeve at one of these conventions, that convention was invaded by politicians. I hope we don't get that kind of reception next week.

About these resolutions . . . I had read this resolution and pointed out that the municipalities would sooner have the money than purple gas. I want to emphasize, there is every indication in this budget, that there is going to be a reduction in money to municipalities. Every year since 1956, we have seen a substantial increase to money sent to municipalities. This year it is in reverse and I do not like it.

**An Hon. Member:** — Shame! Shame!

**Mr. Thibault:** — What are you going to tell the farmers?

**Mr. D.C. McLennan: (Last Mountain)** — You tell us.

**An Hon. Member:** — Purple gas.

**Mr. Thibault:** — You are giving them purple gas and they are going to have to pay more taxes on their land to get the same service. In other words, you are making these farmers drive trucks instead of their cars, and lowering their standard of living. That is what you are doing. I am not scared to oppose this bill because I am going to oppose it. If you would give the municipalities more money, it would be different. But you are putting them in reverse. I am not scared to face the people of my constituency because I have been authorized to oppose this bill. I am not going to beat around the bush. So there you are. It is no use being wishy-washy about this thing — to say we are giving you something and then on the other hand, take it away.

So, I am not in favor of lowering the standard of the farmer, to force him to use a truck, when you could give a larger grant to his municipality where in return, he would get a lower mill rate. You could have gone along and given them a little more money for winter maintenance to keep the roads open in the winter time.

These are the things you should have done instead of bringing in purple gas. I would go along with the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) about his resolution. Now, I am out of order, but there has been so many things out of order that even if I am out a little bit it would not hurt. But his resolution on snow removal should have been considered instead of this purple gas.

At the same time, there would be no jealousy. Whether the farmer drives with a truck or a car, there would be no remarks made. In my community



the fellows that are driving with trucks will be told: "Oh, there you are. You are driving for nothing." The little plumber who has to pay about \$100 license, has not any purple gas for his truck. So there you are — creating class. Oh, it works good — creating class. Divide the people and rule. Well, I am not in favor. I like to see everybody equal before the law. That is why I will oppose this, because it is not achieving what you are trying to claim that it is achieving.

I am going to go along with the member for Regina and I am not scared to go back to my constituency and tell them that the reason I opposed it is because you refused to increase the money to the municipalities and it is going to force their taxes to go up and they will see, when the next tax notice comes, that the Liberal government is in power in Saskatchewan. Thank you.

**Mr. Fern Larochelle: (Shaunavon)** — Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of getting up on my feet, but the member from Regina (Mr. Whelan) really pulled me up when he said that the truckers of this province are going to be glad about purple gas — it might help them and that I should get up and defend them.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to defend the truckers of this province. They are proud to pay their way on the highways. We will continue to be proud to pay our way. We are contributing to the highway system of this province over \$3,000,000 a year, to build good roads, and I for one, am glad to contribute part of this amount.

I know we are fighting against odds in the transportation business, against subsidies and the likes of that. But I would like to tell the member from Regina (Mr. Whelan) to not worry about the truckers. We will look after ourselves. You should not worry about them and we are not going to ask any quarters either, because we have been paying our way.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I would like to draw the attention of the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) to a point that he mentioned. He was saying, a little while ago, that these people would be throwing vans on the back of their trucks and would be going out fishing in the north in these vans, on purple gas.

**Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey)** — Mr. Speaker, I didn't say that. I just asked a question about whether they would be able to use the purple gas.

**Mr. Larochelle:** — I will explain why they won't be able, and this is the reason why. We are not setting up service stations. This bill is put through to help the farmers in their farming operations, not to help them to go fishing or the likes of that. It is done to help them on their farm operations. This is one of the reasons why they will not be able to get that far out. There will be no restriction to their farm operations.

