

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Thirteenth Legislature
18th Day

Monday, March 7, 1960

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

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines, from Friday, March 4, 1960: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into the Committee of Supply):

Mr. L.N. Nicholson (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate Friday evening, I believe I was discussing the pros and cons of the Saskatchewan Power vs. Alberta Power. Many statements have been made in this House about the cost of power in this province and the cost of power in Alberta. I think, beyond a doubt, that it is a fact that the cost of power in the province of Saskatchewan to a farmer before the debentures have been paid, will be more than it will be in the province of Alberta. The reason I say that is because their money is available at a smaller rate of interest and they pay for and own their power. Now, I do know that their monthly payments at minimum charge in Alberta is considerably less than in this province. However, the people of Alberta seem to like their power, and the people of Saskatchewan seem to like ours, so I don't know what we're arguing about.

Friday evening, Mr. Speaker, I heard a report on the radio from Ottawa that disturbed me very much, and I would like to just mention it just for a moment, but before I do, I will say that I cannot support the motion. Most of the reasons have already been brought out by my colleague from Rosthern, but I want to say this afternoon, in my short time available, a few of the things that I think were not right.

The point that I wanted to make with regard to the radio on Friday evening was the announcement by the Prime Minister of Canada. I believe he said that the federal government would not pay deficiency payments under my circumstances. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have never thought that a deficiency payment, as such, was the answer to the western farmer's problems, other than a stop-gap measure. However, I have always felt that pressure has to be put on Ottawa to make them realize that we

March 7, 1960

need deficiency payments, a two-price system, acreage bonus, or something, because as long as the rest of our society is subsidized then, certainly the farmers should be entitled to an equal break in that respect. When all is said and done he is producing the foodstuff which is the most valuable production in Canada. I think that we all, in this House, agree that that announcement was a very disappointing announcement as far as the western farmers are concerned.

I want to spend just a few moments, Mr. Speaker, referring to the project at Squaw Rapids. I was one of the cavalcade of about 130-odd cars which went from Carrot River to Squaw Rapids on March 2nd. It was a very big day for the people up north and I'm convinced that the development of that power site will inevitably mean the beginning of progress in the northeast part of Saskatchewan. That cavalcade shows the people of the north were keenly interested in the project in its entirety. However, Mr. Speaker, with all of the good that can come out of it, and there will be much good, some things are not as they should be in my opinion. I refer to the people who are going to be moved from the flood area. I was only in Carrot River for a short time the evening of March 2nd, but I was approached by a number of people with regard to the confusion that exists regarding the purchasing of the land from the people in that area. Now, I don't think that anyone can take a hard and fast rule and satisfy all of those people, but I do believe, as I have said before, that the responsibility of the Government is to make it possible for those people to relocate themselves at no cost to themselves.

I want to use, Mr. Speaker, one man's particular situation. This man went into that country ten or twelve years ago — I know that he had \$18,000 in cash from the sale of land that he had just sold. I know that that man, since that time, has sold his home in Nipawin for over \$8,000, and that money is all in there. This person, as well as having that money spent, has given ten or twelve years of his life to real hard work in order to get what he wants and today he has a very good half section of land with good buildings, and he has another good half section that is all cultivated, rented. His own half-section is all cultivated, and he also has a fifth quarter that is partly cultivated. In all, he farms about 700 acres. The purchasers working for the Power Corporation are going at it wrong because they're not sitting down with the man and figuring out what it will cost him to re-locate.

They apparently dropped into this particular man's place and suggested a purchase price of \$16,000. When I was in Carrot River last week he said that they had been back and suggested a purchase price of \$7,200 odd per quarter for his half section. This gentleman has asked the moving contractor what it would cost to move his house twenty-four miles and I believe the price he quoted was \$750.00, so the cost of moving his buildings, his out-buildings are very good too, would run into probably \$1,500, or \$2,000. Therefore I would like the men

who are responsible for purchasing to go to this gentleman and figure the best they can what it will cost him to re-locate in reasonably equal circumstances. I doubt, actually, if \$2,500, would do it. I'm not suggesting that that is the price of his land, but I do say this, that the price of his land, plus severance pay or forcible separation, or whatever you call it, should equal enough to allow him to re-locate. Now this man, in September, shortly after the official announcement of the dam said: "Well, I'll tell you how I feel about it; if the Government will get me as good a half section as I have now, no farther from town, make it possible for me to rent another good half section, move my buildings, give me my power and my telephone, I don't want their money."

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is about as reasonable as a man can be. In fact, he has quoted that to me on several occasions. "Move me, and I don't want their money." So he's not trying to stick for more money than he actually needs to re-locate, Mr. Speaker. I think the only thing that can be done is to go to each individual in that area and try to work out an agreement that will fit his particular need, because there are no two alike. There are instances where people owe quite a bit, partly because of the excess moisture of the last few years, and if those judgments are paid from the purchase of their land they will just simply be put on the road with no money to relocate. Now, I would ask definitely that in those cases where it can be done that a registered obligation be transferred, if possible, to the land that they are being moved to. In that way they would still have the obligation and still have the chance to pay it off. I would ask the Minister at this time to try to instruct his men to go to them as individuals and try to bring each deal to a head.

Now, the confusion is terrific today: it is worse than it was when I came down here on the 9th of February. If they will go and sit down with this person I have referred to — or to any other — and say, "Well, now, it's going to cost you so much to relocate," figure all angles out, and try to bring each deal to a head, I think they could conclude a lot of these deals. As far as I know they have only purchased one quarter section of land as of this date, and it is a quarter of land that the man has never lived on. He lives in Nipawin and purchased it as an investment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on social aid. Social aid to the needy is a must. Certainly every hon. member will agree to that, but we remember last year in this House when the new social aid legislation was brought in, and it actually was a relaxed type of program which gave people possibly more than they were getting before — in fact it is more — and I want to make a comparison or two which I think we should all give some thought to. A Return tabled in the House on March 4th shows that a man and wife with four children draw \$200.00 a month including food and clothing and fuel. In addition to that they have their hospital card which is of quite a bit of value. Now, by comparison, we will take the man who works for a minimum wage and has the same family circumstances. The minimum wage, as I figure it, is roughly \$142.00 per month.

March 7, 1960

He has no hospital card, he has no dental or eye care; he has no assistance whatever, and still he tries to get by on the minimum wage which is roughly \$142 to \$145 a month. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if a person sitting on social aid can get up to \$200 with those services in addition, the man who is willing to work should get at least as much.

Now the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the incentive under this program is wrong. The incentive today is to take social aid, not to seek employment. I think that the Government should stress very strongly a means of creating employment for these people so that those who are employable would have work. Now this Government has repeatedly told us that things are so good, that they couldn't be better, and a person would just have to vote for the program of this Government.

I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to a Return tabled in this Legislature on March 4th, "What are the social aid case loads per year from 1945 to 1958? I am going to take '45, '50, '55, and '58. I want to show you, Mr., Speaker, that in good years our social aid case load has increased continuously. For instance, in 1945, there were 1,483 single persons on social aid. In 1950 it jumped from 1,483 to 2,575. In 1955 it had backed off a little to 2,144. In 1958 the total of single persons on social aid was 2,655 by the comparison of 1945 of 1,483 — almost double. Now, we'll follow through with the next part of the question: Heads of families - in 1945 there were 1,311. Mr. Speaker, these are not my figures, these were given in a Return tabled by the Government the other day. There were 1,311 heads of families in 1945; in 1950, there were 1,875; in 1955 — it had backed off a little to 1,567, but in 1958 it had jumped from 2,678: 1,311 in 1945, to 2,678 in 1958.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the best years that Saskatchewan has ever known. These same years that we are giving these figures for. The number of dependents: in 1945 there were 3,273. In 1950, there were 5,059; in 1955 it backed off a little, 4,719; in 1958, there were 8,812 dependants on social aid. Now that jumped in that eight-year period from 3,273 persons to 8,812. Now we'll follow the totals down, and we get a very similar situation. In 1945 the total amount of persons on social aid were 6,077. By 1950 it had increased to 9,509, in 1955 — it had backed off a little, 8,430, but in 1958, 14,145, Mr. Speaker. What is wrong if things are as good as the Government says they are in this province? Why do we have to have so many more people on social aid in these buoyant years? The total case load jumped from, 6,077 in 1945 to 14,145 in 1958.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is only part of the story, because our new social aid plan has not been in effect a full year yet so that figures aren't available, but what I do know, I checked with the Nipawin Town Office to see what the situation was there in the last year.

As of December 31st, 1958, there were 28 heads of families on social aid in Nipawin and the total number of people involved was 85 — 28 heads of families with 85 persons. On December 31st, 1959, one year later, the heads of families on social aid equalled 75, and the number of people involved equalled 188 — almost three times in both cases, Mr. Speaker. Now I followed through with the hospital card. Those are the responsibility of the municipality. On December 31st, 1958, the Town of Nipawin had purchased 12 hospital cards for indigent people. On December 31st, 1959 they had purchased 29, 5 more cards than double the amount, so, it worries me to think of what the figures on this Return would be a year from now. If that is a reasonable sample of the province as a whole, then we certainly are getting ourselves into trouble very fast.

Mr. Speaker, I want for a few moments to talk about this hospital plan we have heard so much about. They other day the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources was speaking, and he said the Social Credit boys don't approve of this plan because they don't think we can afford it. Mr. Speaker, he is partly right. A medical plan in this province would be a wonderful thing, provided that the poorest of the poor people could take part in the plan without being a responsibility to local authorities. Now, let's just analyze for a moment the possibilities under a compulsory complete medical plan. I would suggest lightly that instead of having a hospital card we would have a hospital plus medical card in one. I imagine that would be the better way to do it. I don't think it's reasonable for anyone to say that the combination of the hospital card plus medical services will cost less — or very little less, than \$100 per card.

Premier Douglas: — Oh! Oh! Oh!

Mr. Nicholson: — Wait and see, I think it will.

Premier Douglas: — You think it will, but it won't.

Mr. Nicholson: — Your hospital, plus medical services . . .?

Premier Douglas: — That's right.

Mr. Nicholson: — All right, you'll have time to tell us the answer, if that is the case, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it will be nearly that. They can try to hold it back, but these costs are going to be something that we can't have too much to do with, and I believe that it will equal very close to \$100 per card. Now, if the Town of Nipawin were to pay . . .

Will the hon. Member tell us what the \$100 is based on? The hospital card is only \$35, and you said that you hoped the medical card would be something in the one vicinity. How do you figure \$100?

March 7, 1960

Mr. Nicholson: — That's \$70. Add them together and you get \$70.

Premier Douglas: — Well, where do you get the \$100?

Mr. Nicholson: — You're too low. I may be too high, but you're too low. For the simple reason that you take the cost, of medical services and it just doesn't add up that you're going to get it for \$35. I hope you can. But, even in that case, the municipalities — if they had to pay as many hospital cards as they are paying today, and those costs were all charged to them — would find it too great a burden for the local authorities to handle . . .

Premier Douglas: — They're carrying the doctor bills right now — the entire doctor bills.

Mr. Nicholson: — That is true. I was on the Nipawin Town Council for four years, and my job was social aid. I did my very best to check the poor people in that town to try to avoid our getting caught with a hospital bills and check as you say, the odd one will got away on you. I understand, from the Mayor of Nipawin, that they just got 'hooked' for \$500, from a party they had no notion was in that financial position. This scheme in order to be right, or to be good, must be good for poor people. If, by any chance a compulsory state medical care program would cost us even some of our top medical men, it would be a crime against humanity. We all realize that the University Hospital in Saskatoon is recognized as one of the best on this entire continent. Any move that would make it desirable for some of our top doctors and specialists to leave Saskatchewan would be wrong. I think anyone would agree with that.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Why should they leave?

Mr. Nicholson: — Well, let's wait and see what your plan is and see whether they'll leave.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to read from an article in The 'Leader-Post' of January 27th, 1960, by a Dr. Berezan of the Swift Current Health Region. Now, whether he's right or wrong, I want the public to hear what he has to say:

"A compulsory, province-wide prepaid medical care program under Government control has little chance of succeeding in Saskatchewan, according to a prominent Swift Current Doctor. Dr. David Berezan, who has practiced twelve years under the state controlled Swift Current Health Region gave two primary reasons why state-controlled medical care in Saskatchewan would not work. The tremendous cost to the taxpayers and the firm decision by Saskatchewan doctors to refuse to work under government control of medical services.

'Doctors agree that every citizen has the right to choose whether or not they wish to prepay the cost of their medical care, such as under Group Medical Services and Medical Services Incorporated. But they want no part of any compulsory scheme operated under Government control or intervention,' said the Past President of the Swift Current and District Society.

