

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Fifteenth Legislature**  
**18th Day**

**Thursday, March 3, 1966**

The Assembly met at 2.30 o'clock p.m.  
on the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention and through you to the members of the legislature, a group of students in the Speaker's Gallery. These students are grade 11 and 12 students from the Goodwater High School. Goodwater is in the Weyburn constituency. These students are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Andrew Medwid and their bus driver, Mr. E. Erickson. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you all join with me in wishing them a very profitable and pleasant stay with us and a very safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, may I draw to your attention, the presence of a group of school students from the city of Saskatoon, in the west gallery today. They are 37 students from Northcott Public School. The one that is here each day, is the best school, of course, of the whole city. They are with their teacher, Miss Talbot, and I am sure the members will join with me in welcoming them to this legislature.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce through you to the members of the house a group in the Speaker's Gallery, which comes from the Elrose constituency. There is a student from each of the high schools, which are Lacadena, Kyle, Beechy, Eston, Elrose, White Bear, Wiseton, Birsay, Lucky Lake and Dinsmore. Their drivers are Mr. and Mrs. Bob O'Hara with Mr. Bill Leith and Mr. Lorne Burns. These students are here for two days. They are here for a rather more detailed study of the business of government rather than our usual half a day tour, and I know that all members would wish them good luck, wish that they learn something this afternoon, and that they enjoy themselves.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like all members of the house to join in extending a welcome to a group of university students who are here in the galleries today. I am advised that they are from the Political Science Department of the university. I am sure that all of us would want to extend to them our very best wishes for an enjoyable and, hopefully, an informative afternoon.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## CORRECTION OF NEWSPAPER REPORT

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West):** — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, might I rise on a point of personal privilege. It has been drawn to my attention that in a report in the Leader Post on Tuesday last, I was inaccurately quoted as indicating that oil production in Saskatchewan had been 7,000,000 barrels in 1963, 10,000,000 barrels in 1964, 6,000,000 barrels in 1965. What I, of course, said was our increase in oil production had been those particular figures in each year.

## BUDGET DEBATE

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the amendment thereto by Mr. Blakeney.

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate yesterday evening, I had taken some time to review a number of the programs, policies of my department, which I thought would be of interest to members, and I had just completed some remarks on the LID branch. I would like to make another comment or two on one more branch of my department, namely the Municipal Assessment Branch. This branch is responsible for the assessment of practically all of the property in Saskatchewan, other than the two cities, and we have found that we are behind in the reassessment program of the province some ten to fifteen years and in some cases up to 20 years. As a result we have sought to increase the staff in the department and as well as that to hire and train a class of assistant assessment officers to help speed up the load and update the assessment picture of the province. With that comment on the assessment branch of my department, I would like to spend some time this afternoon dealing with the budget presented by the Provincial Treasurer and to point out some of the areas that particularly affect my department, and just how specifically they do so.

The Provincial Treasurer has come up with a budget that sees a predicted increase in spending over last year's estimates by almost \$48,000,000, and yet the budget provides for only two tax increases and two major areas of reduced taxes. The reduction in income tax will benefit everybody and bring this province in line with the other provinces of the Dominion; also the Home-owner grants is a major step in an attempt to return some of the revenue of the province to the property owners of this province.

Now his budget also provides some major increases in present programs and some significantly new programs as well. Of particular interest to me, Mr. Speaker, is that his budget very clearly reflects the Liberal party's recognition of the fact that local governments do need more financial help from the province. In his Budget Address, the Provincial Treasurer stated that the total increase in direct financial assistance to local governments will be \$15,700,000. I would like to mention some of the increases that I would like to deal with in the time at my disposal. There are the Home-owner grants which will be going directly to every home owner in the province; the increase in the budget for the urban assistance program; the increase of \$800,000

over last year's estimate for grid road construction; the increase of \$1,400,000 in equalization grants to rural municipalities; a new program providing \$250,000 to assist rural people in snow removal on grid roads and school bus routes; a new program providing \$1,000,000 to rural municipalities to help in the maintenance of grid roads; the increase in the estimates for regravelling of grid roads, another contribution.

I would like to just further illustrate the value and the meaning of the Home-owner grants to the people of this province, and to cite the example of a town in my constituency, the town of Scott, Mr. Speaker. The 1964 assessment in the town of Scott was \$199,000, 1964 mill rate in that town was 68 mills. Now in that town there are 77 homes privately owned, and seven owned by the experimental station. In talking with the secretary of the town this morning, we estimated that there are about 70 of these homes that are owner occupied and will qualify for the Home-owner grant. Now, just how do they rate when we break them down? Sixty-four per cent of the homes in Scott will qualify for a grant equal to 50 per cent of the mill rate based on the 1964 figures, in other words, the Home-owner grants will mean a 34 mill reduction in the property taxes to 60 some per cent of the people in that town. Sixteen per cent of the people will qualify for a grant of \$50 which will represent a saving in mill rate of at least 25 mills, and 16.8 per cent in total will enjoy a reduction in mill rate of at least 36 per cent over last year.

The Urban Assistance Program is another program that is administered by the Department of Highways. However, because of the fact that my department does deal with urban officials in many other programs, I will make brief mention of it here.

The total expenditure last year, the minister tells me, will approximate \$5,000,000. The last year the NDP government was in power, the amount of money they spent on urban assistance totalled slightly under \$1,000,000, yet yesterday, the hon. member from Swift Current, (Mr. Wood) intimated that we were forgetting the urban governments. I would suggest that the increase in this program alone certainly indicates that the urban people are getting their fair share of the gasoline tax dollar as well.

In connection with urban assistance to municipalities, pardon me, assistance to urban municipalities, the member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) made the point yesterday that I mentioned in yesterday evening's remarks, but I would like to repeat it now. He said that the estimates indicated reduced assistance under the Municipal Water Assistance Program. That is correct, they do indicate some reduction, however, he also intimated that the policy was being curtailed by this government. This, Mr. Speaker, is not correct. For the first year in the history of the program there was no rationing of the funds. Up to this date, as of yesterday, \$586,000 had been paid out this year under this policy, and we expect that the total for the current fiscal year to run over \$600,000, with every qualified application for a grant being taken care of. We are using the same formula as I mentioned yesterday, that has been in effect for some years.

Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, I would like to take a moment or two to direct my remarks to the people of my constituency, the constituency of Wilkie. I want to thank them first of all for the support they have given me, not only in the last election but since that time. It is the first time ever, Mr.

**March 3, 1966**

Speaker, that Wilkie constituency has been represented in the Saskatchewan cabinet, and I want them to know that I will continue to make every effort to look after their needs even though I am 300 miles from home most of the time.

Last year we saw highway no. 14 oil surfaced from south of Landis to Wilkie, and from west of Unity to Macklin and the Alberta border, thus completing a dust free highway from Saskatoon to Edmonton running through my entire constituency. Arrangements were also finalized for the completion of the grid between Kerrobert and Unity and this road will become a reality this year.

Highway 29 which is the major access road for all of my constituents to North Battleford was oiled a distance of 15 miles north of Wilkie last year. This is a road used by most of my constituents in going to North Battleford as well as to the resort areas farther north in the province.

I know I am speaking for people of all political faiths in my constituency when I tell the Minister of Highways that we were very happy with last year's program. Although I will remind him that we still have a few more projects to look after before we will be satisfied. Highway 29, the balance of it to North Battleford, is in need of reconstruction. Highway 31 from Macklin through Primate, Denzil, Salvador, Luseland to Kerrobert, needs to be dust proofed. The people of north of Macklin are anxious to see Highway 17 oil surfaced to Lloydminster. We will be most anxious to see what the Minister of Highways has for us when he speaks in this debate next week, and opens his bag of goodies. With \$47,000,000 the record expenditure on highways, as revealed in the budget, it is clearly obvious to everyone in this province, that we are making every effort to catch up on the tremendous backlog of roadwork bequeathed to us by the Socialist administration opposite.

I would like to turn now to an event that I was closely involved with last year, Mr. Speaker. I refer to the Provincial-Municipal Conference which was called by the Premier of this province in December of 1965. I would like to spend some time, Mr. Speaker, to tell the members how the conference has affected the estimates and the programs of my department for this year. I will deal first with the Municipal Road Assistance Authority.

To give this agency the recognition and the emphasis that it deserves, and as an indication of what we intend to do with this agency, we propose to establish this authority under an act of the legislature this year. This authority is embarking on a number of new policies and expanding some of the present policies. The original ten year grid road program is completed as of this year, 860 miles, approximately, were built by municipalities this year, bringing the net total to date of a few miles short of 12,000 miles. Over \$5,000,000 was allotted by this government for construction in the past year, almost a record, Mr. Speaker, for grid road construction. This grid road program is being extended and to that end the grid road authority, itself, is presently negotiating extension mileage. To date approximately 3,000 miles of extension to the grid road system have been approved and additional miles will be approved as early this season as possible. Now in order to sort out the various requests we have had for extensions, engineers of the Municipal Road Assistance Authority will begin, as soon as we can this spring, to conduct traffic counts and do on-the-spot studies, and of course to work in conjunction with the municipalities involved to sort out the remainder of the approvals. As I mentioned yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the

question of designating a road as a grid road is now being handled by the Municipal Road Assistance Authority and not the Advisory Commission. The Advisory Commission has done this work in the past, and they have done a good job on it. The criteria that we are presently using to designate a road as a grid road are basically very simple. Firstly, that such roads be arterial in nature or intermunicipal connections and secondly, that they carry or will potentially carry 50 to 60 vehicles a day. Putting it very briefly, they must be going somewhere and carrying reasonable traffic as well.

Obviously, of course, all municipalities in the province will not be getting a specified average number of miles to construct as grid road. For some municipalities, the original mileage allocated some ten years ago comes very close to fulfilling their need of a network of all-weather roads. Others still require a good deal of mileage to be built before such a road network is complete. We realize, of course, Mr. Speaker, that occasionally local industries will develop and local trading patterns change that will in future require that a road be designated as a grid road. We will be prepared to look at these special cases when they arise.

As well as this we are initiating and encouraging another new service to municipalities this year. I refer to a traffic flow study of municipal roads. This will be a cost-shared program between the government and the municipality. Now what are the aims and objects of such a study, and what good will it do the municipality? The immediate objective of course would be to help us to designate any necessary grid road extensions. The more important, long range objective of such traffic study and overall road plan would be to determine the need for a system of access roads and feeder roads. And certainly municipalities should be able to more efficiently develop a long term complete road program that will make the best use of their tax dollar and our tax dollar. We announced this in late January, Mr. Speaker, to the municipalities and recently we have had a total of over 50 applications from municipalities interested in conducting such a survey.

Another program that I referred to earlier was the Equalization Grant structure of assistance to municipalities. Any overall program of assistance to municipalities should give special recognition to the poor municipalities, those municipalities with a low assessment in relation to the cost of services that they are required to provide. This brings us to a definition of equalization grants and their purposes.

Equalization grants are cash grants paid in an attempt to provide the lower assessed municipalities with the financial resources necessary to provide their residents with a reasonable average standard of services. Now the poorer municipalities are given special recognition in the formula we use for determining grid road grants. The weakness of the grid road grant and other shared-cost policies, of course, lies in the fact that they may be very hard pressed to make up their own contribution in order to take advantage of our assistance. To relieve this situation, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is increasing its unconditional equalization grant by over four times, reaching an annual figure next year, an actual figure of \$1,820,000. This is in comparison to a figure of \$420,000 last year and in every year since 1958 under the previous administration. This, I submit, Mr. Speaker, will be a significant step in the direction of helping out the low assessed municipalities. Increased equalization

grants were termed the top priority of rural governments at our recent Provincial Municipal Conference and this is the result of that.

For years, the former administration used a formula which no one in my department is presently able to understand. The result was that the annual equalization grant was not always an equalization grant. The existing formula is inflexible and it has not, as I say, resulted in the poorer municipalities actually getting the larger grant many times. In contrast to this inflexible, irrational and little-bit-difficult-to-understand formula. We are presently in the final stages of drafting a formula that will channel the majority of the funds to the poorer municipalities. The main category of expenditure, of course, that they have is road construction. We will be taking into account such factors as the population of the municipality, the density of population, the assessment per township, existing provincial highways, the need for intermunicipal road connections and the location of service centres in that municipality. We arrive at a theoretical road need for each municipality. When we work out this formula, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that it will be a much more equitable, flexible formula than has been used in the past. We are working this formula out in conjunction with municipal officials who will be consulted and advised as we go along on it.

Grid Road Maintenance is another new program that is instituted this year for the first time. The SARM has asked the provincial government for the last several years to provide them with financial assistance to help cover the cost of maintenance of grid roads. This request is based on the fact that a good percentage of the traffic on these roads is not local municipal traffic. Certain grid roads incidentally show traffic counts equal to or about that on some of our minor highways. At the Provincial-Municipal Conference, the SARM again raised this question as being one of their high priority requests. Now the estimates show a figure of \$1,000,000 to be provided for general maintenance for grid roads. We do not have the detailed policy worked out as yet, Mr. Speaker, but again we are working on it and consulting with SARM officials in developing a fair and equitable formula. We will provide this on a dollar for dollar basis as far as our funds will go. One million dollars spread over 12,000 miles of grid road will provide a good reasonable amount per mile for maintenance cost. We will expect a certain basic minimum standard of maintenance to be adhered to. For example, surface blading, shoulder reshaping, mowing and brush removal, are some of the requirements that I could mention.

Another new policy, Mr. Speaker, that is provided for in the sub-vote of \$250,000 is a policy designed to assist municipalities with snow clearing costs. While this policy is also intended to be a shared-cost policy, we have made this policy quite flexible for the first year. The money will be made available to the municipalities in the coming year's estimates, but it will apply to this last winter's operation. We are well aware that the amount is not large, but it is \$250,000 more than has ever been provided before for this purpose, and we do recognize that the problem exists.

I will say this much, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion the great bulk of our assistance to municipalities should be in the construction of more all-weather roads. This, I believe, is the best long term approach to this problem of snow removal. The budget estimates, I submit, reflect this approach, Mr. Speaker, in that the increase in estimates for the Municipal Road Assistance Authority this year totals \$3,800,000. This figure alone represents an increase in assistance averaging five mills over the

total rural assessment of the province, an average of five mills in representing the increased assistance provided this year alone. It will give the municipalities a chance to either reduce taxes on an average, or extend their services in particular, their services on all-weather roads. These roads, of course, are used by people in the towns and villages and by school buses as well.

Now the previous administration, Mr. Speaker, was very concerned and very intent on facilitating means of centralizing our school system. I don't wish to get into the pros and cons of this at the present time. I just want to point out one parallel development. In 1955 there were 12,000 children going to school by school bus. Last year, at the beginning of September, 1965, there were almost 76,000 children travelling to their schools by bus, fantastic increase in a short space of ten years. School bus routes total over 50,000 miles daily in this province and most of these miles are on municipal roads. Such roads for obvious reasons should be all-weather roads. Yet the former government never demonstrated in a financial way that it had any concern for the tremendous increased demands that were placed upon the municipal councils of this province by the centralization of the school system. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all members, that the budget for the Municipal Road Assistance Authority this year clearly indicates to municipal people and to school board members that the Liberal government does recognize this need for better roads and better services in the country. Not only are there increases, but the variety of policies, Mr. Speaker, are positive proof of our attitude.

I would like to just briefly review, Mr. Speaker, the suggestions that were made to this government at the Municipal-Provincial Conference last fall. All three bodies at the conference, School Trustees, Urban Association, Rural Association, requested increased funds for education. Major increases are contained in this budget for schools and educational costs. The rural association sought increased equalization grants. I have outlined to you that this has been done. They also requested that the province assume part of the cost of grid maintenance, and we have done this. All groups expressed concern over the property tax burden and the Home-owner grants to be paid to the citizens next year will be a major step forward to help relieve this burden. The Urban Association asked for more comprehensive housing legislation and this is being introduced at this session. The urban delegates also asked for an expansion of the Urban Assistance policy and this, I understand, will be forthcoming when the Minister of Highways speaks to this debate next week. There were several other requests that were made and granted. I would suggest that the atmosphere that prevailed at the conference, the overall success, and the results of it, that is something that the Liberal government and the municipal government of this province can well be proud of.

The last such conference was held in 1956, Mr. Speaker. At that one, municipal officials were brought in and rather than consulted with were mainly lectured to. What were the results of that conference? Basically this — a long series of public meetings by a boundary commission, meetings that aroused the ire and antagonism of almost every rural council and rural ratepayer in the province. I need not comment on the comparison of the Liberal approach to the municipalities of this province.

Mr. Speaker, quite obviously I will support the motion and not the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**March 3, 1966**

**Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, on rising to take part in the Budget Debate, I would like to add my name to those who have congratulated our new members. I feel sure that they will make a big contribution to this house.

Mr. Speaker, it gives one a good feeling to stand up and support a budget that was brought down by our Provincial Treasurer and Premier in the house last Friday. I just can't understand why the members opposite could vote against it. Mr. Speaker, when we add the savings of this budget to the savings in last year's budget, the savings to the taxpayers in this province under a Liberal government are amounting to a good sized figure.

Special mention should be made of the \$50 Home-owner grants, also the reduction of one per cent in the income tax. Add to this the tax free gas for farm trucks, which incidentally, Mr. Speaker, some farmers tell me will save them up to \$200 in their farming operations within a year. But of more importance I feel it is a saving to the small farmer of my constituency who can only afford one vehicle and this a half-ton truck, which they use for transportation as well as for transporting their farm produce to market. Mr. Speaker, these savings mean quite a lot when one thinks of the savings in the reduction also of the education tax from five to four per cent last year. There is a tremendous saving and it is a considerable help in what is called the cost-price squeeze of the farmer. Mr. Speaker, when the members opposite were the government they used to do a lot of talking about the cost-price squeeze of the farmer but the only thing that I recall them doing about it was yelling to Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, now that we have a Liberal government here in Saskatchewan we are doing something about it and we intend to do more about it in the future.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coupland:** — Mr. Speaker, there are other ways in which we are saving the taxpayer money, one of these is grants, some of which the hon. member has just finished relating. One, as you may recall, Mr. Speaker, was when the Meadow Lake constituency had rains of up to seven inches in a few hours last June, causing 21 bridges to be washed out and a lot of roads disappeared and this would have created a raise in the mill rate in one LID had not this Liberal government stepped in and advanced something around \$10,000 to help replace these bridges and some of the roads. Mr. Speaker, I have also a copy of a letter which I received from our LID office in Meadow Lake. I would like to quote from it. It is a resolution, and I quote:

The following is a resolution passed by the committee of representatives on February 14, 1966.

It is addressed to the Hon. J.C. McIsaac and a copy to myself.

That a letter of thanks be sent to the Minister of Municipal Service for formulating the snowplow policy with a copy to H. Coupland.

On behalf of the committee, the ratepayers and myself, I wish to express our thanks for the snowplow policy. It is of great assistance in the neighboring snow removal on school bus routes and grid roads.



Mr. Speaker, this is what people in my area think of the liberal policies that are being brought forth in their term of office.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to commend the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) for a job well done in his department. We have had almost a \$1,000,000 of work tendered on capital construction in the last year in the Meadow Lake constituency. This is apart from the ordinary maintenance that is carried on. Mr. Speaker, I must say that the maintenance crews must be doing a far better job as I have had far less complaints in the last year than we used to get in the past. I think this speaks for itself in the job that is being done throughout the country. I hope the minister will take into consideration the rebuilding of no. 4 highway south of Meadow Lake in the near future so that when the road is completed to Dorintosh the tourists will be able to enjoy one of the best recreational areas in Saskatchewan.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the house the picture on the highways report. It is a picture of the start of the Vermette Lake road which goes up on the west side of Canoe Lake and goes on into the country north. It gives an indication of the type of terrain that the crews have to work in, in order to push this road north. It will open a lot of country for the tourist trade as well as give access to the Primrose Forest Products timber berth which would have been in operation this year, Mr. Speaker, if the Timber Board monopoly had been lifted as much as I would have liked to have seen it lifted.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) for his part in getting a pulp mill into Saskatchewan. Even though this pulp mill is situated over at Prince Albert I feel that it is going to create a lot of employment in the Meadow Lake area. Mr. Speaker, I have a clipping here that I would like to quote from; I see the member for North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) is not in his chair. This clipping is from the North Battleford News Optimist, dated January 18th, 1966, and the headlines are "Kramer Forecasts Surprise Election", but I think the only surprise he got was in Bengough, Mr. Speaker. But I would like to quote from this article to show some of the double talk that we are getting, he said:

The people of Saskatchewan are going to build a mill, build a road, supply the site and pay the company to take our timber. I sincerely hope that these suspicions are wrong but I feel they are right.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we got the pulp mill but he goes on to say:

The government of Saskatchewan has a lot of new advantages in dealing with any pulp company.