The member for Moose Jaw, (I am sorry he is not in his seat), referred to the poor service station man. I am one of these small service station operators. He is talking about the cost of \$5,000 to install a service pump. He must be installing a C.P.R. service pump. As far as I am concerned, my cost of installing a service pump — this is pump, a tank, and a cement island — the largest amount I can build it up to is \$900. I have installed them. I installed one just last summer again. There is no \$5,000 involved. You are talking about building a service station. I am talking about installing a pump. There is a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to see this legislation come in. It will be a saving to the farmers. A good saving. There was reference made that this would hurt the commercial trucker. I wonder if the people across the way have sat down and figured out the cost of trucking. I know it. Let us take an average haul of twenty miles — round trip. You say this is discriminating against the commercial trucker. If he is hauling 200 bushels of grain to town at an average cost of four cents a bushel, which is usually the maximum, it is \$8. The only competition that he has as a trucker, as close as I can figure out, is 36 cents. This is the advantage that this trucker will have. Thirty-six cents on the whole trip. Certainly this is not discriminating against the commercial trucker.

This is a good bill, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to be on this side of the house and be able to support it. I am not going to beat around the bush and say anything bad about it because it is good for the farmer.

**Mr. W.E. Smishek: (Regina East)** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that

**March 8, 1965**

there will be many farmers in the province who will welcome the introduction of this legislation. I also feel certain that the larger the farmer, the more he is going to welcome this legislation. If a farmer has one truck and will be able to save \$70 a year, so the argument comes from the other side of the house, then I suppose the farmer who has two trucks will save \$140; and the farmer who has three trucks will be able to save \$310, and so on.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is going to be establishing double standards which is typical of proposals from Liberal governments. First, there is going to be a double standard between the large farmer and the small farmer who does not own a truck, and there are still many of those farmers in Saskatchewan. To these farmers there is going to be no tax relief. This legislation will establish a double standard between the farmer and the urban dweller. Arguments have been presented from this side of the house that there are many people, whether it be a bricklayer, a carpenter, a plumber, or an electrician, who will have no tax relief from this legislation. In fact, every wage earner in the province will not get any tax relief from this law.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if it is good for farmers to have tax-free gasoline, in order that they may be able to improve their livelihood, then it should be equally good to have the same tax concession for wage earners, so they may be able to go back and forth to work on tax-free gas. I made a very rough calculation, and it seems to me, that in a larger centre, in Saskatoon and Regina, where many wage earners use their automobiles to go back and forth to work, in these centres, they have to travel anywhere from five to seven miles to get to work. On this basis, going back and forth to work over a period of fifty weeks each year, they will travel between 5,000 and 6,000 miles each year. I think that the wage earners would welcome a \$70 tax relief as well, but it appears that the wage earner is not going to get tax-free gasoline.

We also heard an announcement, with a great deal of clang and clatter, that farmers are also going to get some tax relief by way of a sales tax reduction on certain items. I looked carefully at the exemptions that are before us so far, and I see that wage earners are not getting any tax concessions on the tools they have to buy . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Point or order . . .

**Mr. Smishek:** — There are others who have strayed from the topic, so I hope that I might be permitted a wee bit of stretch as well.

Certainly, the teachers are not going to get any tax relief from this legislation. Many of them have to travel from ten to twenty miles to teach, from their homes to their schools. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out, this legislation really establishes dual classes, and in many respects, is discriminatory between one group of our population and another.

We have heard the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane) remind us that the government is planning a \$175,000,000 highway construction program in the next four years. This year, the government intends to spend \$35,000,000. To maintain its promise, expenditures will have to average approximately \$44,000,000 a year. Revenues from the gasoline tax and license fees in the province is about \$38,500,000 annually. Now, if the government is going to keep its promise of \$175,000,000 expenditures on highways, it seems to me, that the rest of the population in the years ahead will be faced with an increase in gasoline tax and probably license fees, or both.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope the government would be prepared to reconsider this bill before the third reading, to give some tax travel relief to the wage earners who have to travel back and forth to work, and to self-employed people, so that they too can have an equal chance, and have an equal saving to that of the farm people.

One other item, Mr. Speaker, before I resume my seat. I notice in the election promises that were made by Liberal candidates in Regina during the last campaign, they promised to provide an equitable share of gasoline tax revenues for Regina road construction and maintenance. I looked in the estimates, I looked in this bill, and I find that there is no equitable sharing of gasoline revenues for the people of Regina.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that while the government intends to keep this purple gas promise, that they also keep some of their other promises. As some of the speakers on this side have pointed out, they will be supporting the proposed legislation. They will do so with the intent to keep the Liberal party honest.