Dr. Berezan said government control of medical practice is bound to lower standards

He cited the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan under which hospitals are held to a 75 cent per day dietary allowance per patient.

'This can't be done', he said.

'Hospitals can't improve dietary standards with this 75 cent daily rate which was set 10 to 12 years ago when there was a much lower food price structure.

In Swift Current we need a full-time cook, full-time dietician and an assistant dietician to improve the standard of diet for patients in our hospital. Appointment of these vital people has been held up by Government officials in Regina who appear to be paying little personal attention to our problems.

I'm afraid the same lowering of standards will happen to medical care if it is placed under government control,' Dr. Berezan said.

In Swift Current doctors work on a contract basis under a lay regional board. They are paid an amount based on a fee for services rendered.

Dr. Berezan said the plan has operated with reasonable success because it has been left to the doctors to make it work and because local doctors have been able to sit down frequently with the recipients of medical services and iron out problems as they arose.'

To illustrate his point, Dr. Berezan said that during one four-year period in the Swift Current plan's 13-year history, a ceiling was place on

March 7, 1960

the amount of money a doctor could earn, but no ceiling was placed on the amount of work a doctor was called upon to do. He said this resulted in local doctors receiving about 50 per cent of the fee schedule adopted by the Saskatchewan College of Physicians and Surgeons.

The doctors threatened to quit the plan so the regional board instituted payment of doctors on a fee for service basis and now they are receiving 80 per cent of the College of Physicians and Surgeons schedule of fees.

Dr. Berezan said the Swift Current system of regional medical care has not been favourably received in other areas of the province.

Dr. Berezan said a recent financial statement issued by Swift Current health region showed the plan had \$6,950 deficit in 1957, jumping to \$44,319, in 1958.

'I can't see the deficit being any less for 1959 and our operating surpluses are nearly depleted,' he said.

'The future holds nothing but increasing costs and the only way the region will be able to meet these coats will be to increase personal head tax and property tax.

In 1960 single residents will pay \$24 head tax. A family of two will pay \$40 and family of three or over \$50. If they are property owners in Swift Current, they will be assessed 2.17 mills, plus a .53 mills levy for health services imposed by the provincial department of health. Property owners in rural areas will pay 2.4 mills property tax in addition to head tax.

Financial statements of the region do not present a true picture of the cost to the individual. The utilization fee (a direct charge made to patients for home and office calls) must be taken into consideration and such things as a direct charge for electro-cardiogram interpretations and the extra charge to patients when referred to specialists practising outside the region.

Should the Saskatchewan Government institute a Government-controlled medical care program — and Mr. Douglas has made this part of his CCF party platform for an election scheduled for this summer — then the people will suffer with an extra burden of taxation and the doctors will be forced to accept a considerably lower percentage of their fee schedule and an increasing amount of work.

Saskatchewan doctors, myself included, will not return to conditions as they existed in the Swift Current area when doctors subsidized the regional medical plan by taking a low percentage of the fee schedule. At that time we know that people of the area were lacking medical attention, that there was an acute shortage of doctors, and that some plan had to be instituted to provide adequate medical care.

This situation has never existed over the whole province. It is greatly improved in Swift Current. Today about 80 percent of Saskatchewan citizens are covered by some form of prepaid medical insurance . . .

Mr. Nicholson: — Is that correct?

Premier Douglas: — No!

Mr. Nicholson: — Well, that's his statement that about 80 per cent . . .

Premier Douglas: — That is not correct.

Mr. Nicholson: — I have been a member of Medical Services for twelve or thirteen years, in fact my number is 3071, so there were only 3070 in it when I took my membership . . .

'If any political party feels that it needs a health and welfare issue for its political platform, then it should honestly turn to fields where it is needed — improved standards of hospital care and better treatment for the aged, mentally ill and indigent.'

Now I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, Oh, I see my time is up — I want to repeat that if a plan is put into effect that will cost us even some of our good doctors and specialists it will be a crime against humanity. I wanted to bring up a number of topics about a lot of things, including our friends on the Co-op Farms east of Carrot River, but I see my time has lapsed, so with that, Mr. Speaker, I will repeat, I shall not support the motion.

March 7, 1960

Mr. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate, I wish to first congratulate all members who have taken part in this particular debate before me. I want particularly to convey my congratulations to the Provincial Treasurer in bringing down his sixteenth annual budget, a budget that I believe is outstanding in its realistic plan. He is planning, not only to cope with the economic problems before us, but the long-term programs and to bring even a fuller life to the people of Saskatchewan. I want, on behalf of my people of the Canora constituency, to express my appreciation, or our appreciation and gratitude, for the outstanding contribution that the Provincial Treasurer has made to their general welfare and to the improved financial standing of the province. I know that my people would want me to express their sincere regret on his decision to leave the political life of the province, and, upon their behalf, to express their finest wishes for his future well-being in whatever he may choose to do.

I want to take this opportunity, too, of expressing on behalf of my people in the Canora constituency, their appreciation to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the other members and ministers of the government on their retirement.

I want to mention the hon. Tom Bentley, Minister of Social Welfare, particularly. You, Sir, lived in the Canora constituency for a good many years. You were on the Council of the Town of Canora during the hungry thirties, and I want to say that whenever I am in the constituency, my people speak very highly of your accomplishments while you were there, and your willingness always to help people out. I want to say, too, that they have followed your career very closely since you left the Town of Canora, therefore, I would like, on their behalf, to convey their sincerest feelings and good wishes to you and Mrs. Bentley for many years of pleasant and rewarding retirement.

Before going into my talk I would like to reply to a few questions, or a few statements that were raised by the M.L.A. for Nipawin. Speaking on Friday evening to this debate, he pointed out his stand on the tax on farm fuel in the province of Saskatchewan, stating that some of the truckers of the province probably drive only 200 miles on highways and the rest are driven on municipal roads. I would like him to point out to some of these people in the rural areas although they may be driving on municipal roads, this Government is spending at the present time over \$7 million in grants to improve rural roads. May I point out that this is an amount three times as great as the estimate of \$2,400,000 that my come from farm fuel tax. I know that when the M.L.A. for Nipawin or the Social Creditors get up they always point to the 'holy land' in Alberta. Why does he not explain this to the farmers of Saskatchewan; in Saskatchewan a farm track license on a truck of a maximum weight of 14,000 pounds, costs \$20,00; insurance

in Saskatchewan costs \$31.00 (or \$51.00); and then I'm going to set up a figure for purple gas: since the estimate is \$2,400,000 that is collected from this gas in the province, there is an estimate of some hundred thousand farmers in the province of Saskatchewan, this amounts to an average of \$25.00. If I add \$25.00, then, in Saskatchewan the farmer on this particular truck pays \$20.00, plus \$31.00, plus \$25.00 — or a total of \$76.00, but in Alberta it is true that they do not collect the tax from farm fuel, but the license costs \$35.00 and the insurance \$76.30 or, actually \$35.30 more than the farmer pays in the province of Saskatchewan in license, insurance and in tax on farm fuel.

I was very amused, Mr. Speaker, with another statement he made in connection with the expansion of rural power, both in the province of Saskatchewan and in Alberta. He fairly well agrees that the farmer in Alberta on the average pays approximately \$1,400 to have power installed on the farm but, he says, after he has paid this \$1,400, he owns the power line — for \$1,400. What a terrific asset! This is true — he owns the installation, therefore, for example, if the lightning strikes the transformer on the Alberta farm and he's got to install a new one, they tell him, "Go to town, buy one, and hook it up." In Saskatchewan, if anything goes wrong with the line or with the transformer, the Power Corporation pays the cost of the upkeep or the maintenance.

I would like to reply to another question that was raised in the Crown Corporations* The hon. Leader of the Opposition in the House, made the statement in the Crown Corporations Committee (they always do give far more credit to other provinces, and always under-rate their own) — in speaking on pulp mills he made the statement that Alberta has two pulp mills in operation and one under construction. Now, the information that I have, and I want to say that this is very authoritative information (we do pass information between the two provinces and the information that I have and the one that I was aware of even prior to this) was that they have only the one pulp mill in operation that they had there number of years ago, and this one is owned by the Northwest Power Company.

Mr. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — At least they have one.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — The second one is only a promotion scheme by the Alberta West Pulp and Power. The Alberta government has signed an agreement with the promoting company to start the construction of the mill as of May of 1959. Since then, they have given two extensions and at the present time they have got no mill — they haven't even commenced the construction. If that is a pulp mill, Mr. Speaker, we must have a couple of them in the province already, because we have had similar agreements drawn up.

Mr. Cameron: — That's like Saskatchewan. We have three of that kind here.

March 7, 1960

Mr. McFarlane: — I'm surprised you even dare to bring that up.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Of the third, Mr. Speaker, I'm informed that only two other groups are interested in the pulp organization in Alberta. The Alberta Government has not even considered granting them an option agreement on the forest area. Therefore, what it means is, that it is the same old pulp mill in Alberta that has been operating there for the last few years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I had mentioned this afternoon to the Opposition, I'm going to take the opportunity of reviewing some of the programs in my department, as well as making reference to the Crown Corporations under my control. Crown Corporations, Mr. Speakers under my direction, are those associated with the management or wise use of the renewable resources, such as forests, fish, fur, recreational land use and tourist. We're interested in the development of these resources from three points of view: from the commercial view-point, from the domestic, that is, use by the people within the area in which they reside, and the increasing importance of recreational land use and tourists. In our work we must always have in mind the long-range potential rate of use of our resources. Thus, while we are endeavouring to promote the immediate use of our resources, we must remember future generations and consider how we could best conserve and even increase resources for the descendents who will follow us.

Before going into the programs, Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to review for the benefit of the Members, the organizational structure of my department. Our programs are many and varied. We manage resources that are found throughout the length and breadth of the province of Saskatchewan, in a very wide variety of character, quantity, and distribution. These resources occur in different economic and social environments. We have, therefore, organized our department along regional lines. The Southern area is a highly developed economy, where the bulk of our population resides. Here the renewable resources are mainly used in the form of outdoor recreation, provincial and regional parks, tourist, angling, hunting plus trapping, some forestry, and a few fur farms. In commercial forest area which includes the Hudson Bay region, the Prince Albert region, and the Meadow Lake regions where the population is concerned with agriculture, but depends to a great extent upon earning a part of their livelihood from the commercial forest operation, we are concerned with forest management as a major operation plus all the other resource uses that I have mentioned in the southern region.

In the northern region, all that area north of the commercial forest belt, all the renewable resources are limited in quantity and distribution, and most of the people in the area depend totally upon the limited renewable resources. May I say this is underdeveloped except for such points as Creighton near Flin Flon, the mining area, Island Falls,

the hydro-power industry and Uranium City, the number of uranium mines in the area. Here we are responsible not only for the management of the renewable resources, but also for municipal administration, including hospitalization, social welfare, road and street building, community development with the aim of integrating the culture and way of life of our Metis and Indian brothers with that of our complex way of living. We have, therefore, structured the department to include program branches, which are concerned particularly with resources, such as forestry, the fisheries, wildlife and the recreation land use.

These program branches are the ones that devise programs and give technical know-how to the regions and the regions are the ones responsible for the implementation of the programs. Within each one of these program branches we have a research division — a very important part of our operation. In the research branch we determine the nature of the resource base to its quantity and its quality; we must at all times be assessing the impact on, or the change in the resources it has utilized during the year. We take inventories of the resources such as fish, fur, wildlife and forest. These are very necessary in the management of the resources. For example, the setting of the season, the setting of bag limits, the free limits on fish species and then commercial fish limits on the different lakes of the north. These are required to set our quota for forest production, particularly white spruce soft timber. All utilization and harvesting must be geared to a sustained yield basis, therefore, this continuous research is very necessary. Research, too, is carried on to devise more efficient harvesting methods, ways and means of increasing productivity and the regeneration of our resources. We are also undertaking social and economic research to devise ways and means by which the residents of the north may reap greater benefits from these resources that they harvest in the north.

I would now like to deal particularly with three of our very important programs; recreational development, northern affairs, and resource programs. In recreational development, Mr. Speaker, our object is to continue the development of picnic sites, of camp sites, beaches, cottage subdivisions and other facilities necessary for the use of our people, and to promote the tourist industry. For example, along the Hanson Lake road and in the La Ronge road on through to the Churchill many new beautiful fishing and camping spots are being provided, and will be provided in the coming year. Further south, new access roads to recreational spots in the forest area will be continued during the coming year. Work will be continued in the development of the Meadow Lake Provincial Park under a comprehensive, orderly, long-term plan. The Pike Lake provincial park just out of the city of Saskatoon is being developed and will become a reality with good beaches and an adequate water supply from the Saskatchewan River. Here we intend, in the coming year, to plant some twenty thousand trees, provide for picnic facilities, and improved playgrounds. We are, in this Park this year, building new toilets and bath change buildings and a maintenance building. A new Provincial Park is being developed in the

March 7, 1960

Echo-Pasqua lake area. Seven thousand dollars of work was done there during the winter. Landscaping and camp ground facilities will be provided in the coming year at Jackfish Lake. We have already acquired some land, and we are negotiating for some land from the Department of Indian Affairs, and we believe that a beginning will be made in 1960.