And I would say that they have some advantage being a Liberal government. That's one big advantage. He ends up by saying:

That while he had been Minister of Natural Resources he felt confident that with such guarantees of grants and freight rates he would have had Green Bay Package build a pulp mill.

In other words he's saying that we shouldn't do it but he should have done it when he was Minister of Natural Resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to turn to the problem

**March 3, 1966**

we have in our area. It involves the Metis settlement of Green Lake. There has been lots said about it but I would like to say a few words about some of the agitators we have in our area. I have a copy of a university paper in which the Neestow students have an appeal for funds. Now, I would just like to quote a paragraph or two from that paper, Mr. Speaker, to show where these people come from; one of them is Robertson Wood. This is dated January 21st, 1966.

In October, Mr. Robertson Wood finished his work with the student non-violent co-ordinating committee in Mississippi and other parts of the south, and has come to work with Neestow on a long term basis.

Farther on it says, there are three people, I am informed that there are four there now, but here it says all three people working in Green Lake are there on long term commitments to Neestow and intend to stay and work at the shortest for a year.

Both Rob and Linda have experience in community organizing in the free movement in the south and are living on subsistence wages.

**An Hon. Member:** — Communist agitators.

**Mr. Coupland:** — Mr. Speaker, these four, two boys and two girls, are living in a little house up there, a two-roomed house, and I don't feel, Mr. Speaker, that they are setting a very good example to our Indian and Metis population in Green Lake.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coupland:** — All they are doing is creating a lot of problems. We have been trying to set up policies. We realize that these people over the past twenty years haven't been getting a break in that area, but when we have people like these four up there that are agitating and causing dissension when the government is trying to set up policies, I just don't feel that it is right. I have another clipping here, Mr. Speaker. It is a paper put out by the Metis Association — a newsletter. In these papers most of the literature is compiled by the Neestow students. I have one here the Metis Association newsletter, Green Lake Local, December 23 and I would like to quote from here and show what type of things they are trying to stir up. In this newsletter there is a copy of a letter from Malcolm Norris. It is addressed to Richard Thompson, Associate Member, M.A.S., Green Lake.

Dear Richard: I have been given a copy of the paper entitled a new approach to human rights, which I will have cut on a stencil for distribution.

It starts off with the first sentence as follows:

People don't get opportunity or freedom or equality or dignity as a gift or an act of charity. They only get these things in an act of taking them through their own efforts. Pass this on to the people of Green Lake. The more militant they become the better. Tell them to get more militant.

And then he goes on to say:

Perhaps a march on the legislative buildings in Regina is what is required.

Now how are you going to do things for these people up there when you have people telling them to get more militant. I would just like to say that I have had quite a few discussions with a lot of the Metis people up in that area and they have been asking me if maybe they could start petitions to have these people out of there. This is the feeling that is up in that area in regard to them and I think that if the people knew what was going on in Green Lake there would be very few donations come in on an appeal like this one here. Mr. Speaker, as you will fully realize I will wholeheartedly support the motion but I will vote against the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I notice there are few minutes left before the opposition takes over the floor on radio time and I have just a few comments that I would like to make on the budget.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I think that this is a budget which will be received by the people of Saskatchewan with great enthusiasm, particularly from the viewpoint of tax reduction. We Liberals have long believed that the people of Saskatchewan are the most highly taxed people in Canada. We are particularly concerned over property taxes. We watched over the past 20 years property taxes increase over 400 per cent in this province. We believed that it was absolutely necessary to do something in this regard. Let me briefly review some of the things that the Liberal government has done to tackle this problem in the past two years.

First of all in our first budget brought down a year ago we reduced sales tax from five to four per cent. Second, we permitted the use of purple tax free gas in farm trucks. Third, we removed the mineral tax from farm lands. Fourth, the exemption of newly married couples from sales tax on purchases of furniture and other household goods up to \$1,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, in this budget we have taken further steps to see that property taxes in Saskatchewan are lowered. Number one, of course, and the most important, is the Home-owner grant. When I think of what has been accomplished in this province by this government in regard to property taxes, I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan will accept it as a direct attempt on the part of the Liberal government to reduce property taxes. Let me turn to a couple of other items. Number one, the incentive grants in education. This can either be passed on in increased service or can reduce taxes to the equivalent of two mills. Grid road assistance, you know, Mr. Speaker, it was rather interesting for all of us on this side of the house to watch the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) stand on his feet and talk for half an hour and never mention the tremendously expanded budget in the Department of Municipal Affairs. I know of no man who should have stood on top of his desk and shouted to the heights about the increase and expanded revenues in that department.

**Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current):** — Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I said a good deal about the large increase in the Municipal Road Assistance Grant.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, his points were not only critical but highly confusing, insofar as first of all he looked around for an

excuse and an opportunity to criticize the Water Grants to small communities. The minister explained that not only were these Water Grants given to small municipalities but they were given to any and all towns and villages that applied for them.

I want to also comment, Mr. Speaker, for a moment on the Saskatchewan Youth Agency. Many of the members opposite have commented and expressed an interest in the work of the Saskatchewan Youth Agency. Unfortunately they didn't show their interest in a more tangible fashion. The junior member for Saskatoon (Mr. Brockelbank) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) both expressed concern that no comments had been made on the Saskatchewan Youth Agency. Early this summer I wrote a letter to every member of this house extending a very cordial invitation for them to attend the public hearings of the Saskatchewan Youth Agency. I can say that many members of the government side attended those hearings but not one single member of the opposition, not even those members where public hearings were held in their own communities, showed any interest whatsoever in attending these public hearings.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, the reason for delay in reporting on the Saskatchewan Youth Agency is the fact that I was most concerned that each member of this assembly receive a copy of Youth Today, a public report presented by Dr. Howard Nixon and Dr. Lloyd Barber on the problems of youth in Saskatchewan as found in the research carried on by the Saskatchewan Youth Agency over the past summer. I felt that not only should it be presented to this house but that every member of this house be given an opportunity to read it and study it carefully before the amendments to the bill were put in. Early next week I hope to give a complete and rather detailed report, not only on the progress of the Saskatchewan Youth Agency and what has been accomplished in the past year but also on the plans and programs for the coming year. Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes I have left I would like to comment on a phase of the work in the Department of Health that I had an opportunity to work with as a Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Health.

This government has moved ahead to meet the existing and emerging needs for trained personnel in the health area. In September the School of Physiotherapy was opened on the Saskatoon Campus of the university. This government has announced plans for a College of Dentistry, a need long overdue. We have had increases in the number of both doctors and dentists practising in this province and I am pleased to say that about one-third of the new physicians are practising in smaller urban centres, centres which traditionally suffered from a shortage of doctors. This government has also acted to consider the problems of shortages of trained and qualified nurses in Saskatchewan. Last July we assembled an ad hoc committee on nursing education, chaired by Mr. Justice W.A. Tucker of Saskatoon. Members of the committee represented the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association, the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, The Catholic Hospital Conference, the University of Saskatchewan, the Department of Education and the Department of Health. As you all well know we have in this province been continually faced with a shortage of qualified nurses. This is a problem of many years' standing, a problem that becomes more and more urgent. We must resolve the question of supply of an adequate number of well-trained nurses and we must ensure that they are best used in the important work that we entrust to them. We believe that the best way

to examine these questions was through an independent committee. A committee made up to represent many of the groups vitally interested in these problems. We, therefore, asked the committee to study the nursing education system that we presently have in Saskatchewan. We asked them to determine our need for nurses by type, by quantity and by quality. We asked them to consider whether the present system would be able to meet these needs. We asked them to consider how to best use the human and physical resources that are now and will be available. We asked them to consider costs, to examine the processes of standard setting of inspection, of enforcement. We asked them to recommend which agency could best discharge these functions and what definitions of authority and responsibility would be needed. We asked them to provide a means of establishing a good form of relationship between the agency responsible and other groups interested in nursing education.

We are pleased to be able to tell you that Mr. Justice Tucker, two months ago, submitted an interim report and based on recommendations therein, and study by cabinet, we have introduced legislation in the house that will substantially affect nursing education in this province when passed and put into effect.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that my time is expired. I hope that you have noticed from my remarks that I will support the budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina East):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to enter into the Budget Debate. Being on the air for the first time this session I deem it most fitting to extend a very warm welcome to our radio audience who faithfully listen to these broadcasts coming from their capital city. We extend an invitation to them to come in person sometime and visit this assembly. It is my duty as an MLA to help inform the people of Saskatchewan, as well as the citizens of the Queen City of Regina, and particularly my own constituency, Regina East, whom I have the privilege of serving and advising as to the effects on the economy of the 1966-67 budget.

In fact these estimates do not provide the benefits the citizens of this province wish to retain and magnify in the future. This budget appears to represent a slowing up of the economy, considering the history of this province over the past 20 years. There is one essential thing needed in this day and age and that is to give security to our people. It cannot be recognized to the full in this budget for this year. This can be done only through proper welfare legislation and by strengthening our economic base. Over the past 20 years while the CCF were in office they gave the farmers, the workers, the people in business and in industry, real security in this fine province of ours. What security did we give the farmer? Too often we forget what transpired in the past, such as what took place during the 30's before 1944, while members of the government side were in power. We forget about the men who worked on farms for board and room and in some cases may have received \$5 a month. We forget about the farmers and the city people who lost their farms and homes through tax sales or repossession because of not being able to pay off their mortgage.

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Estevan):** — I don't believe you . . .

**Mr. Baker:** — We forget about the days when

**March 3, 1966**

the farmer got three or four cents for a dozen of eggs. We forget about the days when we couldn't get into a hospital because we could not pay the entrance fee and we could not pay for doctors either. Not only did we not have car insurance but we didn't have any cars to drive. We have forgotten when teachers were paid \$300 a year and collected their wages by notes or by being on relief. Yes, we forget when our school children were ill-clothed and when we had poor schools and no facilities for them such as school books. We forget about our young boy and girls who worked 50 to 60 hours a week for \$4 to \$6 in the cities. I could go on and on, recounting incidents how our people were treated by a government which we again have in power in our province today.

What security did the CCF give in those 20 years while in office? First let's take a look at our farmers. The first form of security was to bring in the Farm Security Act so that farmers could not lose their land during the times of drought or crop failure. This same act gave similar protection to our city dwellers if illness or loss of job on the part of the breadwinner and payments could not be made. How was the worker affected when the CCF government took office? The first thing it did was to give collective bargaining rights to working people. It gave holidays with pay. It brought in an Hours of Work Act, raised workmen's compensation and raised the minimum wage, and saw that people received proper incomes. I may point out at this time that the workmen's compensation benefits today need an upgrading very soon. How did this affect business? When more money was put into the hands of our salaried people it was spent in our business premises. People bought insurance, they bought and built homes and created a demand for more industrial goods thus getting the wheels of industry going. What did we do to attract industry to our province and set up an economic base? The key to this was to get electricity. This is where the Power Corporation came in and distributed electricity to the cities, towns and villages and to all the farms. Also included in this was the distribution of natural gas to these centres. What do you suppose will put British Columbia strong in the field of industrial development? It is the public control of its electricity. They followed our pattern; but they did one thing different, they took the B.C. Electric, a privately owned company, away from the owners and paid for it after. Manitoba as you notice is now embarking upon a large hydro development, following Saskatchewan's example of the Power Corporation.

Yes, we gave security in many ways: through our hospitalization and medicare plan, our car insurance, our air ambulance service, commonly known as flights of mercy; by developing 5,800 oil and gas wells, by discovering and developing potash mines and fertilizer plants, by setting up a steel mill in Regina, cement plants and other enterprises in different centres. We extended a modern telephone system to most of the province and it is now one of the finest on this continent. Yes, we attracted private monies for industry, housing and apartment building. We provided public and co-operative monies to start new and expanded industries. We established a well-balanced economy to look after all the people of this province.

Now what does the budget just brought down for 1966-67 do at this time to give further security, to continue to build on our solid economic base? I must say that in just two short years, the stature of this province has been steadily slipping. Surely the government's policies can be altered to eliminate the conditions that created the 30's, still fresh in the minds of the citizens of this province. The budget talks about priorities. What are the real priorities for cities, towns, villages and

our farming industry?

First, I would like to cover the number one priority as I see it in this province, and that is the condition of most of our senior citizens and pensioners. It is the senior citizens in the twilight period of life who are annually finding it more difficult to exist on fixed incomes and an ever increasing cost of living. These are the people who developed our great province of Saskatchewan. These are the citizens who lived through the Dirty Thirties when the government of that day did absolutely nothing to aid their meagre living. Let's amend these estimates to immediately increase the old age pension from \$75 to \$100 per month at this session. We in this province need not wait for Ottawa to take action in this regard. Let's make it a humane budget and help, as all government should, the people in need, mainly our senior citizens who are having a difficult time.

Our provincial economy is lucrative enough to increase the pension by \$25 to \$100 a month as well as to give mothers' allowance and social aid people the same increases. Added to this the pensioners should get \$150 a year homeowner grant at age 65 if they own their property, and \$120 a year for those over the age of 65 if they pay rent.

What would I list as priority number two in this budget? We must compensate the farmers for the 37 or 38 cent wheat payment they just received; it's some 10 to 17 cents less than last year. This reduced price takes place in a period of increasing prices for machinery and other costs. In spite of this situation this government provides no concrete proposals in this budget or recommendations to Ottawa.

It appears there isn't much money provided to fight the CPR to prevent the reduction of passenger service to our communities or rail line abandonment. Nothing has been provided to work out plans to reduce handling storage charges of farm products. No recommendations have been pressed on my suggestion regarding the two-price system for wheat. Nothing to stop the sky rocketing of costs of farm machinery. I am told that farm tractors are going up by \$300 to \$400 this year. I repeat again for this assembly, my recommendation through this house to Ottawa that the farmers be paid for the first 2,000 bushels a fixed price of \$2.75 for no. 1 Northern wheat over and above freight charges; and wheat over and above the 2,000 be sold at prevailing rates. If this cannot be accomplished then we have reached the stage in Canada where farm machinery for the farmers must be subsidized.

These are some of the things that will maintain the family farm and produce a diversified agricultural economy, and also keep the economy of the whole of this country moving. We need floor prices to protect the income of those engaged in diversified agriculture such as raising cattle, hogs, dairying and so forth. We need a board to handle their products, the same as our successful wheat board.

The farming industry is our prime resource and income and must be protected at all costs. It was broadcast all over this province that when the present government got in it would return to the farmers the cost of installing electricity in farm homes, something like \$500 per home. With a profit of between \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 this year, I suggest that we work out a plan and pay this back to the farmers on the basis of \$100 a year over a five year period. Although the net expenditure is up \$2,000,000, we see no new programs of significance to help the farmer. The time

**March 3, 1966**

is also ripe to pressure Ottawa to put all farm laborers under the unemployment insurance plan.

I turn now to municipal financing. Recently the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, met with the government of Canada on urgent matters facing the municipalities of this country. It was through the efforts of the mayor's organization that the Municipal Development and Loan Act came into force some three years ago. It was a good act for it provided low interest borrowing not obtainable on the open market for municipalities. It was resolved by the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities that the government continue through additional appropriation to make municipal capital available to those provinces still lacking low interest provincial schemes. After consultation with the provinces, the government itself could determine through what machinery, either new or existing, such funds could be made available and at what point the federal scheme may be terminated and a provincial plan enacted.

You and I today are faced with a tight money policy in this country. Perhaps tight money may be necessary in eastern Canada but it is certainly not necessary in Saskatchewan or Regina. We need more investment money to keep our economy continually moving. Some say that tight money will continue for six months or even longer. What will happen? It will certainly have a recessive effect on our economy sometime in the next year or two. It will effect the revenues of this province and of the municipalities as well. It is primarily designed, this tight money policy, in the main to force up interest rates. If monies are not available for the construction of houses, apartments or other living quarters, we are going to be faced with a serious housing shortage in Regina in the next two years. What are the answers to stop these booms and busts that we are continually faced with because of policies at Ottawa? The municipal loan fund that the mayors got the Ottawa government to set up will be discontinued this year. The Canada Pension contribution in Saskatchewan could give our province \$25,000,000 for investment. What method should be followed to get this money in the hands of our people? A development corporation fund has been suggested. This is good. But I believe we have reached the stage where we must go one step further and that is to set up a Saskatchewan bank. Let's get into the banking business as a province. Oh yes, you may say you can't do it under the BNA Act. I'm sure this can be worked out on a joint effort with the Bank of Canada without forfeiting any of the federal rights of Confederation. These monies could be available now as social capital to municipalities for sewer, water, roads and transportation. These monies are needed now as risk capital to lend to the construction industry for building houses, apartments, nursing homes, hospitals, for commercial and industrial purposes too. This could be done by charging reasonable interest rates. It is the only way we can offset recessions, when the loaning institutions clamp down in providing money thus causing ups and downs in our economy and increasing interest rates.

The government of Saskatchewan has a duty to direct the funds of a buoyant economy to attain lasting benefit. One such place requiring these funds is the University of Regina. This government must direct funds to this educational institution in order to make a sound investment in our youth. Today's students are with us for such a short period. This time is quickly reduced when the student must go to other areas to complete his or her university training. Many of these students are gone forever as they secure employment other than in Saskatchewan upon graduation.



We must rapidly expand our training facilities. It is the best way to develop our youth for the benefit of this province. This can be accomplished to the full by giving our university in Regina its own Board of Governors and by establishing complete degree-granting courses here in our city to take care of southern Saskatchewan.

Independent boards are now given to the universities in British Columbia and in the province of Alberta. The ten Ontario universities have all got autonomy with separate boards of governors. Let's take this step at this session and move ahead with the university here as planned to accommodate eight to ten thousand students so that we can get on with other centres that should be receiving colleges for their share of higher education too, such as Moose Jaw, Yorkton, Swift Current — I can go on and name Estevan, Weyburn, Melfort, Melville, and North Battleford . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — How about Prince Albert?

**Mr. Baker:** — If we are to establish advanced degree courses here in Regina then the government had better act soon because there won't be many left.

I am very surprised at the Premier, who while working for the whole of Saskatchewan forgets about all of the other cities, particularly when he himself lives very close to the two major southern centres.

What about all the other MLAs on their side living in southern Saskatchewan. I wonder how they feel. I don't begrudge anyone schools of higher learning but let's look after the other centres as well. I would ask the government and the Minister of Education as I did the last session to give complete autonomy to our Regina university now.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that this government is proud of its already announced allocation of \$100,000 to the Saskatchewan Arts Board. This government in a press report indicated, "We are hopeful of obtaining next summer in Regina the Montreal and Vancouver Symphonies and the Royal Winnipeg Ballet". This contribution is a good start. It is to be noted, however, that the government was not quite so generous in its contributions for the two auditoriums in Regina and Saskatoon. These auditoriums . . .

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier):** — Gave more than the CCF allotted.

**Mr. Baker:** — These auditoriums are basic for the development of our arts in this province. Culture cannot be bought but proper facilities must be provided to promote cultural growth. For over a year I had to prod many in authority until some form of agreement was reached. Yes, and had procrastination continued much longer these projects would have never been undertaken. Some people made it most difficult. If it were not for the Auditorium Board in Regina and some of us elected to local governments there would probably be no auditorium in either city, Regina or Saskatoon. If this government really is interested in the arts I would suggest to them that they give each city another \$800,000 to complete the project properly.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You're great at spending our money, Henry.

**March 3, 1966**

**Mr. Baker:** — We've had ours for years. We saved it up for 20 years for you.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . spending it alright.

**Mr. Baker:** — This can be justified because of the rapid increase in costs which have come about because of governments similar to that across the way.

Mr. Speaker, I was extremely disturbed to note the item "South Saskatchewan Base Hospital, Regina, no funds." Here you have the major city in Saskatchewan with two hospitals. Beds are in short supply for the citizens of Regina and the whole of the southern part of this province. You realize, Mr. Speaker, that the beds in these two hospitals are utilized 50 per cent by people other than from Regina. We want the people to come here but we also want to give them a good and timely accommodation, not to wait for months to get a bed. Could the government be waiting to put another tax on the municipalities to pay for it?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Waiting for you to . . .

**Mr. Baker:** — We are now paying \$72 a year hospitalization and health tax. Saskatoon has three hospitals for a smaller population and they got one, the University Hospital for free under a CCF government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Surely you can see the need. Let's get moving on the third hospital for Regina to be totally paid out of the hospital and medicare tax fund. This is another definite priority that is needed in this budget.

This government is continuing to contribute varying amounts to rural regions far in excess of the 75 cents per capita granted to the cities of Regina and Saskatoon. While places like Prince Albert, the home of the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) get well over \$2 per person . . .

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Depressed area.