**Mr. W.A. Robbins: (Saskatoon City)** — Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be extremely brief. The member from Canora (Mr. Romuld) said he had not thought it was necessary to enter the debate, and then proved rather conclusively by his remarks, that it was not necessary.

The public accounts which I have taken the trouble to tabulate clearly indicate the government purchases in the last fiscal period did not go to the service stations to which he referred. The majority of it went to the Imperial Oil.

**Mr. George G. Leith: (Elrose)** — May I rise on a point of order? I think we have already found out that until the Public Accounts Committee reports to this legislature, nothing can be reported from it. Is this correct?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, until such time as the Crown Corporation Committee reports, no reference can be made to what took place in the Crown Corporation Committee.

**Mr. Robbins:** — The Premier estimates, or should I say, the Provincial Treasurer, estimates that the savings to farmers with respect to purple gas will come to \$3,900,000. Mr. Speaker, the Premier is not really noted for accuracy when it comes to quoting figures.

For example, the election campaign last April, the man who is now the Premier, the hon. member from Morse (Mr. Thatcher) — (I sometimes think this should be remorse) — said the previous administration had increased some 600 different taxes, yet on page six of the estimated budgetary revenues for 1965-66 . . .

**Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Gravelbourg)** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do not think that the hon. gentleman really is in order by referring to page six of the budget, and referring to the Budget Speech as such. We are dealing with a bill, and it is alright to refer to general matters, but not to specific pages and paragraphs. I think this is away out of order.

**Mr. Robbins:** — He lists seven taxes, one which is a new one — tobacco tax. I am sure the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) and I, are both going to see that he does not get too much revenue from this tax, but it also lists under this total taxes . . .

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher:** — The hon. member is talking about the budget and he can not do this in this debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would remind the hon. member that the budget is rather a long way from the bill we are talking about now.

**Mr. Robbins:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might say, in conclusion, that I know something about farming. I come from a farm that could very well classify for one of the master farm awards that the government is now talking about. This farm home was completely modern, as early as 1915, both in sewer and water and electricity. Personally, insofar, as the purple gas is concerned I feel the legislation is discriminatory. I think tax levies, if they are to be good tax levies should be levied uniformly over the population as a whole, and I will, therefore, Mr. Speaker, oppose this bill.

**Hon. A.C. Cameron: (Minister of Mineral Resources)** — Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to prolong the debate, but having been in this house and having joined in a motion requesting the former government to give us purple gas for so many years, I do not think it would be right for me not to say a few words on this momentous occasion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the opposition this evening, and I do not think, in my seventeen years in the legislature, that I have ever witnessed a performance such as I have witnessed tonight. Certainly, the kindest

**March 8, 1965**

word I can say is that they are caught with their garments in disarray.

They proceed to tell us all that is wrong with this bill. They say it is a political hoax — a political fraud — that it is paying a political debt — that it is paying a bribe to the people — and that it is bad legislation. The think the member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) said it is an irresponsible political promise.

After all these things, they stand up and frankly admit that they are going to condone these things. They are this political hoax. They are going to condone this fraud. to condone the Liberal party paying off their Liberal bribes and unabashedly going to condone They are going . . .

**Mr. Willis:** — Honest men.

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . and they are going to show that they are going to condone it because they said they are going to vote for it. They said, “Oh, they are going to go out and they can talk because they have fulfilled one political promise”. Indeed, we have. There are a few other political debts that we have yet to pay. There are other political promises that we have made, and you will be asked shortly to condone this political “bribe” too, to remove the mineral tax from farmers.

You will be asked about the lease land, and the sale of leases to farmers. These are political promises which the Liberal party made and which it is going to keep. One by one, we are meeting those commitments. I am surprised when I hear all of the words that were uttered tonight. Mr. Speaker, I think that there is a design behind it. This is not a free vote, and they know it. This is a vote on legislation introduced by the government. You either support it or you are opposed to it. But I know, and I can understand so clearly, from what has been said, that they are going to be in a position where they can either oppose it, or support it, depending upon to whom they are speaking.