Rowan's Ravine in the Provincial Park which is situated on Last Mountain Lake will have further development continued. We are planning here to plant trees on thirty acres of land during this coming year. This is going to mean doubling the irrigation system which they have there at the present time. In this Provincial Park we will be constructing and providing for a better concession building, a maintenance building, and further playground equipment.

In the Moose Mountain Provincial Park or Kenossee Park, we intend to complete the water system, rebuild a laundry building and provide new and larger toilet facilities and improvement to the golf course. We intend to do away with the entrance road that we have there at the present time in order to provide more picnic areas. We are going to take the road back, I think, approximately one-half mile away from the settled area and a new road will be built of black-top. Here we are building, too, a new headquarters for the conservation officer, and picnic and parking areas will be provided.

At Duck Mountain park, bathing and picnic facilities will be provided and the golf fairway improved. Other improvements will be provided at Cypress, Greenwater, Goodspirit and Katepwa Parks.

In addition to the Provincial Parks program we expect to commence an assistance program of technical advice for planning and developing Regional Parks, by making financial contributions amounting to 40 percent of the capital cost of those regional parks that will be organized over a period of five years. We expect that in the coming year, therefore. Mr. Speaker, there will be five or six of these regional parks organized. Money is provided in this budget for further acquisition of recreational lands that are so necessary, particularly in the new provincial parks that we are commencing and are acquiring more land for at the present time. All in all, I may say that within my budget there is approximately a million dollars provided for outdoor recreational program development. That takes in the Provincial Parks, picnic and camp sites along the highways and in the northern areas, and the lakes that are being tapped in the north, historic sites and grants to regional parks.

The next very major program is the Northern Affairs Development Program. In thinking about this vast area, Mr. Speaker, we must realize that it is an entirely different environment to what we have in the south. I may say almost another world. I call it an under-developed area of Saskatchewan or an under-developed area of the world, and when I say Saskatchewan, this applies to the northern areas of all provinces of Canada and the Northwest Territory. I am just wondering how many people in Saskatchewan realize, Mr. Speaker, that Cumberland House, for example, in the north was settled back in 1774, almost two hundred years ago. For

example, La Ronge, Stanley, LaLoche were flourishing fur trade centres well known in eastern Canada long before the southern portion of Saskatchewan was ever settled. I want to say that the great development that went on in the south in the last sixty to seventy years barely touched the people of the north. The mode of living of eking out an existence from the marginal resources of the north remained very similar down through the years. In fact, I believe, that it got worse as the white man entered that area, and particularly the fur trader.

With the coming of the fur trader the natives of the north lost many of the skills of their forefathers, for example, in providing clothing, food, and their other requirements. As the fur trader came in and took their fur and traded it off for clothing they lost the skill of making their own clothing; as they were sold guns and ammunition, they lost the skills of making their own weapons for taking fur-bearing animals and food for themselves. Therefore, as down through the years they depended more on the fur trader, the fur trader therefore took greater advantage of them. May I say that, down through the years, they dropped into unbelievable poverty, poor health, and were slowly dying off and the Indian and Metis population of the north had actually decreased.

May I say this, that the white man's exploitation of our Indian not only unscrupulously robbed him of his toil, but in time robbed him of his character, his dignity, and initiative through the process of semi-starvation and malnutrition. I want to say that with the re-election of this government in 1944 they got a break . . .

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — We organized immediately after 1944 the Fur Marketing Service which was organized to bring to the producer the greatest possible return, and may I say, that the compulsory feature of the fur marketing service was a wonderful thing to the people of the north, particularly in the beginning. Therefore, they received far more for their fur than they had ever been able to get from the fur trader prior to that time. We instituted conservation policies, we organized trappers' blocks where they elected their own council, and through democratic means they worked with our people in the conservation of fur-bearing animals, particularly beaver.

I want to say something about the beaver. I wonder how many people realize that for example in 1941-42 there were only forty beaver harvested in the whole province of Saskatchewan. With the organization of the fur trapper in the north the bringing in of a conservation policy, the beaver population in the forties continuously increased. In fact in 1957-58 we harvested over fifty two thousand beaver pelts, therefore, increasing the standard of living of the people of the north. After 1944, we not only organized the Fur Marketing Service to bring more to the trapper from fur, we organized a Fish Marketing Board. After the organization, yes, I expected a kind of a giggle . . .

March 7, 1960

Mr. Danielson: — Don't talk about it. You have \$800,000.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — But I'm going to tell you that the Fish Board brought increased revenue to the fishermen of northern Saskatchewan when there were losses sustained by the Fish Board. There were losses sustained because we paid more for the fish on the lakes than we realized later by selling. In other words, if there was a loss of a few hundred thousand dollars that wasn't a loss. It went back to the fishermen of northern Saskatchewan and didn't go up in the form of smoke as, for example, the millions that had been spent on the DEW line and the foolish Bomarc missile.

The Fish Marketing Board was reorganized into the Fish Marketing Service; a floor price was instituted by this Government to guarantee the minimum floor price for the producer of fish in northern Saskatchewan; schools were built and education brought into the north. Hospitals were built. These services provided hospital and social welfare services. I'm going to give credit here to the Federal Government in instituting Old Age Pensions and then bringing in the family allowances to the north. The health of the population of the northern people improved and now the population is increasing.

We can now foresee, Mr. Speaker, that there are going to be other problems. With the increase in the population of the, they will have to have something more than the revenue that they receive from the limited resources that are found in northern Saskatchewan. We realized this problem. This Government in 1955 appointed an anthropologist in my department to make a study of one particular area, the Ile-a-la-Crosse area. Yes, I can see the Opposition smile, as anthropologists they laughed and said: "Now what kind of an animal is this?" But I want to say that this anthropologist was put in there with the aim of studying and devising some method for further improving the standards or the lot of the natives of the north. He recommended for example, the organization of local trading co-operatives, and encouraged the people of the north to participate in solving some of their economic problems themselves, and this is what in necessary. The result was the first co-operative organization amongst the natives of Northern Saskatchewan. When it was organized and open for business, prices of goods dropped in local stores in the area, therefore, the dollar went further. Since then co-operative stores have been organised in the northern Buffalo Narrows, LaLoche, Beauval, Clear Lake, Patnasak, Kinosee on Reindeer Lake — these co-operative stores now not only have native people on the boards of directors operating these co-operatives, but also have native managers and clerks operating the store.

I want to say that the Indians and the Metis or the natives of the north co-operated excellently; sales in the stores increased rapidly. In fact, the last time I was at Ile-a-la-Crosse, the co-operative store was turning some \$90,000 annually in business. Prices in the whole area of the north dropped and the standard of living, therefore, increased to some extent. I want to point out that over the last few years, too, we have organized local power co-operatives. These have been organized

in Ile-a-la-Crosse, Buffalo Narrows, Sandy Bay, and Stoney Rapids. These power co-operatives were organized and turned over to the people. They are administering and operating these co-ops, as well as collecting accounts in the villages. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, not only under this Government did the lights go on in the southern part of Saskatchewan, but the lights went on in the northern parts of this province as well.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of thanking the officials at the Power Corporation on the fine co-operation which they gave in taking over some of their diesel units that were taken out in the south, transporting them into the areas of the north, installing and building lines and then turning this over to the natives of the north.

In the last few years, may I say, recreational co-ops have been organized. Last year in my department we had a budget for grants to be given out to the development of recreational centres in Northern Saskatchewan. Grants were paid at points such as La Ronge, Ile-a-la-Crosse, and Buffalo Narrows. I want to report, Mr. Speaker, that this year again, we have grants provided in the budget and they will be available for further recreation centres to be developed under our community development program of northern Saskatchewan. In the last few years we have continued in the north in the organization of the local fishermen's co-operatives. These were organized with the aim in view of finally transferring the two corporations that the Government own — the Fish Marketing Service and Saskatchewan Trading to the people at northern Saskatchewan. A year ago, Mr. Speaker, we transferred over the two Crown corporations of Fish Marketing and Saskatchewan Trading and organized them as co-operatives that will finally be administered, operated, and owned by the people of the north.

I am very pleased to report to the Legislature that the Co-Operative Fisheries Limited and Co-operative Trading have had an excellent year. Although the books are not finalized for the year, I believe that both of them will be in a position to make more than their minimum payments required under the transfer. I believe that they will be taking advantage of earning further discounts that were provided in the two bills that we passed last year. I want then to take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of the Government to members of the Board of Directors of these two co-operatives. Some of these members are very busy executives of other large co-operatives in southern Saskatchewan. I want to say that they have given invaluable service in the direction of these two co-operatives.

Mr. Loptson: — They're doing better than the Government.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the House that the Fish Marketing Co-operative participated along with the provincial Government and Federal Government in building yet another modern fish filleting plant at Pelican Narrows. This plant will be opened and will be processing fish this coming summer and may I point

March 7, 1960

out, too, that the production of this fish will be going out over the Lake Hanson road to the markets of Canada and America, thereby again, reducing the costs of transportation of the primary product and as a result more will remain with the fishermen.

I want to express my appreciation here, again, for the co-operation that we have received from the Federal Government, particularly the personnel working in the north, and the Federal Government's willingness to go a little further than the previous Liberal Federal Government did in solving the difficulties of the natives, particularly, in the north. I know that, because I have had, I believe, seven employees from my department taken over by the Minister of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources. They were taken over because these people were trained in northern community development and were taken over by the Federal Government to commence similar programs to this, in northern parts of the provinces of Canada and in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the co-operative method is the best one known by which people can participate in their own affairs and improve their material standard. It is a form, Mr. Speaker, of experience and education for the people. With the marginal resources that we have in the north there is no room in northern Saskatchewan for any other enterprise except co-operative enterprise, where all that is within the marginal resources or northern Saskatchewan must be returned to the people of Saskatchewan if we are to improve the living standards of the people.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I want to report to the House that I have, lately, with the co-operation of my colleagues in the Governments, placed before the department of Citizenship and Immigration, the Indian Affairs Branch, a proposal further to assist the peoples of northern Saskatchewan to become owners and operators of more of the fish processing plants of the north. I hope that the Federal Government will see fit to participate. I want to point out that it is the Federal Government's responsibility for the welfare of the Treaty Indians, as ours is for the Metis. And, therefore, I believe that the Federal contribution to such assistance should be even greater than ours.

My department too, signed a contract recently with the Centre for Community Studies at the University. The Centre, during the next three years, will conduct research into further community development, and in so doing, is going to take over the Anthropological Research that was carried on in my department. The Centre is also going to conduct a training program for our Government employees working with the natives of the north on community development. The Centre will also, during this coming year, commence an educational program to train native community leaders to hasten the development of local leadership for their own particular areas of the north. We are this year instituting a new

program to help the natives improve their housing needs in northern Saskatchewan. We will be making available small loans through local credit unions. These loans will be guaranteed by this Government. These people, Mr. Speaker, for various reasons, cannot qualify under the National Housing Scheme. My department is going to have an added person on the staff in the form of a carpenter who is going to help the natives of the north in designing and advising them on the construction of homes in the north.

I want to report too, that where the Timber Board mills are in operation, lumber is going to be available on these projects at cost. In the remote areas of the north we, in the department, have two portable sawmills and planers which will be made available for operation on a co-operative basis in the different areas of northern Saskatchewan. We are this year, under community development, providing for small agricultural grants to aid the people of the north to develop more gardens, purchase seed, pay part of the cost of clearing and breaking and purchase poultry.

In this budget under community development we are providing funds to bring out 25 to 30 boys and girls from the north to take technical education in Saskatoon. We'll be paying for these students coming out and providing board and room for them. The technical education that will be available to them will consist of carpentry and motor mechanics for the boys and nursing, home economics and stenographic training for the girls. We will be encouraging these boys and girls to go back into the north and take over some of the jobs that are today held by white people. I'm hoping, Mr. Speaker, that this program will be successful; I can not see any reason why it will not be. If it is, I'm hoping that this program will increase considerably in the years to come. I hope to see the time when some of the people of the north may be retrained and put into jobs — into positions in the southern part of Saskatchewan, and therefore, bring about more rapid integration of our people throughout the whole of the province.