**Mr. Baker:** — . . . we in Regina have tried to correct this inequality of the past years and had hoped that this government would, with its abundant revenue, see fit to make an adjustment. The citizens of Regina will continue to pay an unjust share. This will be the situation even though the Minister of Health apparently agrees with me that we are not being treated fairly.

Also I fail to see the inclusion in medicare of the chiropractic services. We unanimously passed this resolution at the last session. Why wasn't it included in this year's estimates? When is the government going to direct its attention to this important matter as well as to other services provided by many other professional groups?

Much has been said about our mental hospitals. There really appears to be no hope for the needy under this government. They seem to be reverting to their cold-blooded policies. No hope for

the mentally ill who are being released just like cattle from mental institutions. Before 1944 they tell me the staff there turned the hoses on these mental patients sealed up in cells without clothing. When the CCF took over each one was given maximum care and put into a bed and rooms in which to live and receive the same care as any hospital patient. Yes, it was an excellent program. Look at the Weyburn hospital now. Out of, I believe, nearly 1,800 patients, it seems to me that they reduced this by nearly 1,000. Where are these patients being sent to? I'll tell you. They are being hovelled in places where most would not want to be. Not everybody will accept them into housing establishments. The place for most of these people is still the care they received at our Saskatchewan hospitals. Heaven have mercy on those who are tampering with the souls of these unfortunates.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Mr. Steuart, (Minister of Health) has indicated outside this house that urban centres are not adequately treated and so I ask the government to provide, as I said earlier, the same grants as we find in rural regions.

I would now refer to the monies to be voted for welfare. The government has been expounding at great length on the status of its new program. On January 17, 1966, it was reported in the newspaper that the Canada Assistance Act and the announced Provincial Act will mean a saving for the provincial welfare department of \$1,500,000. No announcement was made to my knowledge as to the saving to be given to the municipalities in order to reduce property taxation. At last I know why. Just look at the total for welfare on page 61 of the estimates, 1965-66 — \$19,220,000; 66-67, \$18,656,000, a decrease in the new budget by \$566,000 over last year. Now, look at the increase per capita contribution by the urban and rural municipalities of this province, on the same page, 1965-66, \$533,000, for 66-67, approximately \$1,149,000 — an increase in payments by municipalities in the new budget of \$616,000. Mr. Speaker, it is unusual to collect an additional sum from the rural and urban municipalities to decrease spending by the Social Welfare Department of the province of Saskatchewan. It is not only unusual but it also proves the point made last year, that taxes in most ways are again being loaded on to the municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, the budget is unsound in many ways. I indicated earlier that citizens of Regina definitely can expect to have to pay more by way of property tax for social aid. One ray of hope does exist, the new act does provide if any area in the province is not within the confines of a unit the minister will designate a regional office of the Department of Social Welfare as the administrative unit to provide assistance. Please take note that if any way the new program costs the citizens of Regina more I will urge the council of our city to return the complete program to the Saskatchewan government.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens will, if these estimates are approved, have to pay the indicated increase per capita by way of increased property taxation. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is done when this government receives from the federal government funds for the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan in the amount of 1965-66 — \$4,967,000; 1966-67 — \$9,112,000 — an increase over last year that they are receiving is \$4,550,000. If the estimates were sound the cost to the municipalities would be reduced from that \$1,149,000 which they are charged to nil.

**March 3, 1966**

Mr. Speaker, all municipalities, urban and rural, have been given by the legislature of the province of Saskatchewan specific functions to carry out. Our great province has and is steadily developing. This province has a tremendous future providing the citizens are given the opportunity to put all resources to work. I would like to return to the mill rate in the city of Regina with regard to municipal rate and educational taxes from 1959 to 65. The municipal rate from 1959 to 1965 increased by slightly over two mills. If you turn to the education costs during those six or seven years you will find that the mill rate in 1959 was 33.32 mills, in 1965 it was 45.38 mills, an increase of 12.06 mills in the last six or seven years. Mr. Speaker, this is the source of complaint municipal officials are continually faced with; the ever-increasing demands for education. In fact the municipal mill rate must be held or decreased to lighten the load on property taxes for education. It is of interest to note, however, that approximately one-half of the 12 mill increase was incurred in the last two years. I needn't tell you who the government has been in the last two years. It is not tax reduction, it is a process of transferring the tax responsibility from provinces to the municipalities.

Last year I did suggest the raising of the minimum wage over a two year period to \$1.40 per hour. I advocated \$1.25 for 1965 and \$1.40 in the year 1966. I don't know what the government will be doing in this regard. In 1965 wages and prices climbed more steeply than for a number of years. Between September, 1964 and September, 1965, the consumer price index rose from 135.6 to 139.1, an increase of 2.6 per cent. Average hourly earnings in the same period for manufacturing increased by 4.9 per cent. In other words, all the workers benefited was by 2.3 per cent.

I would like to say there appears to be nothing to provide the one day minimum sick leave per month to organized or unorganised labor . . . Where is the support to get bargaining rights for federal employees? Where is the act to give portability to protect pensions? Portability to pensions regardless of place of employment? Where is the income continuous pay plan for all the people of this province who become ill and unable to earn? These are some of the things that count as priorities, Mr. Speaker, and I think that this budget has been somewhat negligent in providing these.

It has been an accepted fact that the government across the way has the habit of stealing points in our program. Yes, they have taken one of my points, the Home-owner grant and I appreciate them doing that. We don't mind them taking our points in our program but let's do them right. We have provided much for the citizens of this province. We on this side of the house strive and usually are the first in the provisions of services for our citizens. You on the government side of the house provided the needed services only after much pressure by the citizens. I might say too, if it wasn't for the 26 CCF members on this side of the house much of the good welfare legislation or security legislation that we have on the statute books would be either removed or watered down.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — We must not permit governments to set the stage for future booms and busts. Social democracy will give a planned economy, an economy that will continue to give security and build on a sound economic base. The present budget does not take care of the security of our people. It does not list the priorities in their

proper order. I must say that we are not receiving any unconditional grants for cities and the urban municipalities. On account of these things I must at this time support the amendment to the motion in order that we may bring this province back to a solid footing.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising first of all I want to congratulate you on the wonderful way you have conducted yourself. I also want to welcome Mr. Bradshaw to Saskatchewan and to our legislature. I hope that his stay here will be a pleasant one and that he will take home many pleasant memories.

I also want to welcome the two new members to this house. As I was told, I wouldn't wish them the same thing that some of the others have wished them because I can remember that when I came in on a by-election in 1959 and the former member for Moosomin said: "I hope your stay here will be a pleasant and a short one". I want to say that I have been re-elected now three times and I hope my good people will see fit to send me here longer.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca):** — Vote against purple gas . . .

**Mr. Thibault:** — First of all I would like to say a few words about the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — Last year I told him that he failed and I think he has failed again this year. I think the Speaker of the house at times should take him into the woodshed and dish him out a little bit of manners because as I listened to him the other day when the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) was speaking, he was continuously interrupting. I am sure that he was not around when his mother dished out the manners.

With that I intend to continue with my speech. I also want to wish his seat mate would try and teach him a little better. Now I want to keep on with my remarks, this was really off the cuff.

I want to compliment the people of my constituency especially for sending a large number of students to this legislature. I want to say that every year there are about three, four, and sometimes five busloads of wonderful people and they do enjoy these trips down here. I want to compliment the people on both sides of the house for putting on a good display while these students are here. I want to say that I certainly appreciate it.

I also want to make mention of another person who deserves mention. This is a fine young man, age 57 who came from Norway when he was 19 years of age. Some time ago he went to Saskatoon and competed in a ski competition with all ages over 18 years and came first in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — This young man at the age of 57, who is a farmer, put on skis for the first time at the age of four and at the age of six

**March 3, 1966**

he was in school competitions and took prizes in Norway. He returned to Norway, visited his parents in 1952, and he took in the world Olympics of which he had in his younger days been a torch bearer. Now I'm always worried every time he goes to a ski competition that he is going to break some of his bones, but he loves it and he certainly recommends it to our young people. Last year he designed and helped to build a ski jump west of Domremy. Today it is one of the nicest ski jumps in the northern part of the province. I would invite anyone who wants to try a ski jump, even the old fellows. He has provided a tow rope to take the older gentlemen up to the top of the hill. He said it was pretty hard walking up the hill in Saskatoon but down in Minatitas, west of Domremy, we have a tow rope to take the people up. Now you see why this fine gentleman is worthwhile mentioning, I would say he is a champion for he took the Provincial Championship six times.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — Now, I want to say a few words about the work that is being done in my constituency for the mentally retarded children. I believe the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) had an opportunity to see what is being done in Kinistino. With a great deal of work by Mr. and Mrs. Polinsky, who look after the home, and the co-operation of the Kinistino school unit and a lot of local effort, quite a bit is being done for the retarded children in that area. I hope that the collection that is being made now in the drive throughout Canada for helping the retarded children will meet with a lot of success. But I say at this time that it should not be left to charitable organizations only to look after these youngsters. I think the government should play a larger part. You know what I mean by that and I will not dwell on that too long.

Now I want to compliment the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) for having continued to work on no. 3 highway. It is proceeding a little slowly but it looks as if he will get there some day. I am sure the people of Kinistino will appreciate it. I hope he will take it all the way across the river down into the Minister of Public Health's (Mr. Steuart) constituency, and I am sure our people will be glad about that too.

Now, I also want to say a few words about a local government. The local governments in my constituency are a group of very co-operative people. Whether I sit on this side of the house or whether I sit on the other side of the house, I can assure the members of the government that these people will co-operate with the programs that are for the welfare of the province as a whole.

I also want to thank the people of Kinistino for having sent me here to represent them. I want to say at this time that it is a pleasure to serve the kind of people that I represent.

Now, I would like to say a few words about the grid road system. You all know that the grid road program was started back in 1956 after the local government conference that was held. I would say that it was a good program, it's a program that took the cars off the blocks. I remember when our cars had to stay on blocks for five months of the year on account of no roads. This is the program that took the cars off the blocks. But I would say we can't stop there. When I hear them say you had 20 years, when we started our 20 years there was nothing to work on. We had to start from the beginning and lay the foundation. I am glad that the grid road program is going to be continued. When you want to

talk about increases for grid roads I want to point out that last year on grid roads there was a tightening and this year you have reached the point where you were the year before. So you cannot blow too much. I say you are going in the right direction but it's too bad that you had to back up one year before you could go ahead. I must say that we can certainly co-operate when the Department of Municipal Affairs renews improving these grid roads. But I also want to say that I am also in favor of taking some of these grid roads into the highway system.

I want to mention a few roads that I believe should be taken into the highway system. There is the Wakaw road that takes in several summer resorts along Wakaw Lake. The first five miles next to Wakaw should really be oiled if you want to do something with it. There are a lot of people from Saskatoon and many parts of the province who do spend time and holidays on the edge of Wakaw Lake. This road is in great need of improvement in spite of it being built as a grid road under the CCF government. I think more should be done.

Another road that should get a little attention is the so-called 44 trail as it is commonly known in my constituency. There is also the road going west of Domremy to the river. Now I am going to mention one that will interest the member for Humboldt (Mr. Brecker). I believe there should be a second branch of no. 20 highway to serve the places along the east side of the three lakes, Basin Lake, Lake Lenore and Middle Lake. For communities of Lake Lenore, Pathlow, St. Brieux, Muenster, there is an area there where a grid road is built, I think it should be taken into the highway system because there is a heavy amount of traffic and it is very costly to maintain.

Now I would like to mention another one and that is the extension of no. 20 north to connect up with no. 3 and on. I know the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) would be interested in this also but you cannot do it all in one year but I would like to see you have it in your plans. Last year we had a program introduced into the house where grid roads would be taken into the highway program, into the highway system. I was quite happy about this, I thought it was a step in the right direction. Although I believe the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) is a very fine gentleman he has been contaminated a bit by the Premier. Out of 20 projects that were advertised in the Saskatchewan Gazette of July 16th, as near as I could figure, 14 of these projects were placed in Liberal seats, six in CCF seats. I could be wrong but that is as far as I could estimate and they are all listed. Now I want to say that perhaps it is only a coincidence but I am strongly in favor of treating everybody with the same degree of fairness.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the member a question. What . . .

**Mr. Thibault:** — No, I will take questions after I'm finished. I'm not the type of guy that gets up and keeps interrupting people, I stay sitting down, and sometimes it's hard to sit down, I'm telling you it's tough. You feel like bouncing up. I sympathize with some of the members across the way. But when I am up here unless I have insulted somebody terribly, well I say get up and tell me so. Well, now so much for the grid roads.

I want to say a few words about the work that I have done last summer on the Highway Safety Committee. It is very enjoyable and I like this type of work. I find that it is a way of working

where you can get members on both sides of the house to sit down and leave the politics aside and work for the common good. Now, I want to compliment the members that worked on that committee. There is a lot more work to be done and I am not going to say too much about it. I think it can achieve a lot if only we can complete the work that has been started. I think that many problems of our country could be dealt with through legislative committees, I think we would get a heck of a lot further than making politics out of everything and that is what seems to occur in the legislature. Legislative committees are one area that I have always felt, and I have served on them on several occasions, is worthwhile; it is not a waste of time. Well, I recommend to the government to have a close look at more legislative committees when they are faced with serious problems. Now, I had a few talks when we worked on this committee about old age people who lose their license because they can drive no more. This is one aspect that I wanted to mention today. It has been mentioned by the member for Kelsey (Mr. J.H. Brockelbank), and I think it's worthwhile keeping it in mind. It's a pretty tough proposition for a police officer to remove the license from an elderly man and say "Now you can't drive anymore". I think in all fairness these elderly people are entitled to a free pass on our Saskatchewan Transportation System. Most of the time these buses are riding with a lot of room left in them. Certainly it wouldn't be too much to give these elderly citizens a free pass. It wouldn't cost the country anything and I am sure they would enjoy their twilight years much better.

Now I think I am going to go to the policies of the Minister of Social Welfare. I have called him other things besides that, but not in the house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — No that's not in his department by the way, I think it's the Department of the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart). It's the distribution of natural gas that I wanted to talk about. Sometime ago I saw in the press where he is going to offer gas to Rosthern, Hague and Duck Lake and Osler at a higher price than other people have to pay. Well, after bragging about the large surpluses that they have made with the Power Corporation, it is pretty hard to justify this higher rate. I think when we set out to distribute power and gas in this province we had in mind to take gas to everyone and equalize the cost. If we had adopted this attitude of charging this little group and so on, the farmers that are two miles away from the power line would never have got power. We would have had a very little, tightly knitted network that would bring in a lot of money and a poor service. I also want to say that there are places in my constituency that would like natural gas and I am sure they are prepared to pay the extra cost to get that natural gas. But I want to say as far as I am concerned when we form the government again we will make it right with these people. That's what we'll do.

**Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture):** — Power too?

**Mr. Thibault:** — That's right. If you want to talk about power I have advocated the refund of the \$500 after the Power Corporation had completed the distribution of power, you can go to my constituency and they will tell you the same thing. I said when the program is finished we should think of starting to refund the money that was



put in there. That's been my stand and it still is. I don't beat around the bush at all, I tell you exactly what I think. Now, so much for power and gas, I think that it is the only fair thing to do is treat everybody with the same degree of fairness. When we start putting up a certain price on one group, another price on the other, then we'll start developing classes. It appears that the people across the way like classes. You know the Socialists like to have everybody more or less eat at the same table.

We sometimes hear about population. I am always intrigued at hearing that the population is at an all-time high. Now let's brag about the population being at an all-time high. If you look at 1963, the population increased by 10,000, in 1964 by 8,000, in 1965 somewhere around 7,000. It's a record every year, even if it had increased 1,000 a year, it would still be an all-time high. But when you look at the birth rate, and I have looked after my share on that, we see that the birth rate for 1963 was 23,543, then in 1964, 23,623, and in 1965, 20,526. When you consider death and immigration we find that in 1963, 7,500 people left the province and in 1965 it went up to over 9,000 people who left the province and in 1965 it went up to over 10,000 people had left the province. We hear the Premier say that he has turned the tables around and people are staying here. Now I want to tell him that they are leaving this province faster than they have ever left before.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Just the Socialists, I think.

**Mr. Thibault:** — No, that's since you got in. If you want to look at the death rate, it's amazing. You know we want to talk about medical care so if you want to read the table on page 3, and you can look at 61, 62, 63, 64, you will find some amusing figures but I will not delve into them here and now because it's all there. And they are Liberal figures because this has been issued since you guys are in power.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Did all the Socialists drop dead?

**Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton):** — What's your source?

**Mr. Thibault:** — Talking about the Home-owner grants . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Going to vote for it?

**Mr. Thibault:** — Yes, I am going to vote for it, because I feel like a man a while ago who said the idea originated on this side of the house. The idea originated with Mayor Baker last year, it was the first time it was mentioned. But I'll give you the real reasons why I'll vote for it.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Henry took the credit for that, eh?

**Mr. Thibault:** — I'll give you the real reason why I'll vote for it, because it will go a little way in paying the increase in insurance rates. In some cases they have gone up as high as 150 per cent. Now, it will also go a little way in paying the increase in the rates that

**March 3, 1966**

were raised in the geriatric centre in Melfort. The rates there have gone up from \$10 a month for these patients to \$50 a month.

**Mr. H.A. Broten (Watrous):** — 500 per cent . . .

**Mr. Thibault:** — 500 per cent? When I went to school it was 400. That's socialist arithmetic, I suppose. Now, it will also help those old age pensioners that were treated so rudely by the Liberal government at Ottawa when they denied them \$25 a month increase in their old age pension, which amounts to \$300 a year. It will certainly feel good when they give them \$50, it will help. Fifty bucks, it will help the housewife to pay the increase on detergents. It's also going to help the farmer and everyone who has to burn gas to pay that one per cent. It will help also to pay the increase in the grazing lease. It will also help them to pay the \$72 a year for their medical care card which was raised, and you know as well as I do, it was not necessary.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Just put it back to your rate.

**Mr. Thibault:** — Oh, wait, there is some more. And when we look at the way the federal government is handling our customers for wheat and see the drop of over 10 cents a bushel, which means that the farmer that sells 1,000 bushels of wheat has lost \$120. Certainly he will be glad when he gets 50 bucks. Now he'll also be happy when he comes to pay his repair bills at the rate machinery is going up. That will help also and by golly everything is okay, we get fifty bucks. Now I've got to give credit to the Conservatives; they really devoted themselves to build up markets throughout the world. But I don't blame Western Canada for not returning a Liberal member to Ottawa. The only way they could get representation was to appoint a defeated renegade to draw an old age pension in the Senate. That's the way they can have representation from Western Canada. Well, this is what we have got now. I hope that the Liberal government will treat our customers in such a way that they will be glad to come and deal with the Canadian people.

Now I want to talk about the insurance rates. This is amusing and I think that the best way that I can give you the picture of insurance rates is with this letter I got here this morning. I used a photostat so if I've got to table it I won't mind. It comes from Crystal Springs and it says:

Dear Arthur: I went the other day to see about my insurance policy and have been informed that my rates on my house and contents on the farm have been increased from 40 cents to \$1 for three years. An increase of 150 per cent. This is a long way from the 5¢ per 100 increase that Mr. Boldt said over the radio.

I don't know if Mr. Boldt knows the back door from the front door of that office, but we have been getting all kinds of rates lately. I wish you would table these rates in the house, so we would know what's going on. I want to quote the letter again:

I wrote to the Insurance Office about it and, of course, I got back a very nice reply. How it can justify 60¢ increase and claim it will present a very fair assessment of my policy, I don't see it.

Mr. Kreutzwieser.

But it is amusing when you read the letter that was answered.

They said it makes our rates comparable with the rates in other provinces. I am not going to read it all because it takes too much time. Here is a photostat, you can have it if you want to.

I just wonder why these rates should have gone up.

**Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West):** — A Liberal government.

**Mr. Thibault:** — I want to point out now what the rates were back in 1962. This should be interesting; these are the SGIO rates. In Lloydminster you had SGIO, \$21; Alberta \$34.50, that's back in 1962. Those, well, those are the rates. Now when you compare Regina, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert, Saskatoon and Yorkton their rates were \$17.50. In Manitoba for Brandon, St. Boniface, Winnipeg, including suburbs \$27.50, Alberta \$39.50. But when you get to just recently you find that the rates in Saskatchewan are very comparable with Alberta and Manitoba, and in some instances just a little higher. Now I can very well see that you can tell our people it's aimed at paying one of the political debts that have been accumulated. And for no other reason. I think that you ought to know where some of these political debts are going to be paid. There is in Maclean Magazine on October 24, 1959, where there was a \$50,000 campaign fund offered, and had they lost they said they would have got their money back. That was on condition that Mr. Thatcher had the nomination over the new member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). I wouldn't be surprised that that is where some of the political debts are being paid off with our insurance today.