You will find, that if they are dealing with the labor class, they will send out someone who opposed it, and he will say, “I am opposed to this because it is class legislation”. Then they are going to send someone to the farmer and he will say, “Oh, but some of us supported it. This is good legislation. It didn’t go far enough”. They will use both sides of face. You mark my words, when you see the press in a few days hence, they will still be speaking to some groups where they will be calling it a political hoax, a bribe to the farmers, an injustice to the laborer; and to others, they will be saying, “It is good legislation in the interests of the farmer, and therefore, I support it”.

I am not going to speak further because I am most anxious to see when their names are called, how they are going to record themselves on this question.

**Mr. R.H. Wooff: (Turtleford)** — Mr. Speaker, I agree with the ex-minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Nollet) when he said things go up and down. My experience over the years with a Liberal government, as far as the farmer is concerned, things mostly go down.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but there is a little motion on the horizontal level with the Liberal party — things go in and out, like Lucien Rivard . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Where is Clarence?

**Mr. Pederson: (Arm River)** — What Guy?

**Mr. A. Guy: (Athabasca)** — Not me.

**Mr. Wooff:** — All I have to say, Mr. Speaker, is I am very happy that we have got our 12,000 miles of grid road, and thousands of miles of municipal roads before this purple gas bill came in. There is a time and a place for all things. Not long ago — (I better keep quiet on that subject or I might get called out of order). However, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very frank about it. I am quite happy to support this piece of legislation, in order to let the Liberals keep one of the first promises that they ever kept, to the voters of Saskatchewan.

The member from Canora (Mr. Romuld) took quite a little time telling

us who voted in 1961, and I am not against it because it was almost worthwhile losing the time to watch the hon. member enjoy himself. But there is serious side to it. I was in Alberta last summer, and on more than one occasion, Mr. Speaker, I was told that the government was considering the withdrawal of purple gas legislation. However, things are as they are, and I for one, am going to give it a chance. I am going to see how it works out. There are some things about the legislation that I foresee trouble with, but I am not going to go into the difficulties now. Much of the ground has been covered by other members. It doesn't hurt me at all, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and say that I will support this legislation.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak, he must do so now.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, it has been my great pleasure to be in politics for twenty odd years, and yet never in those twenty years have I seen the opposition perform as they have today. We thought when we came into this house that we faced an opposition. Tonight it is clear that we face a very weak opposition.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — When they should be talking on a bill they have nothing to say. But if ever there was a bill they should not have been talking on, it was this one tonight, and they are very vociferous.

Here is a party opposite, Mr. Speaker, which for twenty years has been opposed to purple gas for farm trucks; which for twenty years in the legislature, and out of the legislature, voted against purple gas whenever they had the opportunity. Yet, what do we see tonight? As the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) said, one gets up and says "it is discriminatory, but of course, I will vote for it". Another gets up and says, "it is dishonest, but of course, I will vote for it". Two or three say, "it is going to hurt the little man, but of course, I will vote for it". Others say, "it isn't helping the carpenters, the plumbers, and the electricians, but I will vote for it".

The former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) said it was pregnant with difficulties. I challenge him to vote against it. I challenge him. Then the ex-Minister for Highways (Mr. Willis) said, "I have always opposed it, of course, I have got to go back home, so even though I am against it, I am going to vote for it now." I challenge the member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) and the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), who may soon have a by-election in their constituencies — how are you going to vote for it? I think the people in Pelly are going to be very interested now that their member said, "this is a hoax and a fraud" and I will make sure that they do find out about it. The hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) said, "Why, this measure is not new, we thought about it. We considered it." But they did not do a single thing about it. They voted against it. Then the member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) said, "we considered it but we didn't do anything because we wanted to build roads". Mr. Speaker, this government this year is building fifty per cent more roads than the people opposite did last year, right across the province.