Now I would like to review our road program. This road program is going to take a major portion of my capital budget. Some \$2,200,000 will be spent on resource roads construction and maintenance in the 1960-61 season. I believe the Department of Highways will spend a further \$800,000 approximately, on the resource road north of La Ronge; therefore, actually the road budget will be very close to \$3,000,000. During 1960-61 we'll be continuing the building of the Lake Hanson Road, which will be connecting Creighton in Saskatchewan, at Flin Flon, to Smeaton, Saskatchewan on the No. 55 Highway, a distance of some 233 miles. In this coming year we will be spending \$1,300,000 on the construction for this project. We have today cleared all except 26 miles of this 233 miles. We have graded already 145 miles of the road; we have gravelled 110 miles. A bridge, in 1960, across the Sturgeon-Weir River on this road will be completed. This road, Mr. Speaker, I believe, will be open for traffic for the winter of 1960-61 and will be open for summer traffic in the year 1962. The Otosquen Road is another major project, and I may

March 7, 1960

point out that the Hanson Lake Road and the Ostosquen are two roads that I hope in time, to sign an agreement with the federal government where they will be paying 50 per cent of the cost.

Speaking on the Ootosquen Road, this is a road north of Hudson Bay to The Pas, Manitoba, a distance of 82 miles. It was open to traffic in the winter of 1958-59, and will be completed in 1960, at a cost this coming summer of \$200,000. Now here may I add a few remarks on the negotiation of the agreement with the Federal Government. I would like to point out that, in the year 1958, when I first negotiated on these roads with the Federal Government and when we finally came to an oral agreement, that we were to spend together \$15,000,000, on the building of the Ootosquen, the Hanson, and the La Ronge-Uranium City road over a period of some 5 years. The Honourable Alvin Hamilton, Minister of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources, then told me if we commenced in good faith the building of the road, that he would in good faith seal this agreement in the meantime pending the signing of the agreement, making an advance of \$750,000. I want to say that I agreed. Mr. Speaker, we in good faith, commenced the building of the three roads, the Ootosquen, the Lake Hanson, and the Uranium City road. The Federal Government in good faith advanced us \$750,000.

I left them alone. They carried on a political campaign. After the campaign was all over, I finally, in March of 1959 received a draft agreement that I placed before my colleagues and which we signed — signed their own drafted agreement to build three of these roads at a cost of \$15,000,000 with no mention of any bridge across the Saskatchewan River. The bridge across the Saskatchewan River was negotiated with the Department of Highways . . .

Premier Douglas: — About 165 miles away.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Yes, actually that bridge is 165 miles south of the starting of the northern road. Now, how he could justify putting in a bridge into the northern roads, in fact, I had stated, why not put in the South Saskatchewan River Dam and really make it a big amount.

Mr. McFarlane: — That was just a mirage — a vision.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — But I couldn't get them then to sign their own agreement. They repudiated their own agreement entered into between the Province and the Dominion of Canada. Later, I received a request to limit this northern resource road down to the Geike River. The Geikie River is no place, so I pointed out that as far as we were concerned in the Province of Saskatchewan we still have that great vision of northern resource development and we were prepared to go on to Uranium City.

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Do you have visions, too, Alex?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Anyway, Mr. Speaker, finally I received a new draft agreement including the Prince Albert Bridge and, therefore, by taking that action actually reducing the program of the northern roads from \$15,000,000 to \$12,500,000. I realize that the Federal Government has signed, or is preparing to sign, an agreement with every Province in Canada, to go in on the \$15,000,000 northern road program. They even signed one with little Prince Edward Island for \$15,000,000 and I know they wouldn't like to sign an agreement for less than \$15,000,000 with Saskatchewan.

Hon. Russell Brown (Minister of Travel and Information): — Watch the stilettos go now!

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Anyway, when I received this agreement I recommended to my colleagues to refuse to sign. If we are to sign that agreement then we'll sign it as an agreement for \$12,500,000 and not fool the people of Saskatchewan that it was the greater figure.

Today I have had another telephone conversation with Ottawa, and the instruction is definitely that there will be no change; that if we're to get any further moneys, we must sign as requested by Ottawa.

In the southern region, I mentioned a few minutes ago the building of the road in Kenossee Park — the new entrance road which we estimate is going to run to \$40,000. This is the road that is going to be built by the Department of Highways and blacktopped during this coming year. We will be building a new entrance road into Rowan's Ravine at a cost of \$4,000. In the northern region we are going to continue the building of the Buffalo Narrows-LaLoche Road at a cost of \$75,000, and a further \$75,000 will be required in the year 1961-1962 to complete the road from Buffalo Narrows to LaLoche.

Another road we are building in the northern area is a road off the Lake Hanson Road, to give access to Ballantyne Bay and Jans Lake. This will allow fish from the filleting plants of Pelican Narrows and the Deschault plant to go out on the Hanson Lake Road. This will open up new tourist lakes in that area of the province, and will run into some \$50,000. We will be rebuilding in the northern area the Waterhen and River Bridge. Someone up there at one time was interested, but it will cost us \$11,000 to completely rebuild it and fix up the dangerous approaches to the bridge. In my budget, we have, too, some \$14,000 provided for settlements and streets in Stoney Rapids, and Buffalo Narrows, and in Cumberland House.

I would like to refer to some of the branches of my Department. The first one, forestry, I would like to point out that a couple of years ago, we commenced a long-term forestry management plan for the harvesting of forest products. These were based upon the conservation officer districts of the north. This year we are planning to produce management plans for four different areas — two in the Hudson Bay area, one in the Buffalo Narrows area, in the northern area and forest management plan for

March 7, 1960

production of poles in the Cypress Hills area. Under forestry research, we will be carrying on, in co-operation with the Federal Forest Biology Laboratory of Saskatoon, and the Federal Forestry Branch of Winnipeg, research on white spruce regenerations, artificial seeding of white spruce in burned out areas that are lacking natural need; on the regeneration of black spruce and the regeneration of Jackpine, particularly on sandy soil.

Under inventory, the Dominion of Canada has, during the last three years, devised more accurate instruments for interpreting aerial photographs. That is the height of trees, from which we can obtain volume data on the amount of volume in a given forest area. So during 1960 we are planning a program of aerial photography to be carried on over 42,000 square miles of the northern forest, and information and data will be compiled.

Under the division Silva culture and Extension, this is the division responsible for the production of planting tree stock, reforestation projects, forest woodlot management, amongst far woodlots that are being organized over these areas. Under this division, in 1960 we will be commencing to lay out a new forest nursery which will be constructed 10 miles north of Prince Albert. This forest nursery is a requirement to meet a very heavy demand on now forestry stock, particularly for the recreation areas of southern Saskatchewan, the provincial parks, the regional parks and the camping sites on the highways, the historic sites and so on. During this year we expect to transplant 300,000 trees on some of our Crown lands; in fact of the two projects that will be carried out, one will be in the Timberlost area, and the other one in the Cypress Hills.

Under Fire Control, we are constructing a \$60,000 central store at Prince Albert for the storage, maintenance and distribution of fire-fighting equipment that is required throughout the whole of the forest and the park areas of the province. We will be carrying out the construction of four new fire towers, and relocating four others. We are, during the year, expecting to engage a helicopter for three months, particularly during the high fire season for fire suppression and the location of these particular towers. Under Timber Production, timber production has been greatly increased, particularly this year, beyond the sustained yield basis. This is being done as an assistance to provide more work and wages for the farmers of the fringe areas. In fact, may I point out, that when the northern areas were covered with snow and while the Federal Government was considering, and so on, we had put certain plans into operation. For example, the Timber Board white spruce production was increased from 47 1/2 million which we had last year, to 60 million. Farm permits were increased from 2,850,000 to 4,850,000 board feet. I would like to point out that, with the building of the Green Lake-Beauval-Ile-a-la-Crosse-Buffalo Narrows road, we have now located in the Buffalo Narrows area of Niska Lake, some 100,000,000 board feet of white spruce saw timbers, that will be produced over the next few years and which is going to provide employment and so on for the natives of that particular area.

I want to say that while we agreed to increase timber production, we agreed also to increase pulpwood production in the fringe area as an assistance program to farmers. I know there isn't the demand at the present time for pulpwood, but even if we have to hold it over for a year or two, it is an assistance to the agricultural population of the farmers on the north on the fringe area.

I want to point out that as far as the Timber Board is concerned, the increased production of saw timber, and the increased taking out of pulpwood, and the increase of farm permits, we estimate, will provide approximately \$500,000 more in work and wages for the people of the fringe area.

The Fisheries Branch: in the year 1960, for example under 'Sports Fisheries' we are going further to examine water areas to determine suitability for fish stocking. We are intending, this coming year, to test two different lakes to determine previous stocking of fish. One of them is going to be Thompson Lake in the Gravelbourg area, where we stocked 460,000 rainbow trout last year. This will be re-checked again to see how they are doing. In the Bush Lake area, north of North Battleford, is another lake that will be tested to determine previous fish stocking. In 1960, we will be stocking some 750,000 rainbow trout fingerlings in the different lakes throughout Saskatchewan. We will be stocking some 20 million fry pickerel in the many lakes in the province; we will be stocking 10 million whitefish fry in five different lakes of the province, and some 100,000 lake trout fingerlings in White Swan Lake. We are going to take action on the rehabilitation of three lakes in the province. When I speak of rehabilitation, I mean the poisoning out of the stunted fish in the lakes, and restocking it, usually with rainbow trout. This is going to be done on Telfield Reservoir, in the Rosetown-Biggar area, and Sufferin Lake in the Unity Area, and Seely Lake on the Hanson Lake road.

Under commercial operations, or commercial fishing, we intend during this year to carry out an educational and welfare extension program to assist commercial fishermen to increase their efficiency as producers. In the Pelican Narrows area, for example, we are going to have a program that will deal with the care and maintenance of equipment, the production of a higher quality product and the improvement in fishing methods.

Under fish research, our objective to conduct biological surveys on lakes to determine fish productivity, both commercial and angling. Two, to secure information on the relationship of fish species, so that harvest may be carried on without conflict as between commercial and angling users. There are certain areas of the lake, for example, and certain depths of the lake, where if you set your nets, you are able to take the higher percentage of the commercial fish, and a less percentage of the angling fish. Three, to assess various factors which may affect fish life, such as, of course, the pollution of water, the problem on the Qu'Appelle Lakes. Biological surveys will be carried

March 7, 1960

on on the lakes north of La Ronge this coming year, on to the Churchill River, or to the new lakes that are opening up, as the building of the Uranium City Road progresses. We are going to carry out these surveys in Little Bear Lake and Pickerel Lakes where rainbow trout have been introduced a couple of years. Then, biological surveys will be carried on at Madge Lake, Kenossee, in the recreational park waters, such as Thompson Lake and Fishing Lake. We are going to carry on research on carp on Crooked Lake and Round Lake to evaluate carp population in Spawning areas. We are going to carry on a biological survey on these lakes, too, to get information on the present game fish population, to compare it with the surveys that were made back in 1954 and 1956. We are going to carry on a research on the control of algae and weeds on the Qu'Appelle Lakes. In fact, in our budget we have another employee coming in, an aquatic biologist who specialized in that particular line, make a survey, suggest controls and carry out the control of algae and weeds. This pretty well covers major programs of my Department. I want to express my appreciation, Mr. Speaker, to my staff and my employees. I think they have done a wonderful job. I know they could be criticized. Anytime that a Department has to do with the management of certain things, or of resources, and at the same time bring about controls or enforcement, you are bound to run into a number of difficulties. But I believe they have done a splendid job.

May I be permitted, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — You'd better sit down while you're still ahead.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I want to refer to the general statement that I made on commencing my budget. I stated that there is no doubt that the greatest problem before us in Saskatchewan, and in Canada, for that matter, is the agricultural depression. I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that we of the C.C.F. since 1946, have, in and out of the Parliament of Canada and the legislatures of Canada, warned that the agricultural industry cannot survive in an economy where the farmer is forced to buy all his products in protected markets, where the goods are continuously rising, and then sell in an open free market, where his produce is continuously dropping.

Mr. Speaker, our Premier for years has warned Canadians that we are going to see in Canada an agricultural depression in the midst of an industrial boom, and I believe we have got it now. I want to point out that the Liberals, in particular the Liberals in this House, laughed and ridiculed these truths. They called us gloom-mongers and forecasters of doom. Mr. Speaker, they know as well as we do that the Federal Government controls the fiscal policy of Canada, and it is the only government that has the power to remedy this vicious economic policy, of protecting certain industries of Canada, and leaving others to the mercies of the unprotected market of supply and demand. This economic action was controlled prior to 1946 by the Federal Government's price control policy, but in 1946, these controls were lifted by the action of a Federal Liberal Government in power at the time, supported by 'Honest John' and his Conservatives, and the Social Credit Party.