But now we have come to automobile rates. I'm not going to quarrel too much with raising the rates on the offenders but I want to say that there is one area that I would like to see the minister change his attitude and it's towards the young people under the age of 25. The way he has treated these young people is just like the teacher in the classroom. She can't find out who did wrong so she goes ahead and spansks the whole class. That's what he has done here. I know we have a lot of young people that are doing their best to drive cars properly. Sure I will admit that a certain number of them are not behaving right and are in accidents on several occasions. But to punish the whole bunch by a blanket increase on this group I hope the minister will reconsider his position because I think it's wrong. Being on that Highway Safety Committee we have gone into this a lot. We have got to devise ways and means to encourage our young people to be accident free, not by putting two strikes against them before they start. This is wrong and I hope the minister will reconsider his position on this one.

Now as far as Legislative Secretaries, I want to say a few words about them. I think some of them did work okay, but generally speaking I think it was a sort of sneaky way to raise the indemnity of the backbenchers about \$1,000 a year. By rotating it around they will pretty well all come out with extra money on that side. They seem to believe that the members on this side have no work to do. We have work to do also. But it was a way of increasing their indemnity. When I see the rotating taking place now, there is no other answer for it than what I said a moment ago. I noticed it in the by-elections, I've been there, and I noticed how these secretary assistants were very handy to the government.

I want to say a few words about social welfare. Since the

**March 3, 1966**

minister was not in when I spoke about it, I think that the description by the member for Regina North (Mr. Whalen) the other day was true. If they are true, and I believe they are, the Minister of Social Welfare had better find out a little more about his department. The increases in Melfort, I know of one particular case where a mother is suffering from multiple sclerosis, with five children, when the father was hit with \$50 a month to leave his wife there, for how long we don't know, this is not right. To go from \$10 to \$50 a month, I just don't know what these people are thinking of, and yet you want to brag that they are cutting the income tax and they are cutting the cost of social welfare. If this is the kind of cut you make in social welfare I would never employ you as the Minister of Social Welfare if I were the head of the government.

**Mr. MacLennan:** — . . . wouldn't work for you . . .

**Mr. Thibault:** — I want to say a few words about civil rights. I don't think I have to dwell on it very long. We heard about the orders from the minister in charge of the Power Corporation when he told the people working for the Power Corporation to "stay out of politics". I can remember when we were the government and on several occasions I had serious arguments with people who were working for the Power Corporation, I would get told off and after awhile they would come back and say "Do you think I could lose my job?" and I would say "no.". I said "I don't agree with what you say but I'll defend your right to be able to say what you want to say" and that is they way it should be.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — I know a little while ago when the power line between Squaw Rapids and Beatty broke down, the power was out for over seven hours, in approximately 30 to 50 degree below zero weather. These boys for the Power Corporation were out and worked until they had this power going. That is where I'm a little afraid that the Power Corporation is cutting the crew down a little too small, not keeping enough reserve in the case of an emergency. These boys did very well but some places were out of power in this cold weather as long as seven hours. The next morning on "Speak up" a lady phoned CKBI and she felt pretty strongly about it. She wanted to thank the power boys for having done such a wonderful job in doing all they could to bring power back to the people. But she ended up by saying "I feel sorry that in a free country these people have lost their civil rights". How true. I say, there is another thing that this government must have another look at, to re-assure these people that they are free to go to the political meetings they want to attend or the church they want to attend, or wherever they want to go.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — I don't like to see things like that take place in a country where we call ourselves free. We are not when we have governments like that in power.

I am satisfied that all the members across the way don't go along with that line of thinking, but some of the backbenchers are going to have to get up and tell Big No. One just where to get off at some of these days. I am sure now that I have wasted about almost three-quarters of an hour . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Wasted is right.

**Mr. Thibault:** — . . . because as I say, work would be better done in committees. This is why I call it waste.

I want to say that you can see by now by my remarks that I will support the amendment and I will not support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I think I should take the opportunity of congratulating everyone who has participated so far in the debate. I would like to particularly congratulate the hon. member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault). I really believe that he has done a much better job than the official critic. I would be remiss though if I did not mention the great progress that has taken place in the province and how it has been done these last two years.

First, I think that the promotion and the encouragement of the industrial development in this province has definitely gone a long way. It has helped and assisted in the reduction of the sales tax from five to four per cent. Two, it has made it possible to give assistance for snow removal on grid roads. Three, it has made it possible to provide Home-owner grants which is a reduction in the taxes to homeowners of this province. You very well know that for a number of years the taxes in the province of Saskatchewan per capita have been higher than any other place in Canada. So the industrial development in this province has assisted in giving greater assistance to our universities and our schools. Five, it has provided or made the provisions to give more maintenance on grid roads. Again I should never forget to repeat over and over again that the industrial development in this province has provided and made possible more jobs for the people of Saskatchewan.

Of course, a change of government has also provided a thrift-conscious administration. This has saved the taxpayers of this province a considerable amount of money and has released more money for additional services, something quite evident in the budget.

The highways have been greatly extended in the province and it is very noticeable as we travel around. I think the government should be commended for the attitude it has taken towards the youth of our province. I think that one of the greatest assets the people have in Saskatchewan is our youth. We realize that by 1970 almost 53 per cent of the population of our country will be below the ages of 25.

It has established a non-political land lease policy. It has been at last established where political hatchet men are not in the field assisting . . .

**Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cutknife):** — Like in Moosomin?

**Mr. Coderre:** — That's right. Like in Moosomin.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Very non-political.

**March 3, 1966**

**Mr. Coderre:** — It has taken out of the province creeping socialism which had been and was gradually trying to destroy the local institutions, our local governments. You know, this has been proven time and time again since the general election. But I think we should start to review it slightly. We had the Prince Albert by-election. Of course, the CCF were quite broken-hearted at that time. Then we had the general election and boy they were really broken-hearted then. Moosomin, more broken hearts. Bengough, the pay-off. They dropped the boodle and they broke the record.

**Mr. Nollet:** — You bought votes.

**Mr. Coderre:** — And speaking of the broken record, it does remind me of a situation that I got involved in last year. I mentioned the question of a car. They are so broken that they are repeating this car question over and over again. It's rather amusing, like a broken record.

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — . . . broken . . .

**Mr. Coderre:** — I believe that the government should be commended for having established a good hospital policy where the hospitals are not being closed arbitrarily by the administration. The CCF government had established a few years ago a hospital study which had indicated very definitely that a number of hospitals were to be closed. I think that this government should be commended on the policy that it has established now. The government will not arbitrarily close any hospitals in this province.

I don't believe that enough credit has been given to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) for having introduced the Direct Sellers Act.

Another thing that the change of government has done; it has produced a better feeling in the public. Just the other day, coming in from Moose Jaw I had the occasion to pick up a person during the storm. On the way in we were discussing the question of highways and the question of a four-lane highway. This gentleman was saying, "Well, it does take a little bit of my land but at least we are treated one heck of a lot better with the present government than we were ever treated in the past under road policies".

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — I could go on and on with many of the things that this government has done. Purple gas has been mentioned over and over again but I don't believe that it can be mentioned enough. Mineral tax exemptions, exemption for the first \$1,000 for our young people on household goods, all things are for the good life and with a Liberal government you have a good life.

Then you find the gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker, have oftentimes been criticizing the present administration for raising the hospitalization and health tax. What is the record, Mr. Speaker? In 1952 the maximum family tax for hospitalization at that time was \$330, after the election it went up to \$40. Then of course, in '59 that was the year before the election it went down to \$35. After the election it went up.

**An Hon. Member:** — You're wrong.

**Mr. Coderre:** — No, not wrong because this is from the Department of Health. These records have been shown very clearly. In 1959 the maximum family tax was \$35. In 1961 and 1962, that is after the election it went up to \$48, or a total with the health tax of \$72, 1964 they dropped it down to \$52. It is quite obvious, they dropped it and after the election they would raise it. Each time they dropped it was only an attempt as a political bribe. Then they would go ahead and put it on again where it should be. This is a fact and this has been brought up on several occasions but they just seem to forget about this.

The member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) the other day seemed to be attempting to mislead this house in saying that the Fisherman's Co-operative that was carrying operations on in the Cumberland House area was being dissolved. I have made a check of this department this noon and I find that there is no suggestion whatever of its being dissolved. Attempts are made time and time again, Mr. Speaker, by members opposite to try to distort the facts. The hon. member for Regina, a man by the name of Baker, seemed to have made that attempt a moment ago saying that all great labor legislation, everything that has ever happened in this house, has taken place under the previous administration. He said we never had no minimum wage. The first minimum wage in this province was brought in sometime in 1917. The first bargaining agreement in this province took place in 1906. These are many of the things that they try to distort. I don't think that they are lying. I wouldn't say that.

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City):** — Tell us about the legislation of 1906.

**Mr. Coderre:** — It may not have been legislation but there was a bargaining agreement, it was permitted as it should be. It was an agreement between management and labor and that is the way it should be, without inference by anybody else. It was recognized at that time.

**Mr. Davies:** — Permitted I think is the word all right.

**Mr. Coderre:** — In trying to discredit the government the hon. member from Regina (Mr. Baker) was mentioning about the minimum wage. I said the first minimum wage established in this province was sometime around 1917. Last year this government being fully conscious of the needs did introduce an increase in the minimum wage. It has been mentioned in this house that this will be done again. This indicates that the government is very, very conscious of the fact of the working people of this province.

Ever since the opening of this legislature some days ago I have been listening very carefully to the opinions voiced on both sides of the house regarding the accomplishments during this last twenty-two months, also regarding the task ahead of us. I was particularly interested to hear the critical remarks of which there have been a few concerning matters dealing directly or indirectly with the Department of Labour and the programs and policies of the department. I think that it is only fair that we should deal with the efforts of the Department of Labour since I am the minister

**March 3, 1966**

of that department. It is generally believed that the spark of truth comes from the clash of different views and different opinions. People from different backgrounds often judge the same situation differently. I would have liked to think that when these different viewpoints are presented in an assembly like this that the results would be and should be a good clear picture. They say a picture will really bring out the weaknesses and bring in good recommendations. Only too often members across the way have had a tendency to distort the true facts and pictures insofar as what has been going on in the Department of Labour. However, I would be less than honest if I pretended that so far the Department of Labour has received some credit. Everybody knows that the purpose of the Saskatchewan Department of Labour is to administer certain legislation, certain statutes. This task may have been simple in the past but it is getting to be less so in an economy that is becoming more complex.

The industrial expansion which has been mentioned time and time again and has taken place in our province has brought about an increase in our non-agricultural work force. Unfortunately we do not have the detailed statistics of our labor force by occupations. We continue to hope that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics will eventually decide to publish the much needed information on an annual basis. Nevertheless, we know that at the present time two out of every three members of the Saskatchewan labor force are engaged in a non-agricultural occupation. This, of course, means that our labor legislation is becoming much more important and its administration much more involved.

There are some people who seem to think that the word labor applies only to manual labor. This has never been entirely true. Today it is less true than ever. In my opinion and the opinion of a lot of people, labor means work and work is what everybody must do if he is to make an honest living. Some people work in mines, others in factories, shops, laboratories, hospitals, schools, offices, and a variety of other places. We talk of unskilled labor, semi-skilled labor and professional work. No matter how we classify this type of work, they are all the product of human effort and consequently its labor. Our labor legislation, therefore, concerns directly or indirectly, the lives of all citizens of Saskatchewan, except for those matters which the constitution has left under federal jurisdiction.

I am proud to be able to say that the Department of Labour has functioned very well in the last twenty-two months. And I am confident that it will continue to function equally as well in the future. I would say perhaps even better. With a staff that is slightly smaller than that which we found in 1964 we have been able to provide good services for the citizens of Saskatchewan; indeed every branch of the department has done this. Our industrial relations office has spared no effort to prevent industrial disputes from erupting but when this did actually occur our industrial relations officers have provided valuable conciliation service. As a result the proportion of working time lost in man days and man hours through industrial disputes in our province has remained at a minimum though some strikes have been much prolonged. Our staff is still working on that in the effort and hope to have favourable results in the very near future.

We believe that the field of labor management relations constitutes more than just a mere process of the collective bargaining. We believe that it forms an integral part of a free enterprise system and under this system we recognize the advantages of allowing both labor and management to function in an atmosphere free from excessive government control and this is



as it should be. On the other hand though whenever parties wish to have our assistance we are glad to offer it in the interests of harmonious relations, prosperity and steady progress.

Our labor standards branch has continued to ensure the observation of labor standards throughout the province and the results of this work are reflected in the increased number of inspections. The records of our safety branch, safety services, continue to be good. The boilers and pressure vessels branch continues to do a good job and so do the electrical and gas branches. The same may be said of our fire and theatres branch as well as our research branch. It is probably not all that is desired. There is a lot more. If we would be content with what we have then we fail to be progressive. We are looking forward to much more progress in these things.

Under our apprenticeship training program, a total of 1,417 indentured apprentices appeared on record on March 31st, 1964. A year later this has increased to 1,576. This represents an increase of 159 or 10 per cent. A significant increase is in prospect for the current fiscal year, both in respect of indentures and in respect of the number of apprentices receiving training. There are many reasons for the growth of this type of training as well: Good employment opportunities for skilled tradesmen which has been provided by the industrial development, comfortable wages, for the demand of labor on the market, and a substantial allowance paid by the government of Saskatchewan to apprenticeship training. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, of all provinces, Saskatchewan is equalled only by Manitoba in the amount of allowances. This was increased last year, Mr. Speaker, by this administration. We could say in effect, that we pay the highest training allowances in Canada with Manitoba being equal. This is paid to head of families taking training away from home. However, the allowances are paid in Manitoba to parents of two or more children. They get the \$50 per week training allowance where they have two or more children. In Saskatchewan we pay it whether they have children or not.

In view of this expansion, we consider it important to make sure that existing facilities are used as efficiently as they can be. Winter is a popular time, of course, with employers, in regard to training because apprentices can be released more easily during the slack period of business. However, since classroom space for trainees is at a premium at this present time, the point has been reached when some training courses may have to be scheduled for spring and summer months. This is where we will require the co-operation of everyone in this respect.

While I am presenting these facts about the Department of Labour, I will take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of the loyalty and devotion to duty of all government employees. They are the ones who are helping to give good service to the people of Saskatchewan. I would like at this time particularly to pay a special tribute to the Department of Labour because I am dealing with them at this moment.

Members of this legislature have received copies of the annual report of the Department of Labour, which was tabled a few days ago. I don't think I need waste time in repeating here at length what you can read in the report itself. However, I want to draw to your attention table six on page eight which shows the number of unplaced applicants with local offices of the national employment service in Saskatchewan. You will see from this table that there has been a substantial decrease over the last 22 months in

the number of people seeking jobs through the National Employment Office. The figures for the month of December are particularly illuminating. Take for example, in 1963 the number of unplaced job applicants was 18,281. In December of 1964, it was 17,261. In December 1965, it had dropped down to 13,574. This was a tremendous drop in so short a time. Average unemployment in 1956 was actually the lowest since 1957. These statistics do reflect a buoyant condition of the provincial economy which is accompanied by a high level of wages and a general improvement in working conditions, much of which has been gained through the bargaining process.

Recently a member of this house asked a question regarding the hours of work in Saskatchewan. He wanted to know the number of people working 40 hours per week, the number of people working less than 40 hours per week, and so on. You have probably seen, Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question which was given in the votes and proceedings. It is worth pointing out that a very considerable number of employees in Saskatchewan, at the present time, work 40 hours or less per week. This favourable situation is not the product of any fancy legislation. It is not the product of arbitrary decisions by the administration. It is the product of increased productivity and better labor-management relations.

I do not have to tell you that productivity tends to increase as a result of higher technology, a well trained work force, and good industrial relations. It is as a result of this higher productivity that wages and salaries tend to rise. Thus in 1965, wages and salaries in Saskatchewan were 4.1 per cent higher, on the average, than they were in 1964. There was an increase in that year as well. In this connection, I am happy to report that the salaries of the government employees which were increased once in 1964, have been increased in 1965 and will be augmented a third time in the fall of the current year.

In a speech that I gave at the beginning of October, 1965, before the annual convention of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour in North Battleford, I pointed out that in August, 1965, there were 20,000 more people employed in Saskatchewan than was the case 12 months earlier. Following that speech, some doubts, Mr. Speaker, were expressed in the press about the accuracy of my estimate. I submit, Mr. Speaker, at this time that nothing has happened since August of 1965 that might alter the estimate presented at that time. On the contrary, the employment index published by the DBS shows that in 1965 employment in Saskatchewan has been about 4.5 per cent higher again than it was in 1964. As a matter of fact, the increase in the employment index between 1964 and 1965 is the highest on record. These statistics show beyond a doubt that we are on the right path. Living standards in our province are rising holding forth the promise of greater progress in the near future. That is because of our industrial development which has been promoted by this government.

The committee, Mr. Speaker, that was appointed about a year ago to study the advisability of revising the Trade Union Act has held a number of hearings in Regina and Saskatoon. Several briefs have been presented to it, which are being studied at the present time. When the committee completes its report, members of the legislature will have an opportunity to examine it. The government is anxious indeed to have the views of all population strata and economic groups, all areas of our economy, inasmuch as our labor legislation is concerned. Labor legislation, Mr. Speaker, in order to be good must strive to harmonize the interests of the majority

of the people in our province. I hope to have the report sometime in the near future.

I need not speak at great length about the intention of the government to consider proposals for an increase in the minimum wage. I did mention that a moment ago. While I firmly believe that we should establish a minimum level, the level of wages is ultimately determined by the amount of goods and services produced by the national economy. The level of wages generally is levelled out on the basis of the industrial expansion that takes place. We established an increase last year; it is the intention of the government to ask the minimum wage board to have another look at it so we can bring another expansion this year.

The most important problem before us, however, remains that of training and upgrading of our labor force in such a way as to equip it for coping with the ever changing conditions produced by automation. It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that as the work process becomes more and more mechanized in our society, it will be necessary for all people to spend an increasing proportion of their working lives in working and taking education. We must leave no stone unturned in our search for ways and means to learn. We must also apply ourselves more diligently than in the past to the task of preparing instructors, capable of transmitting the available stock of knowledge that we have to the rising generation. It might turn out that this is one of the most difficult tasks which face us to find the necessary instructors in the field of technology. The most skilful of all teachers cannot teach what they do not know. This means that we need instructors who are fully familiar with the subjects they are to teach. This may mean in turn, that a training and upgrading is required for instructors at all levels, starting with kindergarten and ending with the university.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan through the government that they have given themselves, are fully capable of finding a correct solution to the problem of training and education, in trades and otherwise. They have been faced with other problems which they have solved successfully. Perhaps the most important prerequisite for this is harmonious labor-management relations, creating a climate in which the selfish motives of management and labor would give way to a more objective approach, placing the good of the nation over and above the advantage of individual categories of our citizens, no matter how they are defined.

While I do not want to belabor the topic with which you are all familiar, I may be allowed to refer to the abandonment of rail lines, Mr. Speaker, and the cancellation of passenger trains as typical examples of a problem affecting the citizens of Saskatchewan. Such problems, Mr. Speaker, require for their solution the co-ordinated efforts of all our population. It is more important at this time, Mr. Speaker, that everyone works together while we are in the process of growing faster than we have ever grown, to work together.

There are, of course, Mr. Speaker, a variety of other problems to which we should, and we will, give our attention. There is the problem of the older workers who are the first to feel the pressures arising from automation and cybernation. There are the problems associated with the increasing participation of women in our labor force. Last year, Mr. Speaker, we established a women's bureau. We have made a fair amount of studies. We have had meetings and gatherings with quite a few people in this respect.

**March 3, 1966**

Where do we go from there? Other problems with which we are likely going to have to deal are those related to the mobility of our workers, their movement from one locality to another, from one plant to another, and from one occupation to another. We shall deal with these problems, Mr. Speaker, as we go along.

We should realize that what most people want is not merely security or comfort or luxury, although they are glad to have these. People want to live a meaningful life. If we cannot help our people, Mr. Speaker, especially our young people, to find a deeper meaning and some greater objective, they may have to settle for more shallow and more trivial things. This we want to avoid. We want to give them an education. We want to give them technical training and vocational training for our labor force. We want to give them an acceptable minimum wage, progressive reduction of working hours, income protection. This has been indicated, Mr. Speaker, in the budget. It is quite obvious that I will not support the amendment but I will support the motion.

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. minister takes his seat would he permit a few short questions? I take it the minister will accept a few questions.

The minister spoke for some length and it seemed like he was touching on policy this afternoon. I was wondering if he was enunciating "the vigorous work force policy" as mentioned in the Budget Speech. That is my first question. I also want to ask a question about the women's branch in the Department of Labour.