**An Hon. Member:** — Right.

**Mr. Willis:** — Less grid roads.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, in the Hanley by-election, I heard some of the stories on purple gas that my Socialist friends were running around with. They said to the farmer, "You don't want to believe them, because when the Liberals get in they will not let you use it for anything personal. You cannot go to church on it. You cannot drive your children to school with it", and so on. Then they told the farmer, "You will not be able to take your truck more than ten miles away". They said, "You cannot haul your neighbors cattle, or your neighbors grain". They said, "You will not be able to use anything but half-tons". They had lots of stories going.

Mr. Speaker, this government is bringing in legislation that will let farmers use their trucks anywhere in the province, up to and including, three tons.

The member for Watrous (Mr. Broten) and one or two other members

**March 8, 1965**

said he did not think this was good legislation because it was a bribe, because it was not honest. If it isn't honest, why is he voting for it? Then he said all this legislation does is to carry out a political promise. Mr. Speaker, is it not about time that governments did start carrying out political promises?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We said we would do this and we are going to do it tonight and that is why my hon. friends across the way look so sick.

The hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) really had a brain wave tonight. He said this legislation discriminates against thousands of farmers because they cannot use their cars. Mr. Speaker, this legislation was not designed to permit farmers to use their cars. It is brought in because we believe that a farm truck is an implement of production, the same as a tractor. This opposition has talked, year in and year out, about the need to help the farmer. However, have you ever noticed they always think that somebody else should help the farmer? Someone said tonight that Ottawa should be doing something. They should be paying bonus prices. They should be doing this. They should be doing that. Maybe they should be, but this government thinks it is time for the legislature of Saskatchewan to do something for the farmer.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That is precisely what we are doing with this vote.

Now, two or three members had the courage to say "we are going to stand up and vote against this bill". I hope it is because of the principle, not because of the fact that they are city seats where there are not many farmers.

**Mr. Thibault:** — Point of order. I am not from a city seat.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I know you are not. And you will not be from any seat after this vote tonight.

**Mr. Thibault:** — You told me that before the last election, and I am back here.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We will see that you get lots of publicity on this one.

Then the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) said, "this saving won't be \$4,000,000. The Liberals are trying to fool us." I want to tell the hon. member from Cumberland that every time a farmer fills his tank with gasoline, this Liberal measure will save him \$2 to \$2.50. I do not think there will be many farmers in Cumberland who are not going to be very sure that this is good legislation. If my hon. friends think this is bad legislation, they should have the guts to vote against it. I challenge them to do it.

**An Hon. Member:** — Maybe I will.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You haven't the courage. I challenge you to do it. You are one member who lacks the courage.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not say I was going to vote for it.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I will just watch you. You haven't got the courage.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I said, I am for the reduction of the tax. I did not say I was going to vote for it.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I am told I have only one more minute. I have a lot of other things to say. I do want to say this to the people of Saskatchewan. If the Socialists ever take office again, Mr. Speaker, the farmers

of Saskatchewan may be sure that one of their first measures again will be to make the farmers pay tax on purple gas. That is one more reason I know why the farmers will never vote for them. This is legislation whereby this government, and this legislature can bring tangible help to the farmers. I challenge my opposition friends to vote against it.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier promised he would answer my question but he failed to do so — to define a farmer under the provisions of this act.

**An Hon. Member:** — He hasn't any answer.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

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

**YEAS — 46**

**Messieurs**

Thatcher	Grant	Nollet
Howes	Cuelenaere	Brockelbank (Kelsey)
McFarlane	MacDonald (Milestone)	Davies
Boldt	Gallagher	Willis
Cameron	Breker	Dewhurst
McDonald (Moosomin)	Leith	Michayluk
Steuart	Bjarnason	Smishek
Heald	Romuld	Link
Guy	Weatherald	Wooff
Merchant (Mrs.)	MacLennan	Broten
Loken	Larochelle	Larson
MacDougall	Asbell	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Gardiner	Hooker	Pepper
Coderre	Radloff	Pederson
McIsaac	Coupland	
Trapp	Wood	

**NAYS — 5**

**Messieurs**

Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Robbins
Thibault	Berezowsky	

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

The assembly adjourned at 10:05 o'clock p.m.