They were responsible for bringing into being a vicious economic policy that is now bankrupting the agricultural industry, not only in Saskatchewan, but throughout the whole of Canada. Since 1946 those commodities of protected industries have sky-rocketed to unprecedented heights, and are still rising, under the present Conservative Government, while the agricultural products are steadily dropping.

Down through the years, the only political party who had the foresight and the honesty to warn the people of Canada of the inevitable outcome of the change made in 1946 was the C.C.F. Since 1946 we have been warning the primary producers, the farmers, the fishermen and the trapper of the impending consequences of the economic set-up. In fact, I am going to say that we coined the terms 'cost-price squeeze', 'parity prices to primary producers'; 'a fair share of the national income of Canada'. Of course, in 1957-58, the hon. Mr. Diefenbaker, in, I believe, the only vision that he has caught so far, seized these phrases, changed them a little bit and rolled on to victory, using such phrases as 'parity instead of charity', 'cost-price squeeze', 'a fair share of the national income to all fellow Canadian'. What has he done? Well, he doubled the interest rates of Canada. The cost-price squeeze is more effective than ever. In fact, some of the farm products today are reaching the levels established by a previous Conservative Leader.

Mr. Speaker, the surprising part is that the Liberals of Saskatchewan are now commencing to pay lip service, are shedding crocodile tears, are using these very same phrases, that they ridiculed down through the years, in this Legislature, with the hopes of catching the attention or the unsuspecting voter. Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that down through the years the Provincial Liberal Opposition always came to the defence of the Federal Liberals, who created this economic chaos of sky-rocketing costs, and dropping prices for the agricultural industry.

Yes, they speak and they point out — what, are you people doing? What is the Province doing? Surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, any intelligent person realizes that the Province cannot fill the gap between the agricultural income of today, and the fair share of the income that agriculture should receive. In fact, I am positive that our complete budget of \$148 million would not fill this gap. I want to refer again to some of the glowing promises of the old political parties, and then their broken promises and excuses after they were elected to power. I am going to refer to that phrase of the Prime Minister of Canada, 'parity instead of charity'. This fall, I believe, one of the great emergencies in western Canada struck this country, with crops snowed under. What did the Conservatives come up with? I remember that during the campaigns of 1957 and 1958, he ridiculed the previous Federal Liberal Administration for coming out, or when they came out to aid the farmers, they came out only with charitable aid. What did 'John' do? Well, he came out with charitable aid, too, \$2 to \$3 per acre, but he went the Federal Liberals one better. He told the farmers of western Canada, "You cough up half of this charitable contribution to yourself". Therefore, he actually established a new precedent in the Dominion of Canada.

March 7, 1960

What did the Province do to aid this situation. I want to say that, while the Federal Government was considering what they should do, we had already decided, for example, to pay out clearing and breaking accounts of Crown lessees in northern Saskatchewan to help them in the situation. I have stated in my previous speech that we instituted certain increased programs of forest and timber extraction, and therefore provided another \$500,000 of work and wages for the farmers of northern Saskatchewan. Under the Department of Agriculture, and under earned assistance and assistance under feed and fodder, a further \$500,000 was spent.

Then came the acreage payment, where the Provincial Government co-operated with the Federal Government, and we spent approximately \$3 million there, to pay the farmers under the emergency situation. Although some members in the House have previously pointed out that Alberta was paying even more than Saskatchewan, I see that the average payment made now to the farmers of Alberta is very similar to the average paid out by us in this emergency situation. In our budget, Mr. Speaker, I see that the budget of the Department of Agriculture is up by another \$1,600,000 for aid to the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan. I see that our grants to schools are up by \$4 1/2 million. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that over the past three years, as the prices have been sky-rocketing in the province and in Canada, and as taxes have been going up, we have been providing more and more money for education in order to hold the school taxes down in the province of Saskatchewan. Due to the rising costs, when we supplied some \$4 million more in educational grants, we were successful only in holding the school taxes, because costs were still sky-rocketing.

There is a further provision in the educational budget for another \$2 1/4 million above that of last year; in other words, the total increase is somewhere around \$6,750,000, and I am sure that a good portion of this will aid agriculture and help stem school taxes.

On the municipal road assistance authority, or grants to the building of grid roads in the municipalities of Saskatchewan, I see there is an increase in the budget of \$1 million, and I see that there is a supplemental provision for \$1,400,000. I would like to refer to this one particularly, because in 1956 we gave our pledge that we would contribute \$3 million in the form of grants to aid municipalities to build roads and grid roads. Actually, we are contributing now more than twice as much as we promised. We are contributing twice as much mainly because we realize that the costs are still rising and if municipal taxes are to be held down, more money must be provided to municipalities.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the budget.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, when I last had occasion to speak in the House, due to the time element I neglected to do what others have already done, namely, express my personal appreciation for the way you have conducted the affairs in the House,, and also for the type of service you have given the people of this province over your many years in public life. May I add that I hope for you in the future, the best in terms of health and happiness.

May I say, too, to all other members of the Legislature, who will be retiring during this term, that I express my sincere good wishes to them in a similar fashion; also respectfully acknowledging the public service which they have contributed.

I think that the Ministers who will be leaving the Legislature should also receive from us a special tribute. I believe that, too often, men of their position in public life do not receive the type of commendation which is really coming to them. It seems to me that many other duties and many other occupations demand far less from people in private life, than what is required from Ministers of the Crown in public life. This should not be so. I want to record my personal appreciation for the grand work they have done. My purpose in this debate is to deal with the oft repeated theme of the members opposite — especially this year from Liberal Members — that Labour is to blame for all sorts of iniquities. Of course, this theme has one apparent aim — that is, to attempt to split the forces that are supporting the C.C.F. at the next provincial election, and to discredit organized labour, and therefore its association with the new party. I think secondly, there is an attempt to distract the people of the province from the real issues which affect the political environment at the moment, issues such as the medical care plan, or the new farm program, issues such as the expansion of all the present programs that we now know. I suggest that in seeking to distract the attention of the people of this province, that the hon. members and the party they represent are going to fail, and fail miserably, in the coming election.

It is perhaps understandable that my hon. friends in the Opposition should not like the idea of a party so firmly based as it is the intention to base the new party. I don't expect that they would be other than critical of an alliance of this kind. But I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the malevolent statements that have been levelled against unions in the process of their presentations, have gone far beyond the bounds of ordinary criticism, and I say that what we have heard in this House recently is nothing short of an unprincipled maligning of thousands of the decent men and women who make up the Trade Union Movement in Canada.

March 7, 1960

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Davies: — I say this is unforgivable, and I say that it will be forgotten. I predict that it will be long remembered by the Trade Union Movement of this country.

Perhaps the hon. Member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman), tried to be somewhat fairer in his criticism when he spoke, much though I cannot agree with. (For one thing, he said that all labour wanted from the farmer was cheap food). I want to join with him in regretting the incident that he referred to, the beating of a union official in the city of Vancouver. I say that the whole Union movement of the province of British Columbia is out to apprehend the perpetrator of that beating. I want to remind the hon. member that, of course, we do not know who was responsible, and whether indeed, these thugs were part of the Trade Union Movement of British Columbia.

But, Mr. Speaker, does this one incident, or even a series of like incidents mean that the whole Union Movement is bad?

Mr. Korchinski: — Nobody said that!

Mr. Davies: — About the same time that this incident was reported in the press, there was also reported the charging of the Minister of the Gospel in B.C. on a moral infraction. Not no long ago in the Province of Alberta, investigations had gone on with respect to the Chief Magistrates of the two main cities on charges of civic corruption. In the past, from time to time, and recently, we have heard of incidents, unsavoury incidents, involving doctors, lawyers, dentists, teachers, and businessmen. No one would dream of questioning the integrity of the professions, or businessmen, of ministers of the Gospel, or whatever because of these incidents. Yet, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what is taking place in the case of unions. In spite of the most authoritative evidence that has been given across this country to the contrary, we continually see that the labour movement as a whole is being arraigned as a malefactor, while, of course, the fact is that only an insignificant few have any guilt whatsoever.

I say this is the effect of what we have heard in this Legislature during this Session, and of course previously, on more than one occasion. I want to examine some of the specific statements that have been made, particularly from the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson). I believe that when he was speaking on the first day, he referred to the brief of the Saskatchewan Section of the Canadian Manufacturing Association, a brief I believe presented by Mr. Harry Young to the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life some years ago. A statement was made in this brief, I believe, according to the hon. member, that labour laws made an unfavourable climate for industry in this province. Well, I had occasion, not so long ago, to see the latest brief of the Saskatchewan Section of the Canadian Manufacturing Association. Mr. Speaker, of course, as usual, in C.M. Association briefs, they don't

particularly give their blessing to labour legislation. I think this is much the same in every province. I read a week or two ago, a brief on the Alberta section of the Canadian Manufacturing Association, of over 21 pages, which was asking for many revisions of the Industrial Relations law in that province. As I say, such requests are made of government in every other province. But, in any event, the latest brief of the Saskatchewan Section of the C.R.A. makes this reference:

"As yet, as we present this brief, we refer proudly to the good labour relations which have existed in this province in 1959. Credit should certainly go to Saskatchewan management and employees. Certainly we have not as yet experienced some of the serious labour troubles we have seen in recent years as the lot of other jurisdictions, nor do we see much evidence of the threat of such."

In the Stanford Report also, Mr. Speaker, we see evidence rebutting what has been suggested by the hon. member for Saltcoats. The quotation I am referring to here is in that section which refers to labour. It says this:

"Saskatchewan labour legislation is strongly oriented to worker protection. However, it is considered that such legislation is in no way out of line with the trend evidenced in the rest of this continent."

Also, on page 101 of the report there is very favourable reference made to the high degree of informal conciliation methods that are practised in this province that have contributed to fewer labour disputes. I point out, too, with reference to this report, that they refer to the increased productivity of employees and manufacturers, and the statement is made:

"In manufacturing in Saskatchewan, the net production in constant dollars per employee approximately doubled since 1947."

It seems to me that these figures do not suggest an unfavourable environment for industry; rather the contrary. During the course of the talk of the hon. member for Saltcoats, he advanced a thesis which went something like this: We have "union bossism" (I believe that was the term), and the reason why we have this is because all forms of union security — check-off, closed shop, union shop, or whatever other kind of union security — creates the situation of dictatorship of union bosses. In passing he referred to the remarks of one W. Brook of the Canadian Federation of Labour, who spoke, I believe he said, in the city of Vancouver some years ago. I haven't been able to find the reference, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to say this, that the Canadian Federation of Labour is no longer in existence. It is now known as the National Council of Canadian Labour. It is a very small section of the Trade Union Movement as a whole in Canada, and the last report of the Federal Government Department listed its membership as a little more than 7,000.

March 7, 1960

I want to say this, quite categorically as well, that the particular labour group has a distinctly unsavoury reputation among all sections of the labour movement as one of those bodies that contributed to company unionism. It has frequently been called upon by employers when employees are being organized into a legitimate union. In this connection I recall, when I was a member of the Federal War Labour Relations Board for Saskatchewan, sitting on a case which involved the employees of Western Grocers in the City of Prince Albert. At that time, the employees had all signed to join, and had applied for the certification of a union, known as the Retail Clerks, a well-known body affiliated at that time with the American Federation of Labour. This had the jurisdiction in the clerical and retail trade section. Shortly after these employees had made their application for certification to the Board, there appeared on the scene, a representative of the then Canadian Federation of Labour. This representative was taken by the Manager of that concern, to each and every employee of Western Grocers. Employees were told that they should join the Canadian Federation of Labour. They were threatened with loss of privileges if they did not do so. In contrast to this kind of treatment, and to this kind of intimidation, the organizational meeting of the Retail Clerks had taken place in a box-car removed from the plant because they could not hold their meeting there, in 30 below zero temperatures. This is the type of labour organization, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member referred to.

Some reference was also made to certain Ministers of the Gospel and their alleged opinions with respect to trade unions. One of the references was the name of Bishop M. Coleman, of the Anglican Diocese of Qu'Appelle. I have checked, Mr. Speaker, with labour officials in the city of Regina. I am informed that subsequent to the article in question appearing in the newspaper, that a delegation from the Regina Council went to interview Bishop Coleman. I am told that he said that he regretted that the press had isolated certain remarks from their context, and given over-emphasis to others, to make news. He said that nothing was further from his intention than to have his statements taken as an attack on organized labour, which, he said, "is to be held in the highest regard." I don't think, therefore, too much credence can be given the story in the press, as reported by the hon. member opposite. Perhaps a far better reference might be that which is reproduced in "Religion and Labour", for October, 1959. It quotes the Rev. Dr. James R. Mutchmor, Secretary of the Board of Evangelism and Social Service of the United Church of Canada who spoke to a conference sponsored by the United Church of Christ, at Dunkirk, New York. In part he said this:

"This is not a time for the Christian church to join in heavy attack on organized labour. While it is granted that there are some bad apples in the labour barrel, it is not to be alleged that labour as a whole, is rotten. The reverse is true. Over 90 per cent of all labour activities are reputable and good. Labour does not misuse its power. Almost all of her leaders are honest. Her decency record compares favourably with business, finance, industry and government . . .