**Mr. Coderre:** — At this point rather than go through the whole process, again, Mr. Speaker, actually indicating what the women's branch in the Department of Labour is concerned, I am sure that this house would have a greater opportunity to go into all the details when the estimates are down and we can go into a cross questioning program. The Women's Branch of the Labour Standards, I'll give it just briefly, at this moment are concerning themselves with looking or dividing the work load in the Labour Standards Branch. Much of the work that has been done under labor standards was at one time done by the whole branch. We are looking at the advisability of making some sort of a study on the question of baby care while the ladies are working. This is something that the branch is looking into. We have invited all the women's organizations to give any suggestions they may have. This government, Mr. Speaker, believes that it is not up to the government to do something that it, the government, thinks but to get this information from the public and the women's organization which they deal with and on this basis we shall act.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the hon. gentleman has answered my questions really about the "vigorous work force policy" and about the women's bureau.

**Mr. Speaker:** — May I draw the attention of the members of the house to the customary procedure. When members have taken their seat after having made a speech and if anybody wishes to direct a question to them, if they choose to accept the question they do so, the member did that and accepted the questions the member wished to ask and he replied to them. But at the end of a debate we can't enter into a question and answer period. The member asked his two

questions by courtesy of the previous speaker and the previous speaker has answered them.

**Mr. Coderre:** — I believe I answered the question on the women's bureau.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. L.M. Larson (Pelly):** — It hadn't been my intention to participate in this debate to any great length. However there are some points that I wish to make and I choose this occasion to do so.

Before I go into the main remarks that I want to make, I want to do something very unusual in this house. I have a few compliments and a few bouquets to hand out. I want to say to the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) that we appreciate very much some of the work that was done in Madge Lake park. He saw fit to appropriate money for a very badly needed road into a hay meadow. This was very much appreciated. Other work on the park grounds was equally appreciated, and I want at this time to thank the hon. minister for having heeded the suggestion that I put to him. Thank you very much.

I want to say a word of appreciation to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant). I wish the results of work done would have been entirely satisfactory. However, we do appreciate the work that was started and some of the projects that were completed. Some very severe hardships were occasioned by the work on no. 5 highway due to weather conditions. This made travel almost impossible. The department, however, did the best they could, but the job was left unfinished. It is my hope that the minister will be able to complete this work that is badly needed. On the project on no. 49 highway the oiling is very much appreciated. Certainly it appears now as if some additional work ought to have been done on the road bed before the oiling or hard surfacing project was undertaken. It might well turn out that the oiling will be of not too much value inasmuch as the road bed is not standing up. However, the work and the dust free conditions are being enjoyed by the people that travel. Again we appreciate what was done.

Now, the gas extension to Hyas, Norquay and Pelly is again serving a very useful need in that area.

Returning for a moment to the highway situation I am aware that the minister has had some difficulty with the highway going south from Togo. Representations have been made to have this road reclaimed into the highway system. I have not been too happy with some of the proceedings. I have been left out completely. I have not been consulted. Delegations have come to see the minister to make presentations and I have been left out. I have some very, what I think, worthwhile information to offer and yet I have not been consulted to come in on any of this discussion.

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — You should be on this side of the house.

**Mr. Larson:** — Now grid roads. Yes, I realize that I probably would be appreciated on that side of the house although I feel I am much

more appreciated over here.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — Yes, they need your type.

**Mr. Larson:** — Now, with regard to grid roads. My constituency is one of those that have not had full advantage of the grid road program. Much more needs to be done. I would appreciate the extension of the grid road program to where it probably could serve some of the very needed areas. I would appreciate the grid road extension program that is being inaugurated being extended to us. I am hoping that we will not be left out. No. 8 highway is another project that is very badly in need of attention. With some grid road connections it could serve the whole north-east area to complete a highway land grid road program that certainly would be of great value to us all. At the outset this is a very high producing area with tremendous traffic and tremendous amount of movement. The park attracts a very great number of people in the summertime. The refinery at Kamsack occasions a tremendous amount of heavy traffic. This demands that grid roads and highways are essential and we certainly will be looking forward to some improvements in the road structure in this particular corner of the province. Unfortunately we are not as favorably located apparently as some areas. However, I do plead that we do get some attention as it is very urgently needed.

Now, as a general comment, I want to say at the outset that the general tone and character of the budget left, in my opinion, rather much to be desired. I thought, too, that it presented a rather dangerous outline of the general thinking of the political party that is now the government of this province. I find complete return to the free enterprise, dog-eat-dog system that is being so loudly propagated rather dangerous to comprehend. I find myself in general agreement, however, that some of the statements the Provincial Treasurer made when he said "This budget which I am placing before this house this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, endeavors to present a clear picture of the present financial position of the province and the plans of the government for the coming fiscal year". I agree that this is, Mr. Speaker, a noble statement and is in keeping with the responsibilities and the duties of the Provincial Treasurer both to this house and to the people of the province. The people of Saskatchewan have become accustomed to this kind of outline and this kind of analysis. From the previous government this was forthcoming and many people have come to look upon the Budget Speech as a barometer and perhaps a guide for many of their plans and activities during the year.

This is as it should be. This is what is expected and should in fact be demanded of the Treasurer whoever he may be or whatever political party he may represent. Anything less is just not good enough. Anything less calls for an accounting. The accounting made by the Provincial Treasurer, of course, was not long in coming. The first factor the Treasurer and Premier had in mind was the political stocks of the Liberal party. The other factor the Treasurer put rather heavy emphasis on was as I have mentioned, his love and great allegiance to the free and private enterprise system of doing things.

In my opinion, the whole speech was another of the familiar blasts that this province has become rather used to and I feel has suffered from during the last two years. He continued throughout his entire address to blast away and paint, in my opinion, a fictitious and imaginary picture of a free enterprise Utopia that bears little or no resemblance to the facts of life as they exist in Saskatchewan.

If the people of the province were to put the faith they ought in the provincial economy and the report and act accordingly, they would soon discover that they would be living in a fool's paradise and would soon pay the consequences and the penalty of the Treasurer's report.

Now, it is not my intention to criticize what the budget contains, rather I want to make a few remarks about first, its shortcomings and secondly, some of the general directions the Liberal government is taking Saskatchewan and its people.

I want first of all to make a few remarks about Saskatchewan's largest and in my opinion for a long time to come our most important industry. The Liberals of Saskatchewan, as well as at Ottawa, have for as long as I can remember given lip service to this industry. This is an industry that has done more on its own account, an industry that has had to adjust, to adapt, to change, and to survive and to proceed on its own inertia ever since the province came into being. I am, of course, Mr. Speaker, referring to the agricultural and the farming industry.

The Provincial Treasurer was very proud to refer to agriculture in the one billion dollar bracket. I am just as proud of this as he is. I share his view that in the future it will assume even greater importance. That the Treasurer is not really too interested as to what the future holds for this great industry is all hidden in what he did not say about it. He has failed, for example, to point out to this house the very great benefits to Canada as a result of the efforts of the farmers.

He failed to mention the very great improvement, for example, in Canada's financial position generally. The improvement in the balance of payments alone has lessened the embarrassment on the government at Ottawa. The amount of work created by the moving and handling of grain alone has been very substantial and very beneficial. These benefits have been felt from coast to coast of this country. It is being recognized as one of the more important things to hit our nation in the last few years.

The number of workers who have been kept on jobs in industry to provide the goods that the farmers need and have been able to buy, he did not mention these. The immediate benefits of the number of cash registers in the province of Saskatchewan, ringing because of the efforts of the farmers was not indeed even mentioned. And above all, what the Premier and Treasurer failed to mention was the amount of good-will that the efforts of Saskatchewan farmers have brought to Canada as a nation and to the world as a whole, by producing and sending these vast amounts of good wholesome food to feed hungry and starving boys and girls as well as men and women in countries where our food has gone.

It is now 5.30, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the assembly to adjourn until after supper.

The assembly recessed until 7.30 p.m. o'clock.

**Mr. Larson:** — Mr. Speaker, when you arose at 5.30 I was talking about some of the advantages to Canada as a whole occasioned by the contributions of the farmers and the farming industry of this province. I want now to spend a moment or two dealing with an urgent problem that exists in my constituency. I hope that the minister in charge of natural gas, (Mr. Steuart), will be kind enough to listen and to take into account what may be done about this particular problem.

**March 3, 1966**

The native Indians in my constituency are in the process of re-organizing themselves and their living conditions. They are setting up villages and moving their living quarters into groups where they hope to improve their lot. They are faced with a very serious problem insofar as heating is concerned. The reserve has been denuded of its trees and brought into agricultural production. This means that these people are now faced with a serious problem of heating their homes. With the advent of the villages it makes it possible to serve these areas with natural gas. It would be a simple matter to extend it to the villages, to the St. Phillips mission, where there is a school that is doing an excellent job, to continue on to the second village that is being built. This is an urgent matter insofar as these people are concerned. There is some real need. They don't have facilities to haul their wood. If they are going to rely on wood it has to be brought from the forest reserve which is some 20 miles away. I think this is a move that ought to go beyond realms of partisan politics. Certainly the need is here and certainly something must be done in the near future to help these people out of the very serious position and problem that they are facing.

Now I want to go on, Mr. Speaker, and mention some of the utterings and mutterings that have come from the other side of the house. I have heard so many shouts of "You have had 20 years, what did you do?", and many similar remarks like this. But I want to refresh the very short and sometimes dull memory of some of the government members. It may be as well to remind them of some of the things of 20 years ago. Lest the members opposite get so carried away with their own praises and eulogies, I want to reminisce for a few minutes. The story, Mr. Speaker, could become a best seller if it were published. The problem, of course, would be to get members opposite to read and take heed. It would bring back too many unpleasant memories of the Liberal "pork barrel" days. So I will talk a little bit about the last 20 years.

Well, of course, one of the first things that Premier Douglas discovered when he took office from the Liberals was a cupboard that was absolutely bare and without any funds. Instead of the healthy surplus of the present treasury, Mr. Douglas found bills, bills, and more unpaid bills; seed grain payments due, provincial bonds due and no money to pay them; farm mortgages due and payable and farmers being evicted from farms and homes. Well, there were plenty of financial institutions ready to renew loans at charges of unreasonable rates that were outrageous and unreasonable. The credit rating of the province was one of the worst in the whole Dominion of Canada. Compare this position of the province when the present Treasurer took over. He found Saskatchewan's credit rating one of the best in Canada. It's my hope that he is able and willing to keep it that way.

Revenues at that time were another sad story. No oil to brag about. No mineral income; no industries; no power; no potash. There was no need to scramble and go to any and all lengths to claim credit for industries and development. There just was none. If crops on the farms failed everything else suffered and came to a virtual standstill. The main problems facing the government was how to keep solvent and meet commitments. No need to boast and look for headlines. No need to make fabulous and extravagant claims. The question facing the government 20 years ago was not what to claim credit for, but what to do first and where to start.

The Liberals of today talk about industry. They forget that 20 years ago there wasn't enough power in Saskatchewan to run a well-equipped blacksmith shop, let alone an industry.



On page 14 of the submissions by the province to the special committee of the House of Commons, presented April 19, 1944, on Reconstruction and Re-establishment we find this comment on industry:

Saskatchewan from the point of view of industrial development is in a poorer position than any other province in the Dominion of Canada with the possible exception of Prince Edward Island.

Despite the fact that we had in 1939, 8.39 per cent of the population we had only 2.09 per cent of Canadian industrial production. Of power in the province the committee had this to say as reported on page 15:

Speaking on rural electrification. The organization, meaning the SPC, now distributing power in Saskatchewan serves some 300 farms, but existing facilities

it hastens to add

could provide for approximately 2,000.

Then it says this:

About 13,000 farmers have modified electric power service in the form of windchargers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, with the steady blast of wind that is emanating from the benches to your right, I am not sure that these farmers weren't on the right track. Thirteen thousand of them were certainly taking advantage of the Liberal wind of 20 years ago. The commission adds this to its report:

Of the present power generated in Saskatchewan, in 1944, 75 per cent is consumed by the four larger cities.

This was the deplorable position of power in 1944 that faced the government. And the boys sitting over on the other side today have the audacity to talk about the industrial development and industries. Twenty years ago we didn't have enough power or the lines to distribute it to serve as I have said a good-sized blacksmith shop.

On education the commission made some very interesting remarks. It said this:

Saskatchewan has more than 5,000 school districts each administered and financed through the powers of a local board.

Then it adds this comment:

The rural district is an inadequate financial unit. The rural school is almost invariably a one room school inadequately equipped and financed. Saskatchewan rural schools almost invariably need general repairs, painting, redecorating, heating plant extensions or renewals as well as extensions to out buildings.

The problem is aggravated in Saskatchewan by cumulative deterioration of plant and equipment caused by the failure of annual maintenance throughout the 1930s. Under the heading "Estimates of Urgent School Building Needs in the Provinces" the C.N.E.A. lists

**March 3, 1966**

\$3,000,000 to improve school plant and equipment in Saskatchewan.

I only want to mention two more aspects of the report to illustrate to my short-memoried friends the position of 20 years ago. On highways you find this picture and I quote again:

According to the Department of Highways and Transportation there are 8,390 miles of provincial highways in the province that should be improved or built in the post-war period if the highway system is to equal the standards set by other parts of the Dominion. Of the present 8,009 miles of provincial highways only 23.4 miles have been constructed to standard hard surface requirements. Approximately 627 miles have not been graded to a standard above that of an ordinary municipal road.

The commission points an even more despicable picture of the conditions of municipal roads.

I want to quote one more very important item from the report of 1944. This deals with forest resources. I ask the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) to pay particular attention and to use his good judgment to guide him in his future actions. I quote from page 6:

Depletion of Saskatchewan's forest resources has been rapid, particularly in the last ten years and it is estimated that almost 25 per cent of the accessible forest area has been logged off or burned off over the past years. On these areas the residual stand and reproduction of valuable tree species is insufficient to provide a future stand of merchandisable timber within a reasonable time. If our present rate of consumption of timber continues our virgin and mature stands of white spruce and fir will be exhausted in ten years.

These, Mr. Speaker, are some of the conditions the government of 20 years ago found in this province. These are the net end results of the glorious free enterprise system that the Premier, in the words of his budget, is going to nurture and spoon feed. These, Mr. Speaker, are the results of Liberal "Pork Barrel" politics.

I want now to refresh the memory of my friends on the other side of what the CCF did to combat these very grave and disastrous conditions, and to compare their positions when they took office in 1964.

I want now to list a few of the achievements of the last 20 years. The list is a long one and I won't quote them all. Here are a few notable ones among them as well as the reactions of the Liberal party to them.

Hospitalization. You'll remember the howls and wails of Liberal members at that time. School re-organizations from chaos has been changed to what is now considered one of the best in Canada. Again to howls and wails of Liberal members.

Conservation and planned program of the use of timber and natural resources for the benefit of the people of the province instead of being destroyed by a few for more profits.

A highway program from, as the commission reported, "Canada's worst" to at least equal to the very best in Canada; invented and

started the first grid road program of its kind in Canada.

Started the first comprehensive insurance program that has given the best insurance rates in Canada, in spite of the attempts of the present minister to discredit it.

Oil development, that has been nothing short of spectacular.

Potash was discovered and was being developed while the Liberals were busying themselves with mutterings, disgruntled hemming and hawings.

Power was being developed at a rate that even the wildest dreamers thought impossible.

Air ambulance service, the only one of its kind in Canada. The human benefits of this one service alone have been immeasurable.

Transportation services through the Saskatchewan Transportation Company have brought services to those who never dreamt they would have them.

As a result of power and gas development industry came to the province for the first time in our history. Even now the Liberals are trying desperately to claim credit for them several years after they have been accepted and taken for granted.

The medicare program and plan must stand as the outstanding achievement of the past 20 years. That plan, Mr. Speaker, was brought in during a performance of the Liberal party that must go down in history as being unmatched anywhere in Canada. The door of this assembly no doubt, Mr. Speaker, still bears the scars of the Premier's toe. In his indignation and wrath he was prepared to stop at nothing to prevent the program from coming into effect.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, sewer and water brought to farms, senior citizens' homes, geriatric centres, aid to indigents and the likes. It is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, to note the performance of the Liberal party during this period. They have at all times, done everything in their power to either halt entirely or stop any or all of these programs. Their speeches in this house and outside read like a fairy tale. They preached doom and gloom at every opportunity. They wrung their hands in despair, and now when they find themselves in power are proceeding as fast as possible to wreck and destroy all the programs they think they can get away with.

I want now, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to spend a few moments dealing with a few aspects of the budget itself.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Larson:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. members across the way will smart from some of these remarks and reminders. I want to repeat again that I don't want to criticize what is proposed to be done, rather I want to criticize and point out what I think ought to be done.

In checking into the estimates of the 1,000,000,000 agriculture industry and the Department of Agriculture estimates, I find some of these shortcomings. There is little now, Mr. Speaker, and indeed some deletions. With the exception of new personnel and

**March 3, 1966**

an increase in money for the South Saskatchewan River Irrigation Project, I find an actual curtailment of personnel. Two people less in the Field Services Branch, one less in the Land Utilization Branch, one less in the Family Farm Improvement Branch and five less in the Animal Industry Branch. The best that could be done in the other areas is to hold the line. I find that a little better than \$2,000,000 increase is mostly absorbed in general and usual increases of the various branches and salaries and general rising operating costs. If the money estimated in the Veterinarian Service Branch, as well as the grass seeding and new breaking grants are paid out and spent, it will be welcomed. I find it rather hard to understand why the government is not budgeting for some of the items that the agriculture industry is badly in need of.

There is a very great need in the field of plant breeding and seed development. Very much more and intensive research is required. If agriculture is to meet the demands of the future it must have higher yielding varieties as well as better disease resistance. A great vacuum in this area exists. Fertilizer development and uses are another field where we have hardly scratched the surface. The soils testing branch at the university will do a valuable job of soil analysis, but this does not even begin to do the job of testing and developing new fertilizers that may be required. Farmers spend literally millions of dollars on fertilizers, but are only able to buy the standard 11-48 or the high nitrogen varieties. This is a great need in this area.

On the field of livestock production much more needs to be done. We are continually being told of the potential in this field. Yet there is a minimum of expenditures for this purpose. New ways and techniques must be developed to aid producers in better feeds, better health care, and very badly needed is better livestock management methods. A real sore spot in the livestock production is the lack of available capital to develop suitable operations. The better breeding stocks are not easily available because of lack of finances to procure this breeding stock. As a result much of the livestock, particularly cattle, is of inferior breeding. Much more than is being made available by way of present finances must be found if this industry is to develop and grow enough to meet future needs.

I regret very much that the government has not see fit to reinstate and improve the work of AMA. Farmers are spending millions of dollars on machinery and experience has shown that very often they are being sold machines that do not meet their needs and have major flaws. I will not bore the assembly with details of cases, but I invite the minister to do some checking and find out what the situation is really like. I am sure he hasn't a clue of some of the problems encountered by farmers. I note by the agricultural estimates, Mr. Speaker, that the Agricultural Representatives Services Branch is going to only hold the line. I had hoped the minister would have been able to announce a whole new program in this field.

Now, I have every respect for the agricultural representatives and the work they do and have done in the past, but I ask the minister if he is unaware of the needs and the exciting possibilities in this area. Instead of having the talents and the skills of these men confined to 4H clubs, field days, livestock days and distributing pamphlets they ought to assume a much more professional role in each district and community.

To really understand the agricultural picture these trained

men ought to be used by the department to studies of communities and their needs, do extensive planning programs with the farmers, be freed from their routine tasks to do management organizational work. I have only listed a few of the rather long list of duties that are in great need of doing. To meet the demand of the industry it is my belief that a complete reorganization of the Agricultural Representatives Services Branches is overdue. I suggest this to the minister, realizing full well that he is a new man in this department and may not as yet have had time to get too well acquainted and to meet the needs of his department.

I have one more comment to make to the new minister. It has been obvious to me for several years that the Department of Agriculture, which I want to repeat again, Mr. Speaker, is in charge of the provinces largest and most important industry has not yet got its fair share of attention and expenditures. This department always seems to come in last. It looks to me as if after all other departments have had their slice of the budget pie, agriculture gets what happens to be left. This, I submit, is not good enough. A new look and a fresh approach will have to be taken if we are to hold our own, let alone meet the challenges of the future. I make no apologies, Mr. Speaker, for speaking out on these needs of the agriculture industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I want to make a few general observations. After the most splendid analysis of the budget made by the member for Regina, there isn't much left to be said. However, there are some aspects I want to comment on.

On looking at the summary of estimated budgetary revenues I want to say this . The Treasurer and members opposite are continually harping about tax reductions. Yet in their estimates the actual amount of money they hope to extract from the people's pockets is up by some \$47,000,000 or better. Education and Sales tax up — \$6,800,000; gasoline tax up — \$4,700,000; individual income tax up — \$10,200,000; corporation income tax up — \$4,300,000; tobacco tax up — \$250,000; license and permits up — \$8,700,000; receipts from other governments up — \$4,600,000.