(and take special note of this, Mr. Speaker):

... labour racketeering never has been as bad as stocketeering, and related irregular practices in business. Many of industry's power elite groups have made themselves rich by questionable methods. Labour is not the chief sinner."

That is a very precise statement, and sums up the facts. I want to point out this too, that on the question of union security, there are very many persons who believe that union security in the form of the union shop, the check-off, and other similar methods, is a good thing. I shall refer to a few. President Eisenhower, ex-President Harry Truman, have both spoken out forthrightly, against the so-called "Rights to Work" laws, which are, of course, the reverse of union security, and which is advocated in the new platform of the Liberal Party represented in this House by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

I want to refer to Father William J. Kelly, former chairman of the New York Relations Board; Mr. Justice Louis Brandeis, the National Council of Churches; Mr. Reinhold Neiberg, professor of Philosophy at the Union Theological Seminary. They have all made statements against right-to-work laws, and in support of union security. Perhaps the quotation from Dr. Neiberg could be given here. It is a very short one, Mr. Speaker, and with your permission I shall read it:

"The real purpose of the so-called right-to-work laws is to accomplish this weakening of labour under the guise of preserving or restoring the individual liberties of our democratic society, The implausibility of the so-called right-to-work laws, is so obvious that one must come to the conclusion that their proponents are either stupid, or dishonest in their pretensions."

Again I think that is another excellent summation of what many people in other sections of the population think of right-to-work laws.

But in any event it was said by the hon. member for Saltcoats in his talk, that the effect of all this is that union people don't want union security; that they have had it inflicted upon them, that they cannot shake it off their backs. Of course, that is not so. That is not the record. In 1947, the notorious Taft-Hartley Law was passed in the United States, and as everyone knows, it was passed by a pro-business Congress. One of the things that was done in this Act was to emasculate the clause on union security. It was provided in the new Act that before any negotiation could take place between a Union and an employer, on a union security clause, there must first be a vote of the employees, to see whether or not negotiations should be entered into or whether they wanted union security at all. These votes took place from

March 7, 1960

1947 to 1951, when as a result of the overwhelming proportion of workers voting in favour of union shop conditions, the voting requirement was rescinded. Now what happened in this period?

In the period 1947 and 1951, the National Labour Relations Board in the United States conducted 46,117 polls — union shop polls. The results are more than revealing, and in themselves are an effective answer to the whole propaganda campaign against so-called "compulsory unionism". The union shop was authorized in 97.1 per cent of all elections. More than 5 1/2 million workers, or 91 per cent of those covered, voted in favour of the Union shop arrangements. I say, Mr. Speaker, this has been a consistent experience everywhere. The workers do want the Union Security clauses; it is not true that they are inflicted upon them. They are required in order to maintain the security of the union in the midst of conditions that would prove bad for unions otherwise.

Probably the best word that was ever said on the open shop, which, of course is the exact opposite of the union shop and the antithesis of union security, was said by Finlay Dunn, who was regarded as a great humorist and scientist some years ago. He created a character called Mr. Dooley. Mr. Dooley had a friend called Mr. Hennesey. I don't want to attempt the Irish accent, but here is what was said in the discussion between Mr. Dooley and Mr. Hennesey. "What is the open shop? Sure, and it is where they keep the doors open to accommodate the constant stream of men coming in to take jobs cheaper than the men what has the jobs." "Tis like this, Hennesey, suppose one of these free-born citizens is working in the open shop for the princely wages of one large iron dollar a day . . . and along comes another son-of-a-gun and he says to the boss: 'I think I can handle the job nicely for ninety cents'. Sure, says the boss, and the \$1 man gets into the cruel world to exercise his inalienable right as a free-born American citizen, to scab on some other poor devil.' 'But', said Mr. Hennesey, 'these open shop men you mentioned, they are for unions if properly conducted.' 'Sure", said Mr. Dooley, 'if properly conducted' . . . and there we are. 'And how would they have them conducted? No strikes, no rules, no contracts, no scales, hardly any wages and damn few members'. That, Mr. Speaker, is the open shop.

Apart from all that has been said, I regret very much that the hon. member for Saltcoats should make an unsubstantiated, and I think spiteful and false charge unworthy of this House, about people in the Trade Union Movement who are supporting the new party. I think that it is incumbent upon him to make a public announcement as to who are the gangsters and criminals that he says are in those organizations that support the idea of the new party. I say he has made a dreadful and a sweeping charge, and that in fairness to everyone, and to the people concerned themselves, he should clarify it.

I believe in the hon. member's talk, reference was made to the statements made by Mr. Harold Winch, and I note in 'The Leader Post' editorial of March 3rd, Mr. Winch is put in the company of those persons who apparently support the open shop, and against union security. That should be corrected. I happen to know Mr. Winch very well. I think I understand his opinion on the question of foreign trade, and markets, but he never at any time during the course of his remarks, made the kind of statements that we have heard in this

House from other members. Simply that he did have a viewpoint on the question of profits and wages in the competitive world situation that we know today.

Of course, my hon. friend from Saltcoats, when he was talking about these matters, again got on to the question of farm machine prices. I believe his statement was that the profits in the farm machine industry are only 2 1/2 per cent of sales. I think everyone knows that you can't use that type of comparison as a true test of what profits are. The reliable test of profits is the relationship between your profit and your invested capital. That is the ideal type of comparison. However, another way to compare is to look at wages and salaries in an industry as a percentage of the selling value, and then look at the profits in the industry. On this basis here is what happened in the farm machine industry between 1945 and 1957: salaries and wages for all management employees in the whole industry, as a percentage of the selling value at the factory point were 29.9 per cent in 1956, and 32.1 per cent in 1957. Compare this with 42.4 in 1945, and 40.2 per cent in 1946, when farm machine prices were much lower. The value of production per workman in the farm machine industry was more than doubled from 1945 to 1947. Profits rose from \$5 3/4 million in 1945 to \$25 million in 1950. As a matter of fact, in 1957, the profits for the industry amounted to 17.6 per cent, the highest of any year since 1945, bar one year.

We also heard in this House that Mr. J.H. Claussen, of the Steel Company of Canada, made the somewhat amazing remark that wages in the steel industry are going up twice as fast as productivity. Well, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures show what has actually happened, and they certainly do not bear out his comments. The net income of the Canadian Steel companies was \$28,600,000 for the year 1958. The Algoma Steel Corporation had profits of \$17.6 million in 1959, which is an increase of 49.7 per cent, or almost 50 per cent over 1958. If one wants to refer to the American experience on the provision of increases in the U.S.A., one can read 'Newsweek' for January 18, 1960, and see the remarks of Mr. Leon Keyserling, who was Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors under former President of the United States, W. Truman. This is what he says:

"Industry may decide to use the recent wage as a pretext for raising prices. This would indeed be inflationary, but the size of these wage adjustments and the recent and the current break-even point for the Steel industry seems to me to make it manifestly clear that wage increases are not inflationary, that is, they neither justify nor necessitate price increases."

Well now, so much for the question of farm machine prices, and those of steel.

What about some of the other areas. I was reading not so long ago — as a matter of fact, in the December 29, 1959 issue of 'The Winnipeg Free Press'. I am just going to make a very brief reference to this, Mr. Speaker. It is an article on the editorial page, and it begins this way:

March 7, 1960

"Two of the world's greatest foreign trade experts recently conducted in Tokyo a remarkable public dialogue, touching one of Canada's most popular delusions.

Mr. Eric Wyndham-White, the Executive Secretary of the General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs, and Mr. Toyu Hagiwara, Japanese Ambassador to Ottawa, asked one another if a nation like Canada which pays high wages, can afford to trade with a nation whose wages are lower.

"I think", said Mr. Eric Wyndham-White, "What we have got to demonstrate to public opinion that there is a good deal of economic fallacy about this argument of low wages, and its effect on the price of exports. It is a very important and a very dangerous element." To illustrate the economic fallacy, he cited the case of a poor, primitive country where a labourer carries a gallon of oil in a can for five cents an hour, and a rich country, like the United States, where 10,000 gallons are carried in a tank car, driven by one man, and paid \$1.50 an hour.

He goes on:

"At first sight, the poor country seems to have a large advantage, because its wage costs are one-thirteenth of its competitor, but in fact, the labour content of this transport problem in the United States is much lower than for the man in the tropics. It just shows that it is the unit cost of labour that costs; not an absolute comparison of wages."

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that labour costs, treated in this way as the unit of production, are actually much lower in Canada than in many other countries, because while wages may be higher, the increased productivity gives as the advantage. I am going to give an example.

"The output of a Japanese workman in 1955 was only \$444 in United States funds, while the output for a Canadian worker was \$4,259 in United States funds."

So the average output of the Canadian worker was nine and one-half times greater than the average output of the Japanese workman. Of course, on the other hand, the wages of the Canadian worker were five and one-half times greater, but in any event, the measurement puts us far ahead in terms of being able to compete.

I notice much has been said by many speakers in the House, particularly by those opposite, about Unions and political parties. Labour has been advised not to take political action; that it is dangerous. A new party is not good for labour, and so on. Well, I suggest that it is really not simply a question of choice that labour has at any time taken political

action. Particularly in the present scene, labour has been forced to take political action. One has only to look at the situation in Newfoundland last year where legislation was enacted to sweep unions out of existence at the bequest of the Liberal Government of Newfoundland. Or the situation in British Columbia, where after some 60 years of laws to the contrary, unions have been made legal entities and can be sued at great disadvantage in the courts. So I say that it has not been a question of choice; it has been a question of necessity, that labour has undertaken political action.

I want to say also that in effect it is because of political action taken by big business management. I say this has been going on for a long, long time; it is continuing, and it is continuing apace. I have here an excerpt from an article taken from the periodical, "The Iron Age". This issue, for these who might be interested, is June 11, 1959. The heading of the article is 'Political Action for Business — How to Make it Work'. I quote:

"Industry's political crusade is moving from the talk to the action stage. Top management is sincerely throwing its weight behind it, authorizing the tools and the necessary program. This thing has suddenly exploded, said General Electric Company's J.J. Worthner, Jr., a pioneer in the movement. He estimates that there are tens of thousands going through companies or area programs of political indoctrination. General Electric alone has training programs in at least 15 states, and since February 8, United States Chamber of Commerce has received orders for 5,300 sets of its action course in practical politics. Course manuals are currently going out at the rate of 1,000 a week."

Speaking about the city of Syracuse, more than 1,000 businessmen and 40 companies have taken part in the political action program of the City Manufacturers' Association."

He speaks about the American Canning Companies:

"They have formed a 153-man executive team to speak up on political management."

"The Ford Motor Company had devised what is called a step-by-step schedule of political action, extending through to October, 1960."

These are some of the political developments in the field of management. I might add that the National Association of Manufacturers in the United States charges \$300 for a training kit, which includes visual aid and training manuals for a six-part political program. So here again is another instance of the need for labour people and those in farm movements, to do something in the way of contesting the movement, which as I say, for a long time has been active, and which is expanding.

March 7, 1960

Mr. Speaker, to my mind, farm-labour co-operation is necessary for some very good reasons, apart from the superficial reasons that are given from time to time. After all, labour and farmer in the community are two of the largest groups. As such, why should it be bad for them to work together? The hon. members opposite, in their thesis, think that labour and farmer are poles apart; that they cannot come together. This is another way of saying, Mr. Speaker, that the two most decisive parts of the population cannot work together politically, or indeed economically. It is a good aim that the largest part of our community should endeavour to find some kind of a common viewpoint, and some kind of a common arena, in which to work both economically, and politically.

I want to say particularly to the member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) that it is not true that labour has taken a selfish position with respect to the farmer. The Canadian Labour of Congress, at its last two conventions, has endorsed resolutions calling for fair prices to the farmers, and indeed, in the delegation last year at Ottawa, the Canadian Labour of Congress endorsed deficiency payments.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Davies: — It seems to me, too, that in looking at it from another viewpoint, farmers gain rather than lose by association with the largest part of the population, Labour. If you consider the farm population of Saskatchewan, which is in the neighbourhood of 400,000, with all family members accounted for, you will find this part is about 2 1/2 per cent of the whole Canadian population. Most of the needs of farmers, both on the prairies and in every part of Canada must be met legislatively. As has been pointed out by members on both sides of the House very often, it is a very difficult thing for the farmer to use his economic strength. Naturally he looks to legislation; he looks to instruments provided by legislation for the realization of some sort of security. I say this, how in the world, Mr. Speaker, can we expect the farmer to get those things that are desirable in his terms, in isolation from the rest of the population; in isolation from that part of the population which works for wages and salaries. Indeed at the moment in Canada, the ratio of farmers to wage and salary earners is about one to seven. As you know, because of mechanization and other trends, the farm percentage is declining. I say that many of the questions which appear to be in dispute now between farm and labour sections are really because of a lack of contact, a lack of liaison. When contact is made (especially political contact), between the two groups, I don't think there is any question about it, these areas of seeming differences will disappear. In any event, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, for the reasons that I have given, it is to the advantage of the farmer as well as to the advantage of labour people, that there is a mutual association within a political party.

I notice it is 5:25 o'clock, and with your permission I would like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Gardiner: — Go with your other five minutes.

Mr. Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the House to call it 5:30?

Opposition Members: — No, no go on with your five minutes.

Mr. Davies: — To my mind, Mr. Speaker, the budget which we are presently debating is in the way of living proof that the interests of urban and country dweller can be reconciled, and that we can perform in the interests of both of these sections. For many years within the confines of the C.C.F. party we have seen the evidence of the working out of the things that labour wants and the things that the farmers want. I think what has been possible in a province like Saskatchewan is certainly possible in all other provinces, and indeed on a Canada-wide scale.

Mr. Speaker, the Cassandra-like cries of the Opposition when the idea of a new party is raised accompanied by the many charges against the union movement is really more than just an error. It is a fundamentally wrong direction. If Liberals are "on the march", as I believe was suggested as a slogan, by one of the members opposite . . .

Some Liberal Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — That's the best thing you've said today.

Mr. Davies: — Thank you . . . and it is on this road, it is in the wrong direction. I say it is in a direction, and a sure direction, to disaster and oblivion!

Mr. Speaker, I had more that I could have said, but in the interests of letting others take part in the debate I would like to say that I support the motion, as I have rejected the contentions of my hon. friends opposite with reference to labour.

March 7, 1960

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in the next few minutes I would just like to express my words of appreciation for the way you have conducted your high office in this Assembly. I would also like at this time to express my congratulations to all the speakers who have taken part in the budget debate up to this point, particularly today, for the fine address we had from the genial Minister of Natural Resources. I'm quite sure that when we all go home, if we have a creek nearby, we should at least know what kind of fish are going to go into the creek next year. I am quite certain that if we tell them we are going to put a few more fish in, we can really make headway with the voters in our own localities if we make quite certain that they know how many fish they are going to get in the nearest lake. I am quite certain in his review today that the only ones who will not be too pleased are possibly, as the Provincial Treasurer said, the suckers. They may not be too pleased with the review he gave this afternoon because there was not too much in it for the average person in the country. At least the average voter in the country would not be particularly interested in what he had to give them in the course of his remarks this afternoon.

I intend, during the course of my remarks, to make reference to statements that have been made during this debate. Also to proposals that have been made by various Ministers of the Government, and at the same time to indicate the reasons why I will not be supporting the budget when the vote is called. I would like, just before calling it 5:30 to mention one fact, and that is I would like to express the appreciation of the citizens of my constituency for the large allotment of 10 miles of rebuilding and regravelling of roads in my constituency. I am quite sure they will be very appreciative of the monies expended in that particular constituency, and also of the generous attitude of the Minister for 1961, as well. I feel that by the offer he has made them he certainly does not think that that particular constituency is going to be in the fold of the Government party after the election in June, and I appreciate very much the indication of that fact, at least. With those words, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The House Recessed at 5:30 o'clock p.m.

The House resumed at 7:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Gardiner: — Before we recessed at 5:30 p.m., this afternoon, I had just started my remarks with some references to the kindnesses of some of my friends across the way with regard to my constituency. I did want, before proceeding into the main portion of my remarks, also to extend my thanks and appreciation to the Minister for Public Works (Hon. Mr. Willis) for the wide mention given to my constituency, in his remarks during his address on the budget speech. However, before going into the general part of the budget discussion I would like to, for a few minutes, review matters of political interest that have taken place since the start of this debate.

There have been references made from both sides of the House since the budget was presented, with regard to political matters which concern members on both sides of the House and all the political parties in this Legislature. I would like to refer here to statements that are being made around the country today by a certain political party, this one not my friends across the way, but by the other two groups that are presenting themselves to the people for support in the next provincial election; two groups that are claiming that they should have the right to defeat the present Government. For what reason, I have never been able to work out, because of the fact that both of those political groups should accept some of the responsibility for the fact that the present Government is in office today. I think, as I review a little back history of the men that sit across the way, and I know a little about the background of many of them in their political life before they were members of the C.C.F. party, some of the things they did before that time, that I could reveal if I had the time here tonight, individually about each one of them as to what their background was politically, and some of those that gave them the closest support in their constituencies before they came into the picture, in 1934 and 1935.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to go back first to the 1920s to begin the history, because that's where the story starts, when Mr. M.J. Coldwell, who is still the leader of the Federal party, entered into politics in province. When the election was held in 1929, those that ran under the same banner with him are responsible for the fact that a Government was organized in this province that, when it went out of office in 1934, left this province in the worst mess that it has ever been in or otherwise. I have said in the past that we can't lay all the troubles of the province at that time at the foot of the Government of the day, but, we can lay come of the responsibility for the fact the so-called Conservative Government formed in 1929 to 1934, did have the support of the group of gentlemen that Mr. Coldwell ran with at that time as a candidate, and he had the support of all the Independents and all those who represented groups in that election, with the exception of the Liberal party.

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, that statement is just not true.

Mr. Gardiner: — That statement is definitely true. Mr. Jake Benson was one of them if you want to know. If you will take your seat and keep listening you'll hear a little more.

Premier Douglas: — The hon. gentleman has no right to tell me to take my seat. I'll take my seat when I am ready.

Mr. Gardiner: — What's your point of order?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

March 7, 1960

Premier Douglas: — I don't need to tell the specimen of humanity over there. I'll tell the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, his statement is completely untrue. Mr. Coldwell at that time was president of the Independent Labour Party and was not in any way associated with the group who supported the co-operative government from 1929 to 1934. This is the sort of misstatement that the hon. gentleman has been peddling around the province for years. It's not true.

Mr. Gardiner: — I don't know how long the hon. Premier says I've been peddling it, but the Premier knows very well that Mr. Coldwell did engage in discussions with Mr. Anderson before that Government was formed, and he did assist. Mr. Douglas wasn't around at the time . . .

Premier Douglas: — It's just not true.

Mr. Gardiner: — There's another gentleman that helped in 1929. He's jumping up, and there's quite a few others across the way, Mr. Speaker, as well, who were mixed up in the big deal of 1929, when the Anderson Government came to power. I could suggest that the main organizer of the Premier of this province was one of the key men in the campaign which resulted in that particular arm of the province, in the election of the Anderson Government in 1929.

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege again. That statement is also not true. The hon. gentleman has made those statements in other places and never had the nerve to make them before in the House. I say to him that no person has ever been an organizer for me who supported the Anderson Government. He has gone further and said in some places that this person was a supporter of the Klu Klux Klan. He was never an organizer in connection with the C.C.F. The hon. gentleman will not make that statement and get away with it.

Mr. Gardiner: — I'm afraid, Mr. Premier, that you will have to prove that I ever made that statement, publicly or any place else.

Premier Douglas: — You are making it now.

Mr. Gardiner: — I am not making it now. I didn't even mention the Ku Klux Klan.

Mrs. Cooper: — You did to me!

Mr. Gardiner: — I never did, to the junior member for Regina.

Premier Douglas: — The hon. member did, to the junior member for Regina. You like those petty little lies, don't you.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I notice this is causing a little bit of concern across the way.

Premier Douglas: — I just don't like those lies.

Mr. Gardiner: — I'm quite certain that if he looks back in the records, he will find out the truth of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, when we continue on from the course that was followed in 1929, we find that between then and 1934 they weren't very well satisfied with the government they helped put into power, so they formed their own political party, and ran candidates under their own label in 1934. Some of those what at that time ran with the C.C.F. party had been members and supporters of the Anderson Government in 1929 to 1934, including Mr. Benson, of course, who was later the C.C.F. member for the constituency of Last Mountain. Some of those gentlemen were supporting the Anderson Government during the five years that they were in office, but in 1932, finally, they formed their own party and called it the 'Co-operative Commonwealth Federation'. That, today, is ancient history.

Now, in 1934, we all remember, they had great ideas of what they were going to do in 1934. They thought they were going to be the Government; but that wasn't the decision of the people at that time. Following that, we find in the history, a very reliable history of the C.C.F. party which was written with the assistance of some of the gentlemen across the way. The foreword in it indicates that the gentleman who wrote this book had the co-operation of the leaders of the C.C.F. movement in this province, and that he was aware of their history and what had taken place with regard to the organization of their particular group. That's how we find that, in 1935, the C.C.F. party carried out that first attempt to gain the support of other political groups. This is the first election in which we find some reference to the hope of the now Social Credit party in Alberta, and the C.C.F. In Saskatchewan, co-operating together to beat the Liberal party, not only here,, but in the federal election in 1935. And so we find that many of the candidates in this province, including the Premier, were actively engaged in campaigning under two banners in the election of 1935; one as a candidate for the C.C.F. party, the other the official candidate for the Social Credit party in this province. That also, Mr. Speaker, is ancient history.

This was the first attempt of the group across the way to bring in all these people, all these people they have been telling us about, they are now going to bring into the now part that they are starting in 1960. Here is another movement, but let me go on from 1935 and we find in 1938, again, and my friends to the left here may know this, that the Social Credit party once again co-operated with my friends across the way in trying to defeat the Liberal Government of that day, in the constituency that I now represent. The gentleman who ran there in 1938 ran under the Social Credit banner; in the election of 1934 he ran in the Moosomin constituency a representative of the C.C.F. party. He came into the

March 7, 1960

Melville constituency unopposed by my friends across the way, or by any other particular party, and he managed to win that seat, running as a Social Credit candidate in the election of 1938. We can look at other constituencies in the province at the time of that same election and the same sort of thing was going on, collusion between my friends across the way and our friends that came in in great numbers from the province of Alberta, representing the Social Credit movement.

Now, this wasn't enough, they thought they couldn't get elected by just bringing in one group and, as they are doing today, they are trying to bring in class groups, but at this time they were trying to bring in political groups into the one party. So, we run on from 1938 and we come to 1944. By this time they had gathered in, not only the Social Credit but they had also gathered in the Conservative party which, of course, many of them had been aligned with in years gone by, as I stated formerly. They had gathered in, in the meantime, the Conservative party in this province, and they even had the former Premier of this province acting as the official cartoonist of the C.C.F. party in the 1944 election.

We could refer to many other examples of the union between the Conservatives, the Social Credit and the C.C.F. party in the election of 1944, but finally, after many efforts, they were successful and today the two political groups that are as responsible as anyone else for the fact that a Socialist Government is in power in this province. The Conservative and Social Credit parties are today saying to the people of Saskatchewan, now you should come along and unite behind us to defeat the C.C.F. Government in this province. They are the ones, Mr. Speaker, who are responsible for the Government we have in office here today, just as much as the C.C.F. organization itself. The only political party in Saskatchewan that has fought socialism day in and day out since this outfit came into the political picture in this province is the Liberal party, and it is the only party that the people of this province are going to turn to in the election in June to defeat the C.C.F., party.

Premier Douglas: — Keep whistling to keep up your courage!

Mr. Gardiner: — My friends across the way talk about renegades. Well, if they want to talk about renegades, I can start in on some of them. The Minister of Social Welfare, the Assistant to the Premier, I can start in on quite a few of them and read their political records down through the years. And we find out that there are other renegades in this province who have changed their political stripes even more than once or twice. One of the most glaring examples of a renegade that I know of is a man who coined a phrase in this province. "You think your way in to the C.C.F., but you are born into the old line parties".

He though his way into more political parties than any man I know of. The first one he thought his way into was the Liberal party. He was a member of the Liberal executive at one time in Moose Jaw, then he ran in the city of Moose Jaw as a Social Credit candidate and I can still remember listening to the radio in 1944 when my friend, the former Attorney General, speaking on the air, thanked the people of Moose Jaw for his election, and said he wanted to thank the electors of Moose Jaw for his election as a Social Credit member for that fair city.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there are renegades around, here is a man just elected as a C.C.F. member in this province, and he thanks the people of Moose Jaw for having elected him as their Social Credit representative, surely this must indicate the political idealism that exists among the members of the C.C.F. party in this House, Mr. Speaker. It is not idealism, it has been opportunism, right down from the beginning. There is no idealism in the C.C.F. party at all. It's all opportunism from beginning to end. I wouldn't even have to settle with the gentlemen across the way. I could go to the former members of the Federal House of Commons and indicate the positions that they have taken down the years in political life, the older members — oh, there may be one or two like my friend for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) that weren't old enough to belong to other political parties, but most of those that were had many experiences — some of them they didn't like. Many of the former members of this Legislature and in the House of Commons, contested Liberal nominations at one time or another; possibly one of the reasons they became members of the C.C.F. party was that they felt that they were turned down by the Liberal people in their constituency.