I find it very hard, Mr. Speaker, to understand this kind of statement. The Treasurer either was in one of his exuberant and extravagant moods when he drafted this document or he doesn't himself really believe what he is saying when he talks about tax cuts. The budget, Mr. Speaker, is either a bloated headline catching document to try to convince the people of Saskatchewan that the Treasurer has accomplished the magic miracle of spending more, while at the same time cutting taxes, or an admission that is not published to the general public that our taxes are in fact going to cost us more money and that all the Treasurer has done is shifted a few and juggled a few others.

It is obvious the Treasurer can't have it both ways. I think this house and the people are entitled to know what it really is.

There is one item I find of particular interest, Mr. Speaker, — on page six of the estimates I find an item entitled "Other Receipts From Government Enterprise and Other Funds", estimated \$3,778,300, in this budget compared to \$756,740.00 last year. I shall be looking, Mr. Speaker, with interest to the answer on this item.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the budget

**March 3, 1966**

as presented by the Provincial Treasurer is bloated with wishful thinking so far as expected revenues are concerned. It seems to me that it's open-ended as far as expenditures go. It seems to me that taxes have been juggled and as a result the budget will give no relief to the needy. It seems to me further that while the exempting of turkey saddles from the sales tax will be appreciated by the female species, it will do very little to enhance the agricultural industry as a whole.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, will be supporting the amendment, but cannot support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. M.P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, my first remarks in participating in this debate must be to offer to the Provincial Treasurer my congratulations on the presentation of his second budget. Differences of opinion as to the content and the general form that the budget takes, as well as differences on emphasis on priorities, certainly exist between us. I notice that his general and detailed knowledge of what I consider a very complex and massive document indicates to me at any rate that he had done a very substantial amount of homework, and I hasten to offer my congratulations for his performance on Friday, last. At the same time I also want to say how very impressed I was with the thorough and, what I consider, most comprehensive job that was done by the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), when he presented his party's criticism of the budget. It struck me, Mr. Speaker, most forcibly that for those in search of tangible evidence of the underlying differences between the Liberal party and the NDP that no two speeches could have given more evidence than did these two given by the Premier and the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney). This, of course, is as it should be.

I noticed the other day, that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) seemed in his address to take affront at the fact that his party, as the government, should be subjected to such a searching and far-ranging probe, not only into the weaknesses of government policy but also of existing programs. Why this minister, the Minister of Public Works, who, probably more than any other member of this house, is noted for his blind acceptance of Liberal dogma and his often rather total rejection of opposing ideas, should take exception to criticism is beyond me, because he is noteworthy for his criticism in this house. The member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) is well known in this house and outside of it, as the leader of those who attempt during debate to drown out the words of those who are expressing views and ideas that he doesn't understand. This, of course, Mr. Speaker, is almost a daily occurrence for this member, because from what I have observed there is a very substantial percentage of the debate that goes far beyond his comprehension. This is why he seems so noisy on many occasions as he is attempting to do right now. I am rather amused, Mr. Speaker, sitting across from him as I do, I was rather amused this year that when the tables were turned on him, to see him stand in his place and whimper like a puppy about the criticism that he hears. He reminds me very much, Mr. Speaker, of the village bully who stands there and blubbers and cries when he finally gets the licking he deserves.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — Surely, Mr. Speaker, one of the main purposes of allowing

eight days for debate on the budget is that members on both sides of the house can present their views, and as far as possible unobstructed views by the dribbling and snivelling of the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

**Mr. A. Guy (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

**Mr. Pederson:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I stung the member so quickly and so early on in the debate, because if he holds his horses, we will send some more bees over for his bonnet shortly.

**Mr. Guy:** — My reflexes are good.

**Mr. Pederson:** — They would need to be for you to keep out of trouble the way you do. I am sure that this is the purpose of the eight days allowed for the Budget Debate. If some of the members present their views with extraordinary vigor and thought and clarity then surely this must be a matter of congratulations, not condemnation. Believing that, Mr. Speaker, is what prompts me to congratulate both the Premier and the financial critic for the NDP. I must confess though, Mr. Speaker, that I envy these two their rather extensive research staff, because for any member to tackle what I consider the enormous task of evaluating and the offering a constructive critique of a budget of this size without qualified help, I confess is almost frightening to contemplate. I trust, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that my own efforts in this regard will be granted a certain degree of tolerance based on the knowledge that at best only a relatively few specific items can be dealt with as extensively as I would like.

Now the question of effecting economies in government is something we heard a great deal about in the last session of a year ago. The Liberals pledged that they were going to effect substantial savings in all departments of government and in fact much of the emphasis during debates in that last session centered on the feverish activity claimed by various cabinet ministers in cutting costs. Now this year we have heard nothing about economies but instead the emphasis is shifted to substantial increases in spending in all departments. There is one exception to this, however. The Minister of Welfare must have taken the Premier's command last year to cut back very seriously indeed. Because at a time, Mr. Speaker, when virtually every department of government has abandoned the pretense of cutting back and launched on a program of massive spending, the Minister of Welfare continues producing cuts in the face of expanding demands for service.

Here we encounter some very strange contradictions indeed. In some areas of assistance, that is in the supplementary allowance, old age assistance, disabled persons allowance, and blind persons allowance, the difference between the estimates for 1965-66 and 1966-67 is almost staggering. A total in '65-66 of \$7,208,190, and in '66-67 \$1,942,520, a difference of \$5,265,670. The estimate for this coming year, Mr. Speaker, in those four areas is only 27 per cent of what it was in the year just ending. On the face of it, it would seem that it would be fair to suggest, if you just take a fast look at these figures, that welfare savings are being made at the expense of our pioneer citizens, our disabled or crippled neighbours and the blind. However, we have to look a little further than this to see if such a charge is really true.

**March 3, 1966**

I want to turn to the annual report of the Department of Welfare for the year '64 and '65 which was tabled in the house just recently. In this report, which I have here, we find some very interesting, rather revealing statements from which we can draw our own conclusions about the truth of the statement I made just a moment ago. I have studied this report very carefully and I find that in dealing with these four areas of assistance that I mentioned, the minister outlines three main reasons why there has been a drop in the amounts being spent. The first reason he gives, Mr. Speaker, is that a lot of people who were eligible before have died. This is his excuse for a decline in the number of supplemental allowances being paid to those receiving old age security and blind persons allowance.

On page 15 of this report he mentions a total of 3,442 people receiving this supplemental allowance and then he goes on to say:

This represents a decline of over 500 in recipients of the means test supplement mostly because of deaths.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, as these people die very few applicants become eligible in spite of the fact that our population continues to grow, albeit slowly. In spite of what our friends opposite say, our percentage of people in need remains at a fairly constant level. There can be only one conclusion from that statement, Mr. Speaker, that many who are eligible are being denied eligibility and that to me is a sordid method of saving money, I must say.

The second reason that he gives in his report for decline in recipients is that we have had good crops. Well, Mr. Speaker, it certainly is true that the member for Rosthern has been blessed with good crops, not just recently but throughout most of his life. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, the affluence that this has brought him accounts for his impatience with those who haven't had the divine fortune that he has had. I think it is fair to say that the overwhelming majority of people in need of these types of assistance have no connection whatsoever with either farming or the direct benefits from farming. So the minister's report just doesn't hold water.

When we look at the report a little bit closer, it starts to become apparent what the third reason for a decline in the number of recipients is. The report states in a rather indirect fashion that there is a growing demand for assistance. Now, I want to quote what he says under the old age assistance section. He says:

The monthly average number of new applications, however, rose from 140 in 1963-64 to 148 in 1964-65.

A clear cut indication that there is a growing demand. Under the disabled persons allowance, again he says:

The number of recipients showed a net increase of 123 in this fiscal year. The monthly average number of new applications, 38, was slightly higher than the previous year, 34.

Now that indicates to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a growing demand for these services and then we see cut-backs, a clear cut indication to me that a continuing number of people are requiring assistance. These numbers are not remaining static but they are growing. These aren't a group of people, Mr. Speaker, a separate



group who either die or else become wealthy farmers and, therefore, are taken off the lists. Following that logic to its conclusion the minister shortly wouldn't have any problems at all because they would all die off or become wealthy farmers. Far from it. The answer is much more subtle and devious than that and consequently, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, much more devastating to those people who are seeking help. The clue lies in the sharp increase in numbers of case loads waiting action. I want to give you some of the figures that he refers to in his report. Under the old age assistance, he says, "the pending case load also rose in this period from 512 to 567 cases."

Five hundred and sixty-seven cases in this province, Mr. Speaker, at the time of writing this report of people waiting to see whether the minister or his department would approve this assistance or not. The same thing in the Disabled Persons Allowance. It says there is "an average of 189 cases pending per month compared with 151 per month the previous year". In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are having an increase in the number of people who are sitting on the doorstep waiting to be told whether they are going to have assistance or not.

Now, very naturally I have no way of knowing all of the reasons for there being so many case loads pending. I would assume perhaps there are staff problems, and so on. But I do, however, have some very grave misgivings that the policy being followed by that department is one of resistance to granting of assistance so that applicants will, in many cases, give up in sheer frustration, and, therefore neither their names nor the amounts they require would appear on the records in the department. All the evidence points to this as the means that are being used to effect economies.

As was mentioned in the report, our share of some of these programs will be reduced this year because of inclusion in the Canada Pension Plan. Let's not make this an excuse for denying the help that thousands of our people need now. It's no use waiting until the Canada Pension Plan starts cutting in. Some people may go hungry for a long time while they are waiting. If our economy is as buoyant and the future as bright as has been predicted, surely we can share much more of it with those who are more unfortunate than we are at the moment.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the general area of tax levies that were outlined by the Premier in his presentation. He began with the stated premise, that the Treasury must keep spending at a maximum if our economy is to advance. He mentioned essential services such as highways, and health, and education. If what he intends to imply is that the expansion of these services that he mentioned require the maximum that we can afford, then I most certainly agree with him. But on the other hand, I believe that it is also an equal responsibility of government during times of economic buoyancy to take as many steps as possible to reduce the total tax burden, because if this isn't done a continuing spiral of increased spending by government can only lead to the ultimate domination by government of the earning capacity of the taxpayer. Unfortunately it seems to be the common practice of governments everywhere to spend as fast as they receive and often faster than they receive. If they feel safe in doing so, and tax revenues are insufficient to meet insatiable demands made on governments, tax increases are the order of the day.

Now, I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier had some satisfaction the other day in linking my name with the government of

**March 3, 1966**

Ontario and their recent action in instituting substantial tax increases. But I noticed, however, that he was much more reticent in allying himself with the two Liberal governments of Quebec and New Brunswick, who also followed suit. But surely, Mr. Speaker, this is not the question at hand of what one government has done as opposed to another. We have in Saskatchewan a situation that has contrived to present to the government in this past year what I would refer to as an embarrassing surplus. At any rate, it is embarrassing if you take a look at the estimated revenue of one year ago.

We thought, Mr. Speaker, in my party, as did the present Premier, that the NDP on my right here were the last of the big time spenders when it involved the taxpayers' dollar. The budget for 1965-66, including supplementary estimates, represents a 14 per cent increase over the last NDP budget presented to this house and the budget for the coming year, a further 10 per cent making a total increase in expenditures of \$54,000,000 or 25 per cent higher than the 1965-65 NDP budget. Let them laugh that one away, Mr. Speaker, when they talk about big time spenders. They do things in a big way.

**Mr. Nollet:** — . . . reduce taxes.

**Mr. Pederson:** — Yes, well, we'll get to that in a moment. I checked through the record, Mr. Speaker, and I found that one year ago the Premier said that he was basing his estimated revenue largely on two factors. First and foremost, he referred to agriculture and the returns that would be produced from this very basic industry by way of tax revenues.

Secondly, he referred to a continuing steady growth in what he referred to as the industrial and mineral development of our province. With these two major areas of revenue as his base, and estimating that they would produce, as he said, at an average rate of growth, the government found that they had a surplus close to \$26,000,000 in spite of an estimated surplus of only \$235,000. In other words over one hundred times as much of a surplus as had been estimated.

Now, I was interested to note again this year, the Premier is basing his proposed estimate of surplus on the same barometers that he used last year. Yet he tells us that prospects in agriculture will continue better than average in the coming year. He says that good moisture conditions, increasing prices, and sure markets will probably produce the net results of obtaining for farmers, a gross production well in excess of the \$1,000,000,000 figure set in 1965.

Increased activity in the mining field too he tells us, and potash development, as well as a continuing demand for our oil should show a substantial growth in the field of natural resources development as well. It would seem to me at any rate that our surplus for the forthcoming year may well be in excess of the surplus that was registered last year. The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that with conditions as favourable as they are, with revenues reaching an all-time high, with almost a certainty of government revenues being far in excess of that projected in the Budget Debate and the estimates, then surely this would have been a time to have introduced some tax reductions that would have had an immediate and far-reaching impact on our economy.

It is quite true that some tax reductions have been outlined, chiefly in the field of income tax and in the so-called Home-owner grants. The provincial income tax surcharge, I note, is to be reduced from six per cent to five per cent for an alleged saving of \$1,100,000 to the taxpayer. On examination, however, we find that revenues from this source for the coming year will amount to \$32,500,000 from individuals and \$15,400,000 from corporations, an overall increase of some \$15,000,000 over 1965-66 estimates. This government can very well afford, Mr. Speaker, to forego \$1,000,000 of additional revenue when it expects to collect an additional \$15,000,000 in any event. The one per cent reduction in the income tax surcharge that the Saskatchewan residents pay together with the Home-owner grants added together amount to just over \$9,000,000.

Certainly there are arguments in favor of both of these areas of tax reductions and I have felt for some time, Mr. Speaker, that it was necessary for our government to bring Saskatchewan into line with our neighboring provinces insofar as income tax is concerned. The Home-owner grant, however, may be something of another matter. Concerned as I am about the tremendous need for reducing the cost of the property tax on the property owner, I must confess that I have some serious misgivings about the apparent method that is going to be used to effect a step in this direction. It would seem to me at any rate that an increase in the conditional grants to municipalities for the purpose of tax abatement on property would have removed this item in the budget from the smack of political patronage.

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier):** — How are you going to vote, Martin?

**Mr. Pederson:** — I am going to vote for it, but I am certainly going to try in Committee of the Whole to get the method of sending it out changed.

I realize it is very tempting for parties in power to use the direct payment method. No doubt, the Premier had this in mind when he intimated that it was going to be done this way. Other governments have done it, and I must admit that sending \$8,000,000 worth of cheques to homeowners in this province, coming as they will from the Premier's own benevolent little hand, will no doubt have an impact on certain people when they receive it. The impact I refer to, of course, will not be felt only in their wallet, but in their votes as well. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Premier's question, I am going to support it because I believe in reduction of taxes for property owners but I hope that the Premier and his members opposite will give serious consideration to disbursing this money in a fashion that is other than political in its overtones.

As members of this house are well aware, the party that I represent have strongly supported and promoted the idea that some method must be devised whereby a sharp reduction in the tax load carried by the property owner could be effected. I have long been of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the method of raising revenue through property tax for items other than services to property, is outdated and outmoded. It also, in my opinion, is a method that contravenes in many cases the broad principle that taxes should be levelled according to the ability to pay and not merely because an individual has substantial property registered in his name without actual ownership being involved. I believe that in many instances, Mr. Speaker, people are paying taxes on property which is

assessed at ten, fifteen and twenty thousand dollars when, in fact, their total equity in this property is no more than maybe \$500, and they are being taxed as if they are wealthy owners of an equity valued at so-and-so many dollars. This has become or caused to become a very serious problem in our taxation circles. I think that it's time that anything that tended to perpetuate this was removed. I will have some more to say on this item, as I intimated a moment ago, when the estimates come before the house. I hope at that time, as I said a moment ago, that the government might consider a change in the tentative plans that they have outlined for making this money, this Home-owner grant, available as a tax rebate.

I want to examine for a moment the tax cuts offered by this budget. The Provincial Treasurer expects sales tax revenues to amount to \$43,300,000 in 1965-66. He then proceeds to budget for an additional \$3,000,000 from this source in the next fiscal year, after providing for exemptions on several farm items. The 13 exempt items, however, are more than offset by adding the tax on cleansing agents for a net increase in tax of \$100,000. I notice the Premier in his discussion of his highway program tells us that his government has moved 23,900,000 cubic yards of dirt in the past year. It is interesting to note the importance that the Treasurer places on government dirt-moving projects on the one hand and the decision to tax the housewives of this province for their dirt-moving projects on the other.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — Perhaps the fact that, I've noticed in recent weeks, a new detergent called "Bold" has appeared on the market has prompted the Premier to impose a tax on that little rascal, in the hope that it will prompt the old "Boldt" to clean up the dirty problems in his department as quickly as possible. I don't know if this is what was behind it or not . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — . . . but difficult to understand, Mr. Speaker, as I find the Premier's action in this area, it is even more difficult to understand the two strange areas he chose in which to increase taxes. In spite of many of the rather humorous aspects of the thirteen farm items that have been deleted from the list of those requiring a sales tax, I feel quite satisfied that they were merely obscure items that were removed from the list for housekeeping purposes. But when the Treasurer turns around and for apparently the same reason, that is for housekeeping reasons, includes soaps and cleansing agents in the list for the four per cent tax, I find it a high degree of inconsistency. I am not suggesting for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that wealthy people wash less than poor people, but I think that the Premier would find that the largest families tend to occur in the lower income groups and consequently their consumption of these products is far in excess of that of people in the higher income groups. Of the total \$100,000 accruing to the budget through this item, Mr. Speaker, I would hazard a guess that at least 75 per cent of it will come from the pockets of the lower brackets of wage earners.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — Surely if the inclusion of these items were merely a

housekeeping measure, then it would have been better to have allowed them to remain as they were if it was necessary to increase revenues, as the Treasurer has indicated, then add a further small percentage of tax to items such as liquor and tobacco. I am amazed that my friend across the way doesn't raise his eyebrows on that one.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we find that the Premier has suggested that, because the rural municipalities have been asking for one cent of the gasoline tax to be earmarked for municipal road construction, this has prompted him to increase the tax by one cent a gallon in order to meet this request. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that having allowed the use of purple gas for farm trucks last year, that the Premier has weighed the cost of using gas by those other than farmers in such a fashion as to create a good deal of resentment between the farming community and the non-farming community. There were suggestions in this house last year that the tax revenue from the sale of purple gasoline should be earmarked for the use of municipalities, for road construction. This was rejected, and monies continued to be taken from public revenue insofar as grants to the municipalities for roads were concerned.

This year again, the general public who spend the vast majority of their gasoline tax revenue on the provincial highways of this province, that's where most of it is spent, are being called upon to subsidize municipal road construction. Now, being a farmer myself, and realizing how important these municipal roads are to farmers, I am very reluctant to criticize any increase in revenue for either grid or municipal road construction. However, in fairness, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is wrong to obtain this increase in construction at the expense of those people who rarely, if ever, use municipal roads. These then, Mr. Speaker, are the inconsistencies that I see in the actions of the Provincial Treasurer as he outlined in his budget and insofar as the tax increases and decreases are concerned.

I want to come back, Mr. Speaker, to the question of projected surpluses as well as the actual surplus from last year. The estimates that were placed before this legislature a year ago, and which were passed by the members of this assembly were of the order of \$221,000,000. These expenditures provided for a very substantial and far-reaching increase in expenditures in virtually every department of government. I believe that that was as it should be. They allowed for a vastly increased highway building program, a reasonable increase to education, and a substantial increase both to the Department of Public Health and the Department of Social Welfare. Yet with the buoyant economy, and the surplus of \$26,000,000 that it produced, the government enlarged on these already heavily extended programs to the tune of about another \$20,000,000. Surely this could have been regarded in my opinion at any rate as exceptional spending in that year and should not be considered as normal spending even in the face of a rapid need to increase many of the services that we require.

What I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that having budgeted for record revenues last year, and earmarking those revenues for expenditure and then finding a substantial surplus and earmarking most of it for expenditure, the government has now decided that extraordinary spending such as this should be the order of the day. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a more orderly increase, a slightly more modest increase, in the budgets for each department, would be more in keeping with the wishes of the people of this province.

**March 3, 1966**

It is quite true, Mr. Speaker, that we enjoy having the advantages of top class, first class highways, but surely it is not the purpose of government to direct abnormal revenues to this department or any other department, without earmarking a substantial percentage of extraordinary revenue to be used for tax reduction purposes. Perhaps the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant), Mr. Speaker, would be pleased to have a suggestion that I have for him where he can save about \$500,000 in his department. I noticed during the Bengough by-election that the Liberal party promised to build and oil a new highway from no. 13 to Kayville. Well, now that Hazen Argue has been looked after by his appointment, there won't be such a pressing need to build this road through the barren wastes of the Argue cow-pasture. Far better, I would suggest, to build, in the next year or two, a new highway to connect east or west of Kayville, which would serve several communities instead of the one promised by the Liberals in an ad in the Assiniboia Times.

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Health):** — . . . Tory promises . . .

**Mr. Pederson:** — Well, I'll tell you I wish I had the opportunity to promise like you did, Davey, we'd have done all right.

**Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works):** — You just wanted a seconder.

**Mr. Pederson:** — You did very well. I suggest that the only value of the road to Kayville that the Liberals promised was to provide a high speed exit out the back door for Saskatchewan's most unpopular politician.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — And, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the fact that Senator Argue and the Premier have always been such bosom pals, and as one newspaper put it, old roomies together in Ottawa, prompted the Premier to plot this escape route for his friend in the direction of south, towards his friends in the State of Montana.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Still are good friends too.

**Mr. Pederson:** — Well, I'm very pleased to hear that, very pleased to hear that.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a disproportionately small amount of surplus revenue has been used to effect tax reductions as compared to the amounts earmarked for increased spending by the various departments. I would have thought that, in the face of this very substantial surplus that developed, the Premier might very well have instituted a further reduction in the four per cent sales tax. I realize that even a one per cent drop would mean, according to the estimates, a reduction in the tax yield of something like \$11,500,000. Surely, however, this is not too great an item to consider removing from the back of virtually every taxpayer who exists in this province when we contemplate the increase of almost \$49,000,000 in revenues estimated this year as opposed to estimates of one year ago. In short, Mr. Speaker, instead of

launching a crash program, such as we have in some of the departments of government where massive increases in spending are indicated, would it not have been better to have proceeded at a slightly more modest pace and extended to the hard-pressed consumer in this province, a further reduction in the miserable four per cent tax that he is compelled to pay.

I want to draw to the attention of the government, Mr. Speaker, their very strong condemnation of this tax while they were in opposition and again during the election campaign of 1964. It would seem now that they are in government, and I want to paraphrase the phrase the Premier used over and over again the other day, that they were more than reluctant to act the way they talked.

While I am still on the subject of taxation, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the consideration of government to the proposition that further tax exemptions insofar as income tax is concerned should be uppermost in the minds of the government and the Provincial Treasurer when they are having discussions on tax problems with their counterparts in Ottawa. Specifically, items such as property tax, or in lieu of property tax, a certain percentage of rental payments should be exempt from taxation. In effect, what we have in this country is a system of a tax on a tax. The multiplicity of taxes being paid on income that the wage-earner never sees is increasing almost yearly. I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that in the United States they do have these types of exemptions. The income tax then, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, becomes based more fairly on the actual earnings of the taxpayer.

The Conservative party disapproves in principle of the concept of double taxation. Although we realize how difficult it is to eradicate this very dubious practice completely, nevertheless we feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is something that should be kept in mind, and removal of double taxation should take place as often and as quickly as possible.

I had two or three other items, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to deal with, specifically, crown corporations, and one or two other matters, but I would like to hold them over until tomorrow and with the indulgence of the house, I would beg leave of the assembly to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **RESOLUTIONS**

### **MOTION: DISCLOSURE OF CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS**

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City) moved:

That this assembly urges that legislation be laid before this assembly to provide that contributions to provincial political parties, to candidates for office in provincial elections and to organizations participating in provincial elections be disclosed to the public, including contributions as follows: (a) all contributions by corporations; (b) all contributions by trade unions, trade associations and like bodies; and (c) all contributions by individuals over a specified figure per annum.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the object of this resolution is to provide that legislation be laid before this assembly, defining a procedure whereby the source of all contributions for provincial

**March 3, 1966**

political parties purposes shall be readily traceable. I believe that the Canadian people and, indeed, the Canadian parliament was recently shocked to find that the Canadian political structures were being effectively infiltrated by money from the underworld.

The government of the day recognized that there was a problem, and moved to establish a committee on election expenses. Members of the committee established in October, 1964, are Francois Nobert, a former president of the Quebec Liberal federation, M.J. Coldwell, former national leader of the CCF party, and MP for 23 years, and Arthur Smith, conservative MP from 1957 to 1963, Gordon R. Dryden, a lawyer and a Liberal campaign committee man, Professor Norman Ward, of the University of Saskatchewan, Political Scientist, teacher and author.

I hope that this committee of hon. gentlemen soon presents a report. It is also my sincere hope that the main recommendations of the committee shall concern themselves with the getting and spending of funds for political parties.

In my view, the history of Canadian electoral reform has been a slow and painful experience. Bill 90 was introduced into the House of Commons in 1938, by C.G. Power, now more commonly known as Senator Chubby Power. The bill was attempting to provide that the source and distribution of all contributions for federal political purposes should be readily traceable, and further to limit to membership in the House of Commons. The committee reported the bill in 1939 and it was subsequently pigeonholed. Ten years later in 1949, the bill was incorporated into an Act to Amend The Dominion Election Act. The bill at that time received second reading and expired.

Some years ago in a letter to the Reverend Gerard Dion of the faculty of Social Sciences at Laval University, Mr. Power's concluding paragraph read as follows:

There is no doubt whatsoever in my mind but that sooner or later someone will have to take this matter energetically in hand in order to put an end to the constantly rising spiral of political expenditures in connection with electoral campaigns in Canada.

Yours sincerely, Charles G. Power

Our political party has made numerous futile attempts to bring about electoral reform in the House of Commons. In 1961, Murdo Martin, CCF for Timmins, Ontario, had this to say in sponsoring a bill on the subject:

It was not in giving money to a political party that the evil lay, rather it was the secrecy of the donations.

Our party has tried to set an example in Canadian political life. Our example has been one of disclosure of amounts of funds spent in promoting candidates to membership in the House of Commons. We have at all times attempted to be frank with the electorate about our financial relationships. At differing times persons from other political parties have attempted to alert the Canadian electorate to the danger signs for democracy. For example, extracts from a series of articles entitled, "Political Campaign Funds" by Jack Cahill from the Ottawa Journal in April 1964, had this to say:



Former Conservative party national organizer, Alister Grosart, said election expenses should be drastically limited and parties made to declare the source of their funds.

Former Liberal national organizer, James Scott, says:

The war chest systems should be abolished because it is destructive to our concept of a democracy and to our free parliamentary system . . .

The Quebec Election Act has been amended to include a section on disclosing and limiting election expenses. Premier Lesage is quoted on May 29, 1965, in the Globe and Mail as saying:

I have laid my cards on the table because never again do I want money to be a steamroller behind which a party can march to power.

The Ontario Provincial Legislature had introduced by Ken Bryden, the member for provincial parliament, for Toronto-Woodbine, a Bill No. 15, to amend The Election Act to allow publication and auditing of campaign contributions and expenditures. Ontario Liberals favor contributed amounts over \$100 having their source disclosed. The Ontario New Democrats want full disclosure.

I agree money contributions or donations-in-kind are necessary, I feel, as do many others, that money used in sufficiently large amounts can distort the democratic process. The public has a right to know where the money is coming from. That abuses have existed is common knowledge. That the disclosure of the source of funds will allow the voters to more intelligently judge where their ballot should be marked is common sense.

We all heard the remarks delivered in this chamber yesterday about the extent of organized crime in Canada. The Attorneys General of Canada are concerned as are the police forces. The mask of respectability worn by organized crime consists of not only posing as legitimate businessmen, but also consists of buying insurance by donating to a political party or politician. The result of inordinate pressure of large sums on a person of low moral fibre, whether policeman or politician, is a foregone conclusion.

This resolution does not make provisions for allotting free radio and television time or free postal privileges; it does not provide for political donations to be income tax deductible; it does not specify a ceiling on the amount an individual or group may donate to a party in goods, services or cash. Finally this bill does not place any limit on the amount a party or politician can spend in any given time.

I may be attacked for only going half way in this resolution. For the time being, if the source of funds is disclosed, I am prepared to give the citizens of Saskatchewan the final judgment as to whether a party or a politician has spent too much money in any one year or election. I would say that the average person donates only a small amount to a party in any year or election. Consequently the last provision of the resolution protects his identity.

Democracy in Canada rests at the crossroads. Many legislators in other provinces and Ottawa are attempting to bring about reform. In bringing about electoral reform to protect democracy in Canada, they will need all the moral and legislative support there is available. With these brief remarks I move, seconded by

**March 3, 1966**

the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) the foregoing resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the motion as has been moved by the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Brockelbank), I want first of all to congratulate him on his presentation of the case that he laid before the legislature. I do want to say, as he indicated to this house, that there have been such measures brought before the legislative bodies in this country and in other places. I think that if you look back at most of the discussions you will find that most of those resolutions have been found to be very impractical. I am quite certain that if this motion was carried and tried to be put into effect it would be very impractical too.

The reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that many organizations in this country, in this province, organizations of various types do not reveal contributions of any kind that are made to them, and yet there is no slur or attacks on those organizations because they don't reveal the donor or the giver to that particular organization. I know many churches and I am sure there are other organizations that will not reveal the names of their contributors and do not think it is the proper thing to do in their particular organizations to reveal who contributes to their particular church, probably at the request of the individual.

In the twenty years that I have been taking an active part in politics I have read the expense accounts of the candidates sitting across the way and of every member of their party that ever ran in my constituency. I know their campaign expenses weren't correct, because in most cases they spent at least double what the Liberal party spent in each campaign and they showed less.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I could prove that, on just the radio and television that was used alone; in my constituency the candidate couldn't have been putting down his full expenses because of the amount of television time used alone. I didn't use any and he was on for many, many broadcasts and I know the cost of radio and television. My young friend across the way tries to indicate that they are purer than anyone else in this country in politics, and they reveal where their political contributions come from. I think he was being a little on the naive side, I think he knows as well that people contribute to churches and political parties through collections. How about the money on the collection plate? A man could put a thousand dollar bill on there, and who is going to tell us when the meeting is over who put it there? Who is going to control that kind of contribution?

The democratic giving of the people that the party across the way is always talking about would be stopped. The people would be prevented from giving on the collection plate because they would have to reveal who they were, to the political party and to their neighbors. The mover indicates that the voter has to put down whom he donated to. That is stating what his politics are, but he says the individual has the right to support any political party. He would actually be reducing the democratic rights of every citizen

in this country if we said they would have to put their name on a roll and say this is the political party that I give my financial contribution to. Is that what my friends are asking? Is that what the people of this country desire to have everyone asking? Is that what the people of this country desire to have everyone know exactly how they vote? The ballot system in this country is secret. The political party you support in this country is supposed to be a secret, and there are many individuals in Canada who believe they have a right to vote as they desire, for the party they desire. The day we start insisting that our citizens be labelled and regimented by the government of the day in any sense, whether it is financial or otherwise, then that day we will lose a lot of our democracy.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, there are many ways in which political expenses could be controlled, without controlling the individual in our country, and without regimenting the individual. There are many ways in which limitations can be placed on many of the expenses. For television, or radio, they could have the right to place limitations on expenditures that are made by political parties. If we want to control the financing, the expenditures on elections in Canada, there are many ways in which we can do it, without trying to control the individual citizen and say whether he can give to a political party and whether that contribution has to be revealed or not. I say, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter whether that individual happens to be a corporation, whether he happens to be a member of a trade union, whether he happens to be a member of the Farmers Union, or whether he happens to be an individual, if he desires to contribute to a political party, the day that he has to put it down on paper this is going to decrease the democratic rights of every citizen of this country.

I just want to say that in past years, I referred a few moments ago to the fact that some political parties are always willing to assert that they are the only ones that have any virtues, but when I remember back to a gentleman who sat in this house for a short while, and I look at the picture I have before me, I wonder if he would like to reveal where he got all his financial contributions from to run some of his election campaigns. Here is the picture from the bar magazine "Mon Page Bonjour" the management magazine serving the Canadian hospitality interests, shown above the Canada Colony lunch in Florida, left to right, Mrs. Brian Cathcart, Mr. Dave Price, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Fines of Saskatchewan, down in Florida. I am quite certain that if he had had to reveal where his campaign funds, in the years he was here, had come from, we would have had the same address that he wasn't prepared to do so. I would like to say here there is no way, and I defy my friends to indicate anyway in which you can prove or tell how much any individual gives whether he put it down on paper, whether he has given any more or whether he hasn't given it. I think that when you regiment an individual, a corporation, a trade union, or any other one in this country and state that they must reveal whom they support, financially or politically, by so doing, as I stated before, it is regimenting the democracy of our country. So I am saying here I think we should consider many other ways in which we can limit the expenses at election time, in which we can control the heavy expenses that I know about. I know we have been fighting election campaigns, I know that members across the way have, but there are many ways in which this can be done without limiting the democratic rights of people in our country to support the political party that they desire to support.

**March 3, 1966**

So I say here tonight that I cannot support a motion which would regiment the voters and the people of this country to marking down on a piece of paper when they have the freedom and right to support any political party, financially or otherwise, to put a statement down on a paper for any government agency indicating whom they support. So, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I cannot support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words after the effort by the Minister of Public Works, (Mr. Gardiner). He said a lot of words and built up quite a lot of straw men and valiantly knocked them down, but he didn't deal with the real issue. The real issue is the whole question of the possibility and the rights of people or corporations to actually buy political parties. The fact of the matter is that the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) doesn't want the people to know where the Liberal party gets its campaign funds. This is what they don't want. Every once in a while it comes out. It came out over thirty years ago in regard to Beauharnois, the big steal of the water power rights on the St. Lawrence River, when three quarters of a million was given to the Liberal party. The same kind of things came out at the time of the customs investigation and the customs scandal in the twenties, of people that were actually buying the Liberal political party. They bought the Conservative party too, they didn't pay the same price, they didn't think it was worth the price.

**Hon. D. Steuart (Minister of Public Health):** — Your group . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — No, people don't try to buy our political party.

**An Hon. Member:** — I don't think it would be worth it.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Whether it is worth it or not isn't the question; it is beside the point, because it isn't for sale. If we want to prevent this kind of scandals in the future in Canada . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — How about Hoffa?

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Yes, and Hoffa, the man the Liberals brought into Canada. Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to make sure that political parties do toe the line, and I don't care who it is. They should Toe the lie line, it doesn't matter what party they are, and political parties should have to show where they get their campaign funds. Now you can have an exemption for contributions of up to \$50, or something like that, because everybody recognizes that nobody is going to buy a political party for \$50. Some corporations give \$1,000 or \$10,000 or \$100,000. The people in this democracy are supposed to go to the polls on election day and choose between political parties. They are entitled to know who has the strings on what political party. This is the situation, who is supporting them? This has been the trouble in Canada in the past, and there has been no greater sinner than the Liberal party that has always professed it gets money from the rich on the pretense that it will protect the poor from the rich and protect the rich from the poor, this is the game.

Now, ordinary people should know how much mining companies, oil companies, or any other corporation, and how much trade unions give to political parties as well. Then they will be in a much better position to judge, but in my opinion, I know that the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) isn't a hypocrite, but his argument sounded awfully hypocritical and very thin and very weak.

I hope that this house passes this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier):** — I had not intended to participate in this debate. I shall only take about two minutes, however, some of the sanctimonious talk that I hear tonight made me decide that I should say a few words. You know, Mr. Speaker, I am in a rather unique position in this house. At one time I happened to be in the CCF party. The Socialists talk about where they obtained their campaign money. There has been no one in Canada who milked the breweries and the liquor interests like my friends opposite, the CCF. Don't let these Socialists say in a sanctimonious way that they obtain their money only from the little man. Such statements make me sick, because I know different. I know where they obtain their money. They obtain funds in precisely the same way as other political parties. Now it is quite true that a lot of business companies are not too enthused about giving money to the Socialists.

My hon. young friend from Saskatoon said that we should pass this resolution tonight. Why didn't the Socialists in the 20 years they had in office, introduce legislation requiring revelation of amounts and sources of contributions?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — The hon. Premier who has just shouted for two or three minutes as he said he was going to, has just given an admirable example of the advice sometimes given that when the argument is weak "Shout like hell" and that is exactly what he has been doing. He may be able to speak for himself, Mr. Speaker, he may be able to speak for himself as to how he got his money when he was successful in persuading people to elect him, but he cannot speak for other members of that party, who were elected during some of those same years, who stayed true and honest to those principles for which they were elected, and who have continued to be elected to their seats. I submit that the hon. member who has just taken his seat cannot prove in any way whatsoever the allegations that he has attempted to make, that this movement got into the breweries, and to the liquor interests, and got all the money they could. That statement may have applied insofar as his own personal campaign expenses are concerned. They have not applied so far as this party was concerned in the past, in the present nor in the future. I issue that as a challenge.

The truth is further illustrated by the attitudes which members across there are taking to this resolution now. If they are not concerned about revealing the source of their campaign funds, they can prove it in a very simple way. All they have to do is to get up and vote for this resolution. The only reason they may refrain from so doing is that they don't want to reveal to the public how they get the money to operate their campaign.

**March 3, 1966**

May I add to that, Mr. Speaker, the fact that this party has been an active political force for over 30 years. One of the cardinal principles laid down at the founding of this party has been that we will get our money from the great numbers of people who individually decide to support us. That has been an important principle. It is, I submit, the only safe way in which to select a party that is going to be a government. We are responsible to those who finance us, and those people are large numbers of individuals in this province and across this country.

Mr. Speaker, may I repeat again, that of all the oratory, shouting, allegations, and accusations that have come from across there, these can mean nothing, if the hon. members across there decide to vote against this resolution. They can assert their confidence that their sources of funds are right and proper, they can assert their willingness to let the public know from whence comes their funds by voting for this resolution. They can do it in no other way.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, the Premier was kind enough to refer to our associations when he and I were both members of the Socialist party in Canada, and when I was the national treasurer and responsible for the raising of funds. When the Premier and I first met, he was quite impressed to meet the national treasurer. I would suggest that it was his assumption that this would be a person worth knowing, but he came to realize that the national treasurer's main function was to get money for our political party. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Premier to make good the serious charge he has made tonight that while I was the national treasurer, I solicited funds exactly the same way the old parties did.

Mr. Speaker, I would rather imagine that the Liberals really expected Mr. Thatcher as the Premier would have some inside information that would be embarrassing. I challenge the Premier to name any one person in Canada who made any contributions to the CCF while I was the national treasurer, who made a contribution for ulterior motives.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Nicholson:** — I am sure the Premier will agree that although he was the wealthiest person in our party for some time . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — For some time, yes.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, he was recognized as the wealthiest person, but I am sure he will agree with me that he never gave on a year to year basis more than I gave to our party, as long as he was with us. I am in the fortunate position that I never asked anyone in Canada to give on a more generous basis than I contributed myself. My indemnity was \$4,000 a year in those days, Mr. Speaker, it really doesn't take a lot of money to run a political party. I have said this to some of the Liberal friends of the Premier and myself in Ottawa, who were cabinet ministers when we were both in the House of Commons. Walter Harris, who represented Bruce county, my old home county, if he had taken my advice he would still be in the public life of Canada.

One of the fundamental differences between the government over there and our party here is our party presented a new concept in public life in Canada, namely, that the rank and file of the people, if they want to, can elect a government. Mr. Speaker, I have been a candidate a great many times, but my elections were paid for by our members without costing a great deal of money. The member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) complained about the reporting of election expenses. Money was spent for radio and TV in his constituency, but paid by the provincial organization and not by the candidate. The provincial organizations of all parties always spent money for radio and newspaper publicity. Well, Mr. Speaker, again I challenge the Premier to identify the liquor interest which were ever canvassed or gave money to the CCF during the time that I was the national treasurer of the party. I challenge the Premier if he has an information that I haven't got, that he shouldn't be using his privileges in this chamber to make these reckless charges which I am sure he will not make tomorrow, so that people charged will have a chance to defend themselves.

I wasn't expecting to take part in this debate, but since we are on it, I have a relative comment from Hansard of April 27th, 1965, in which Mr. Douglas Fisher was speaking. He was quoting from an article in the Toronto Star, December 17th, written by Peter Newman, who is a very close friend of the Prime Minister of Canada. Newman was explaining how people get to the Senate. I expected to have a chance to debate the abolition of the Senate tonight but later on I will have a chance. Mr. Peter Newman listed several wealthy men recently appointed to the Senate, including Senator Louis P. Gelinas, the chief fund raiser for the Liberal party in the province of Quebec, and a graduate of the University of Montreal. Mr. Fisher went on to say that Senator Gelinas appeared before the Dorion inquiry. We all know that one of the charges being investigated by the Dorion inquiry was to the effect that some \$50,000 was going to be ear-marked for Liberal party funds. This was a contribution that Mrs. Rivard was going to make. Now the chairman of the committee drew the attention of Mr. Fisher that this was discussing the matter, at least somebody was discussing a matter which was before the courts, and Mr. Fisher said:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I disagree with you completely, that this matter and the evidence is subjudice, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice have bandied letters back and forth with the Judge and that inquiry. If you insist that I cannot discuss this point, because it is your interpretation that the subject is subjudice, I am afraid I have only one alternative, and that is to challenge your ruling.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — I'm sorry I wasn't expecting this, I could have had the Dorion Commission report but here is a senator who was the bag man for the Liberal party and we will not know for some time exactly what his involvement will be, but there is no doubt about it that Rivard had \$50,000 for campaign funds for the Liberal party.

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't planning on speaking here, but Hansard for the House of Commons in connection with the Beauharnois scandal is worth reading. I better dig this up to involve the senators because three senators were involved in this Beauharnois scandal . . .

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — When was that?

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Oh, this was away back. This was the last time that there has been an inquiry strictly to try to identify where campaign funds originate. R.O. Sweezey, President of Beauharnois was asked about the size of political contributions made — if I remember correctly — \$650,000 to the Liberal party and \$125,000 to the Conservative party. I must hasten to explain to my friend from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) that it wasn't clearly established that the Conservative party ever got this \$125,000 but a cancelled cheque for this amount to John Aird, Jr. was produced. The money was paid to Mr. Aird, who represented himself as the man who secured money for the Conservatives. Mr. Sweezey was a young engineer in those days. He was asked, and he was most co-operative, "Didn't you consider these were large sums of money to give to political parties?" "Yes". "Why did you give so much?" "Well, I consulted some of my business associates, they said "Don't be stingy, you will find that you will receive might good returns, and don't put all your money or eggs in one basket, don't overlook the opposition. Put the big money where the big business is, and put some money so that you would have friends in court". After paying over \$700,000 for campaign funds Beauharnois was able to fleece the people of Canada to the extent of over \$30,000,000.

**An Hon. Member:** — Pretty good return on your investment.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — It was a very good return. This was before the days of the CCF when there was a Progressive party in the House of Commons. Mr. Sweezey was asked "Did you give any to the Progressives?" The answer was "No, I wasn't canvassed for any money, and didn't give any money to them", and so, Mr. Speaker, this is the last time than an inquiry was made which disclosed campaign contributions. I would submit to the Premier of this province that the techniques which he has introduced into the Liberal party from his Socialist background is helping to build up the Liberal organization. Now, I know it is rather rough when there is only one member in the Canora constituency who is a member according to the most recent reports of their membership.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — There were 280 this morning.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Well, that is good news.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We are working hard.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — But I want to say to the other members opposite that this is one Socialist principle that the Premier has introduced that is sound. The Premier didn't really have to go down east while he was Leader of the Opposition, and represent this province as a depressed area, and say to the people down there that unless you send funds we will never get rid of the Socialist outfit out there. He has within his membership adequate financial resources to pay for radio, newspaper and other facilities which are necessary during an election campaign. So, Mr. Speaker, to conclude I want to say that it was my honor and privilege to be the national treasurer for a good deal of the time that the Premier was a member of our party. I defy him to identify a single person, or corporation



in all Canada, that was interviewed by me, that made a contribution who would be unwilling to have the details made public.

Now, it is true there are some people who, for very good reason, are not able to be active politically. It is a great pity that in Saskatchewan at the present time there are citizens who have been denied their fundamental rights to have political opinions and to express them. In most parts of the democratic world you do not have this threat hanging over the citizens of democracies. This is one Saskatchewan handicap at present. So I hope that the Premier will make outside this house the reckless charges he has made here, so that people who have been accused of wrongdoing should have a chance to defend themselves.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. M. Pederson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I have sat here absolutely fascinated by the chit-chat going on from both sides while these two groups are trying to explain how they have been dividing up the spoils over the years. I happen to be the poor cousin around here, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that not only am I not worried about divulging where my money comes from, I can go even further and say I wish I had some to divulge. I find a great deal of difficulty . . .

**Mr. A. Guy (Athabasca):** — What, no memberships?

**Mr. Pederson:** — Yes, we get the odd membership, but that pays the postage once in a while. I find a great deal of difficulty getting money on any occasion and I wish to heaven in this conversation, or this debate that is going on, that somebody would let slip the secret of the success of both of these rather powerful groups that I am surrounded by.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Just hard work.

**Mr. Pederson:** — Well, I have worked fairly hard, Mr. Premier, but . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — We'll give you the list . . .

**Mr. Pederson:** — . . . it doesn't seem that I am working in the right offices, perhaps. I must confess that the senior member from Saskatoon, (Mr. Nicholson) fascinated me when he went back to the days before I was born and told me all about those Conservative rascals getting a hundred and some thousand, I'll have to speak to some of the powers-that-be to see if they have kept some of that on tap for me, because heaven knows I haven't seen it.

But seriously, Mr. Speaker, I find that there are many people who in the normal course of their political affiliation are most reluctant to have divulged, or give consent to divulge, either their names or the amount of their contribution. I don't attach any great significance to this, I don't think there is any dark mysterious reason for it. I believe that one of the great prerogatives of our citizens, a prerogative that has been granted to us through the secret ballot, is that the great mass of the people in this nation have the right, as far as their political beliefs are concerned, to be anonymous. This, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is probably one of the greatest reasons for not passing a resolution such as this one on the Order Paper today. I am not interested in

either the immense scandals going on in other parts of this nation or what is done on the national level. I am concerned about the methods that are used for obtaining funds in this province. Except for very rare occasions where individual members for one reason or another do not adhere to the rules, I think that by and large this province and its members over the years have been relatively free of the type of scandals that have been referred to on both sides of the house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to be thinking in terms of this resolution, that we are somewhat putting the cart before the horse. There has been a good deal of suggestion from time to time, and the time has come when both in the parliament of Canada and the legislature decide that public funds should be set aside to pay for the expenses of candidates seeking public office provided they received a certain percentage of the total vote. Until this is done, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it is right, or proper, or possible, I also don't think it will work in practice for a resolution such as the one before us, to take effect. There will always be methods where people will be dishonest, can contravene any act such as is contemplated by this resolution. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing to prevent a candidate either receiving under-the-table donations from a union, or under-the-table donations from big business. And there is no legal method of making them account for it, and, therefore, the resolution in itself would be voided and useless.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, until something is done on the level that I have mentioned, and all of us take a hard look at the provision of funds for all candidates seeking public office, so that not only the rich can manage to sway the electorate with massive amounts of programs, with massive amounts of advertising, and putting a ceiling on the amount that can be spent, a ceiling fixed by law over which no one may go, until these things are done then I think there is no point in this resolution whatsoever. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have to take a hard, serious look at this problem because it has got out of hand. The cost of campaigns has become ridiculous; but just the same the divulgence of both the names and the amounts of money and the names of the people who are giving it, will not, in my opinion at any rate, serve any useful purpose and I certainly will oppose the resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cutknife):** — Mr. Speaker, I recognize too, as I think we all do, that the resolution doesn't provide a complete answer to the problem. It is put forward, and has been put forward by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Brockelbank) in an attempt to bring to the attention of this house and to the general public at least one method under which people would be identified with the political party of their choice. Now for any one of the members opposite to say that there isn't a need either for this kind of revelation as to where the funds are coming from, or some other kind of check as mentioned by the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) is just talking pure nonsense. It is just perpetuating what the Premier referred to when he said "Don't worry, Mr. Speaker, these NDPers like to get their foot in the trough too". Well, of course, if there is a trough, and there is bound to be, well for God's sake let's keep everybody's feet out of it and keep their feet clean. If anyone should know who furnishes the money for the CCF, the hon. Premier ought to know.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I do too, I told the house.

**Mr. Nollet:** — He knows, and the people in his constituency know and I know the farmers who contributed to his election, and gave \$150 or \$200, when he crossed the floor and deserted his party, when they had put up the money to elect him as a candidate of this party, they asked for their money back, but they didn't get it from the Premier. Mr. Speaker, I don't make any bones of this fact, none of us do, further we don't claim to wear halos, we don't claim that everyone that belongs to this movement is automatically a saint. There is good and evil in all parties, so the hon. Premier and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) and the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) don't need to keep talking about Clarence Fines. I don't give a damn where Fines is . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Nollet:** — . . . they hope that somehow there is an evil connotation with this name that is going to reflect on this side of the house. Certainly this is no argument against the resolution put forward by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Brockelbank). The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) says it would be terrible if anyone had to reveal if he gave a contribution to a particular party. I don't blame my hon. friends opposite for being concerned. Believe me if I had contributed to the Liberal party and then witnessed some of their actions afterward I would be ashamed of it too. But after all, Mr. Speaker, this resolution has real merit, and certainly doesn't call for the condemnation that is being put forward by hon. members opposite.

This is a matter that is of great concern to all of us. We do know that in our kind of society and in our type of economic system, there are pressure groups, many of them greedy pressure groups, some of whom will stop at nothing to gain their won privileged ends. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that money talks, and money talks in political circles better than anywhere else. There are special privileges to be sought from government. If anything, Mr. Speaker, what should concern us is the degradation of our democratic system by having this control over our elected representatives. Something must be done. Personally, I would prefer a definite limit on election expenses and I will go along with the proposal that a public purse, perhaps, should take care of election expenses and forbid anyone else from contributing other than for ordinary membership fee, Mr. Speaker.

Now, when we look at this, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, at least as a result of bringing this to the attention of the house, that we could set up a committee of this legislature to make an inquiry into the whole field of election expenses which are getting out of hand. Our media of communication is such that any so-called people's party has little or no chance of electing candidates.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly support this motion for the reason that it brings, not only to the attention of this house, but to the people of this province the thought that something very definite will have to be done as to how political parties obtain their money. Expenditures will have to be reckoned with too.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**March 3, 1966**

**Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this political drivél all night, to the sanctimonious drivél coming from the opposite side of the house. The only reason this resolution was brought in at this time, Mr. Speaker, is that this is the first time in the history of the last twenty years that these people have had the courage to bring in this type of resolution. As long as they are in the opposition in Ottawa, as long as they are a defunct minority group in all the other provinces in Canada, they have the courage to bring it in. They wouldn't dare bring out this resolution when they were the government, but once they are out, then they proceed to bring it in. I am surprised at some of the statements here today, surprised at the sanctimonious appeal made by the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) a former old Tory. I am surprised at some of the statements made about the Premier, to cast the reflection on him turning from the CCF to the Liberal party . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Did the hon. member say I was a former old Tory?

**Mr. McFarlane:** — If not Tory, what . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Well, you will have to guess again, I wasn't a Liberal either . . .

**Mr. McFarlane:** — But the part I am very concerned with is the sanctimonious approach taken by the people on the other side of the house, asking every organization, every individual to disclose their donation to political parties. In Saskatchewan today we have a situation where some people belonging to some unions are forced to pay political check-offs.

**An Hon. Member:** — Nonsense.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — They certainly are. I noticed in the paper the other day one of the larger labor unions in Canada now is throwing its weight behind the NDP party. So I say, Mr. Speaker, if this situation develops where they have the labor unions and the people who belong to these unions have to pay political check-offs, and they are not in a position to divulge where these sources of political funds are coming from this can be used as an axe against them. Just to show you how it works regarding the strike in Moose Jaw this past winter, it was stated in the press just the other day the union is now taking action to fine one of the union members for not picketing. Just take a glance through one of the political papers and you can see the situation that the people of this province would be in. So the member for Saskatoon said there are citizens in Saskatchewan who are being deprived of taking part in politics, certainly they are being deprived of taking part in politics because if they belong to one of these organizations they have about the same lack of protection for their jobs as they would if they took a stand against some directives handed to them by some of the labor union bosses.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that people of Saskatchewan are very interested in is, I am sure, that they hope they are never in a position where they have to be given the high-handed treatment that goes on in some of these industries. As I said

previously, the rank and file of the Liberal party of Saskatchewan make no bones that they are donating to their own political party, but they have never brought an action where in order to hold a job they must subscribe to that political party.

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly have no part of supporting this type of resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, when I seconded the motion, I didn't know it would cause such a debate, however, I want to bring something into this debate which so far has not been mentioned. I have a tremendous respect for British rights, traditions and the history of politics as it has developed over the years. I know the fight that went on throughout British history, as it did in other countries too, for democracy. As long as the battle was between the commons and the nobility you did not have this political situation. But we know after Charles I was beheaded and a party system developed that the only way you could govern was, of course, by a party system and parties must be financed, of course. Now, to me, politics is the art of government and I would like to say to this house that we must be democratic and moral.

I think that if the Liberals and the people of Saskatchewan are to be really democratic they should have no feat in publicizing who contributed to a party, and that includes civil servants. I think when the time comes that our civil servants can donate to any political party in this province without fear that is the time when we are going to have democracy.

I think that by hiding the names of those who contributed then there is a lack of morality. That is my opinion, I would rather it be known who is assisting to elect any candidate than to have it the way it is now, where money is being passed under the table. We know this has happened; it has been brought up in the legislature a number of times; it could happen again if some political party was offered another \$50,000 to appoint, say, a leader. This could happen. But it should not happen in a true democracy. The reason I am supporting this motion is not because it is going to resolve campaign fund problems, so much, but because I believe it is going to be a step in the right direction to bring true morality to political parties and to bring democracy into our parliaments in the province of Saskatchewan.

It was mentioned that money was obtained by the party that I represent from breweries, I have no such knowledge whatsoever of this being so. I know that, speaking for myself, at every election that I have had to fight, I have had to dig down in my own pocket, because we never collected enough from our supporters, I had to dig down because we are a poor constituency and I would rather have it that way. Mr. Speaker, in the last election, I was only able, my group were only able to pay for two five minute broadcasts on TV at midnight. This was not much publicity and the hon. member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) knows it to be true. The Liberal party had all kinds of TV time, so I can throw the same kind of stuff back at my hon. friends opposite that they have been trying to throw at us. Making accusations is not the point, but this is the point, I would like this house to consider this, are you really democratic? Do we really respect the traditions and the freedom that the British people and the Canadian people have fought for in trying to

**March 3, 1966**

achieve morality in government and a true democracy? If you do then you will give us support on this motion, or else you may amend it so that it will mean something for the future morality of politics in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City):** — Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that we would have been able to avoid in this debate the splutter and the bluster and the noise and the wind and the dust and the fog that began when my friend the Premier rose in this debate, because I think we have got away to some extent from the essence of the resolution itself. But since some of these things have been said by the speakers that rose on that side of the house after the Premier, let me say this, the word sanctimonious has been used rather freely. Well, I don't think there is anything, Mr. Speaker, by itself, in a man who was being sanctimonious if you can prove it! I notice my friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) speaks about trade unions and their donations to political parties. I want to say this to my friends on the other side of the house that I will challenge anyone of them to tell me about any one trade union in this province that has not arrived at a decision to make donations to a political party on the basis of their own democratic practice within that union.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — They support the ones that they are opposed to, to pay it to . . .

**Mr. Davies:** — While we are being sanctimonious I want to say this to my friends that they are attempting to rob 55,000 public employees of this province of their right of political expression.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — They know that and this is a matter of record. This is a matter of the statement by my friend the Minister of Public Health, (Mr. Steuart) and other members of the government.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Oh, come on . . .

**Mr. Davies:** — The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) asks "Why didn't you bring this in when you were in government?" Well I want to remind the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) that the kind of things that elicit this kind of resolution happened because of certain activities relative to his own party in eastern Canada. This has been cited over the length and breadth of Canada, that is the demand for a resolution of the kind we are putting forward in this house this evening.

I want to say this, too, to my friend from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) that when it comes to the question of corporation donations, according to recent a past history, I don't think his party has done so badly. He has made the argument that there will always be dishonesty, therefore, there is no real reason or real use in trying to make legislation, or trying to achieve a means of avoiding dishonesty. Of course, if this were the case, Mr. Speaker, we would have no legislation at all. Now, if my friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) decides his whole argument on the proposition that this is robbing an individual

of his freedom because he cannot make his donation personally, then let him make an amendment to this resolution by the deletion of the last part of the resolution, which says:

All contributions by individuals over a specified figure per annum.

or we, or myself, can do it, to set it at \$500 if you want that.

**Mr. G. Romuld (Canora):** — Five cents would be better.

**Mr. Davies:** — This is nothing but a means of getting around the real question that is within this resolution. That is an attempt to bring to all political parties in this country some measure of decency, some measure of honor, some measure of conducting our democratic institutions in a better manner than we have in the past.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — How about the fine one of your voters in Moose Jaw paid — \$250 bucks?

**Mr. Davies:** — I will say this, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) comes again the wind and the fog and the bluster talking about a completely unrelated issue of a decision to fine someone who did not take part in a strike. So, Mr. Speaker, what has this got to do with the question, or resolution before the house?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Political freedom. . .

**Mr. Davies:** — The question after all, right or wrong, as it is, was discussed in a trade union meeting, was discussed by those members who they made their decision. I presume that worker would have his recourse as well within the union. But let's for heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, avoid this kind of fog, and try and get down to the resolution. I say to the member over there, the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner), if there is anything at all to his argument that this interferes with individual freedom, to make a motion to delete the last part. Outside of that, there is not one argument that has been raised on the other side of the house that makes any sense whatsoever.

**Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, this has been a most interesting resolution and most interesting debate, but somehow along the line I think the intent of the resolution was lost sight of, and I want to read it to you:

That this assembly urges that legislation be laid before this assembly to provide that contributions to provincial political parties, to candidates for office in provincial election and to organizations participating in provincial elections be disclosed to the public, including contributions as follows: (a) all contributions by corporations; (b) all contributions by trade unions, trade associations and like bodies; and (c) all contributions by individuals over a specified figure per annum.

**March 3, 1966**

But you notice it is confined to the contributions to the political parties. What about the contributions that come to the great federal political parties. These can be channelled down through to the provincial parties. What control is there over businesses in the east who contribute to the political parties, and keep that money from finding its way down into Saskatchewan.

How does this control the great trade unions in the United States who last year said "We have got to raise hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars for the NDP in Canada."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — What is to prevent that money finding its way over here and getting into the elections in Saskatchewan. Tommy Douglas used to say that they were a "little man" party. Last year he said to the people of Canada, "We have now grown up, we have won your confidence, we are no longer the little man's party. We have \$1,000,000 in our pockets to fight this election, these millions are not from nickels and dimes and two-bit pieces."

Ask Mr. Douglas where he got his million bucks.

**An Hon. Member:** — He wouldn't tell you.

**Mr. Cameron:** — And then the former national treasurer of the NDP party, said "When I was the national treasurer, he said I challenge the Premier to point out one corporation from which I asked for money that gave it because of an ulterior motive. He didn't say that they gave it because of an ulterior motive.

**Mr. Nicholson (Saskatoon):** — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister permit a question?

**Mr. Cameron:** — This is the member who sat for some years both in the House of Commons and in this province. Again the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) has sat in this house since 1935, brought up the scandal of the Beauharnois and other so-called national scandals in political parties. His was the party that was supposed to have been born and raised and nurtured on the interest of the little people. They were going to protect the "little man" from being trampled on by the big corporations, yet for twenty years they sat here with the power to do these very things, but they didn't give a thought to doing it.

I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, why they delayed it. They didn't anticipate they would be put out in 1964, be defeated. They delayed it because of having their hand in the pot. In my constituency — and I can bring you the farmers — farmers came to me and showed me that they made application for a lease, and were told to present a membership card. They were forced to buy membership cards before they could get to talk about a lease. I know hotel keepers across this province where they came to their place of business and said "We want so much in dollars and cents in cash. If you don't come forward remember your hotel is licensed." But as the Premier says, they got their fingers into the trough and they liked it. Now they repent about their sins of omission . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — They got their nose in it.



**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . that they didn't remove this opportunity that may be available for others to do likewise. Now they say to themselves, "Why didn't we do it, why didn't we remove these evils." Now they bring in a resolution to rectify these gross evils. This cancerous growth which they fostered unknown to the people of Saskatchewan.

This was their great motion, this is the motion which all the fine talk is about. Well, they boasted over the years of the purity of the party, of the number of dedicated school teachers that they had, and the number of dedicated people of the cloth that were in the party, of the gross evils of the society in which we live, and of their burning aim and dedication to build a new society for the people of Canada, but along the way they forgot to remove this cancerous sore.

Now after 20 years when they are sitting in the opposition, why they no longer have the power to do it, they wish it to be done. They say now it should be done and they are going to ask the government to be so kind as to do it for them

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Where is your halo now?

**Mr. Cameron:** — We believe that every man, as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) pointed out should be free to contribute to any cause of his choice — be it church — fraternal — or any other organization.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — It now being 10 o'clock, the house stands adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

The house adjourned at 10.00 o'clock p.m.