We have many examples of what has taken place in the C.C.F., among the C.C.F. members in the province. I just want to relate that when they are throwing brickbats at someone else who has thought his way out of the C.C.F. party. It appears that the former Attorney General hasn't any respect for a person who thinks his way out of the party, he only has respect for people that he says think their way in. And, of course, he thought his way in and out of so many parties, that I doubt today whether he remembers what particular party he represented when he sat here in the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in turning to the budget, I don't want to make too much reference to the fact that this is the last budget of the Provincial Treasurer in the province, but I am quite certain that whether he had chosen it that way or not, that the election in June would have taken care of the matter in any case, and would have made it certain that he was presenting his last budget on this occasion.

I can remember during this past year that the Provincial Treasurer made statements throughout the country, joking statements about the deficit financing of my friends in Ottawa; the fact that in Ottawa they had to operate on a deficit and here in Saskatchewan, here in the only province that he knew of, we were operating on a surplus. I wonder

March 7, 1960

if he thought of looking at his figures; I wonder if he thought of asking himself where he was getting the money in order to provide the surplus budget for the people of Saskatchewan. Well, we find, in order to provide the surplus budget that he shown this year, that he is receiving in the neighbourhood (this is the estimate of receipts) of \$8 million more from Ottawa than he had in the previous year. He is also receiving a further federal grant this year, over and above what he received last year, of another \$1 million. The hospital grant estimated for this year, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is \$13,638,000, and if he hadn't had these funds at his disposal and he was to provide the same services as this budget will provide, he would be in the hole \$22 million in presenting his budget this year. On top of that, he has placed, and he has criticized my statement with regard to this before, but it is a new entry in the revenue side of the ledger no matter what explanation he might make for it, but he has to put it there whether somebody forces him to put it there or not, of \$1,600,000 which two years ago didn't appear on the revenue side of the ledger. So there is another \$1,600,000 to add to the \$22 million which would make a total of \$24,000,000 deficit, this present year, if it wasn't for the funds received from the Government that he was laughingly pointing out to the people of this province, was operating on a deficit while he was able to operate on a surplus here in Saskatchewan. I can imagine that it would make it very easy for a Provincial Treasurer to operate in that way with the funds he is receiving from the federal government or will receive in this present year; \$42 million or \$12 million more than the total budget of the last Government that was in office, when they took office in 1945; \$12 million more that they were receiving from the Federal Government under the Federal-Provincial agreement than they were receiving from all forms of revenue when this Government came into office.

There has also been reference made since this debate got underway with regard to the operations of the Crown Corporations in this province. I don't think it needs to be repeated, but I think it should be because of the statements and claims that have been made by some of our friends across the way in regard to the attitude of the Liberal party in this province towards the Crown Corporations that exist at the present time. I think it is only right that a statement of the policy which was laid down by the Liberal party at their convention should be made in this House during this Session, and so I propose to read a statement of faith as far as governments in business are concerned.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Thatcher says he'll determine the program.

Mr. Gardiner: —

"No one fears competition, even from the Government, providing it is fair competition and not a monopoly except in the field of public utilities. The Liberal party will treat the Crown Corporations on their merit. Compulsory features

will be done away with except for the automobile accident provision, that everyone must have Liability coverage in order to give good protection to the public. Any corporation which can operate in open competition with private enterprise and the co-operative movement and is providing a worthwhile service to the people of Saskatchewan, will be retained. Any corporation that cannot meet these standards, except in the direct field of utility and transportation, should be disposed of if that can be done without financial loss to the people of the province. The Government should not be in business just for the sake of being in business, but only enter the field of business when it provides a service to the people which cannot be provided by either private or co-operative enterprise."

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That isn't what Thatcher says!

Mr. Gardiner: — I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer, if he will look at, the policy of the Liberal party, and if he will listen to the statements of our leader, he will know that is the policy that has been laid down by the Liberal party in this province.

Premier Douglas: — He's not bound by that.

Mr. Gardiner: — Now, I think in leaving the question of the revenues and Crown Corporations, we should deal for a few moments with the difficulties that are facing our municipal governments, and also questions of road policy in the province.

We all remember the conference that was held following the last election, and I am not going to make any further reference to it, besides indicating the amount that has already been spent since that meeting was held on the Local Government Continuing Committee and their deliberations. To date, up to the end of January, 1960, \$172,267.83 has been spent in the operation of the Local Government Continuing Committee. Next year the budgetary estimate for this particular work has been increased over past years and it will be some \$100,000. As other speakers have pointed out, to date we haven't had any result, and I am going to state here, whether the Premier and his Government appreciate it or not, that I lay the full responsibility, and I think the people of this province do, on the Government for the fact that no report has been brought down to date. I believe if a report had been brought down, that the Government was afraid that they either had to put it into effect, a program that was suggested by this committee, or a program of their own, after this committee had decided, possibly against the wishes of the Government, and then they would be in political hot water. I believe there is only one reason the Continuing Committee will not present a final report before the election

March 7, 1960

of this year, and that is to save the face of Saskatchewan's present Government.

We, in the Liberal party, feel that there must be a realignment of responsibility between the provincial and municipal and local government levels. We believe that the responsibilities of our local governments should be established in such a manner, and that our finances should be distributed in such a manner that the policies or the problems the Provincial Government and local governments have to deal with, would be divided in such a way that both bodies would carry on the work that was assigned to them without having expensive programs of taxation which would affect the land and property owners in this province. I believe we all feel that one of the most serious problems that we are going to have to face, and one of the main issues, I think the main issue in this election is the question of taxation and I think a lot of the people in the rural areas feel the same way. My friends across the way state that the money they have placed in grid roads and the money they have placed in many of the other services, have stabilized or more, the taxations costs to the people of this province. I wonder if they realize that as well as the increase in mill rates that has taken place since they came into office, the large increase in assessments which has taken place, not only in some of the larger centres that may have had development over those years, but in some of the smaller settlements as well, where they have had reassessments for various reasons, and they have been increased a great deal, and in most cases the mill rate has remained the same because of the provision of extra services. The property tax basis in this province today has come to the point where not only the farmer, but also the small business man in our smaller urban centres finds it very difficult to meet his cost of operation because of the heavy tax load that has been placed upon him.

When we discuss taxation, of course, we always come to the problem of tax for education, because we all realize that today the heaviest tax load that both our rural and urban people have to carry is the tax load that's carried for the purpose of education, I believe. This being the start of Education Week, I think that it is only proper that something should be said in the discussion today with regard to the question of education and the problems that are facing the people of this province. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that there have been some gains made with regard to Government grants for educational purposes. I believe every one of us is prepared to admit, we would have to admit whether we wanted to or not, that educational grants have been increased by the Government. But, when you hear some of them talking about it, you would think they had solved the educational problem. I want to point out just exactly what has happened.

Until four years ago they had done very little towards contributing to the cost of education over and above what had been done before they came into office, as far as school grants were concerned, and the

percentage of the cost of education that they were looking after. I have here the approximate figures from 1946 down to 1957 which indicates that in the year 1954, which isn't very long ago, the grants of the per cent of the total of the revenues received by the school districts in the province is 29.9 per cent; in 1946 it was 24.3, so that in 8 years there was an increase of 5 per cent. In some of those years it went up, for instance, it started up and it went up to 28 in three years and then it dropped down to 26 percentage-wise, and then it went up to 29 and down to 26 the year before, 1953. It was only 2 per cent higher 7 years after this Government came into office. That is one of the reasons why the school districts in Saskatchewan today still have heavy arrears of taxes outstanding, only there are still heavy debts against the school districts, by and large. This is because the Government refused until actually following the 1956 election to accept the responsibility that they had promised to accept back in the election of 1944.

We find that even in 1956 they were only paying 29.3 per cent of the total revenues of the school district for provincial grants. Today the Minister says, when he goes out to the people, we are approaching 43 per cent. Over the last four years, knowing that this problem was coming to the point where the people were no longer prepared to support the Government unless they took some definite actions, knowing that there would be another election coming in four years when they would have to go back to the people again, they realized that they couldn't go on forever to the people saying: "Oh, we've increased school grants; you'd better put us back into office, because those who were concerned with the school problem in this province realized that their taxes were being increased year after year."

Now, I would just like to give you a picture of what has taken place in the last two years, in spite of the fact that the two largest increases in school grants have taken place in these two years: in 1958 taxes were increased in 17 of the larger school units in the province; last year, 1959, there was an increase in taxation in 15 of the larger school units, so that in two years, in spite of the large increases mentioned by the leaders of this Government, the taxes of the larger units have been increased. They haven't been stabilized. I am quite certain, when one looks at the possible increases that are going to take place this year in educational costs, and I think that we are going to have to face them if we are going to have teachers in this province. We are going to have to pay salaries that are at least equal to our neighbouring provinces. I fully realize that we must pay these salaries if we are going to have proper teachers in the province of Saskatchewan. If most of the school districts meet the request that have been made this year, it will definitely mean that in spite of the grants that are being provided by the Government, many units and many school districts will have to increase taxes once again in order to carry out the operations and make possible the best education that we can have for our children here in the province of Saskatchewan.

March 7, 1960

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to make a few comments on health, by following the history of health matters. Prior to 1905, health regions were enforced and Dr. Seymour was appointed Health Commissioner in 1905.

In 1911 the Saskatchewan Anti-tuberculosis League was formed. I made reference to this fact before, that this League wasn't formed by the present Government. The League was here many years before the C.C.F. were ever heard of. It was formed by the people of this province, and it was supported by the people of this province, and their Government, down to the time when the C.C.F. came to office in 1944.

In 1944 the first mental hospital was built at North Battleford, the mental hospital that is still there today. Oh yes, there have been improvements made, but the basic part of the present hospital was built in 1914 when there was a Liberal Government in this Province.

In 1915, not 1950, 1915, the Rural Municipality of Sarnia originated the first municipal doctor system and legislation was further enacted in 1919 by the Provincial Government which would make this possible in all the municipalities in the province.

In 1916 a maternal-child hygiene public health program was formed; preschool clinics were set up throughout the province and, today, sixteen years after this Government came into office, many of the people of the province think that we never had pre-school clinics until the present Health Regions were set up, and here they were established in 1916, and operated from that date.

In 1916 the Union Hospital Act was passed, which allowed groups of municipalities to construct hospitals, and here again I would like to point out one thing: there are many who get up and say that medical services can be operated exactly the same as hospital services, but there is one difference and that is that all of us have always realized that groups of people had to establish hospitals to provide service to the people, but we also realize that the doctor-patient relationship is a relationship of two individuals, one with another, it is an altogether different problem that we have to deal with in the question of medical services and the question of hospital services. In 1919 the Public Health nurses started home nursing classes in the province. In 1919 at least 10 municipalities operated prepaid hospital plans; plans to give hospital services to all the people. There are a lot of people in this province, today, who think we didn't have anything like that. We had prepaid hospital schemes in this province before the C.C.F. party was ever heard of, and in 1919 at least 10 municipalities had already set up prepaid hospital schemes in Saskatchewan.

In 1921 a second mental hospital was constructed in the city of Weyburn; 1921 inauguration of grants for maternity costs for indigent mothers; there is the first grants, possibly, for medical services to the

people in this province by the Provincial Government: inauguration of grants for maternity costs for indigent mothers. In 1923 the Department of Health was established as a separate department under Doctor Uhrich and the activities of the Department were broadened from that time down to 1927, when the Union Hospital Act and the Rural Municipal Act were amended to empower rural municipalities to pay from general revenue the hospital care of its resident ratepayers.

In 1927 the Child Welfare Act provided for the admission of mentally deficient children to the Training School at Weyburn. In 1928, a bill to permit the formation of Health Regions: now, this is something else that is supposed to be an innovation, something that is a first in Saskatchewan by a C.C.F. Government and here the bill was passed in 1928. Many people have forgotten about these things, particularly my friends across the way. And I don't think they like anyone reminding them, but there were others who thought about health services for the people long before they were heard of. The bill to permit formation of Health Regions so that these people in the towns and villages would have health protection, was passed, and the first region was formed in March 1929, known as the Gravelbourg Region. The municipality contributed half the cost and the Government and the Rockefeller Foundation shared the remainder equally. Because of the financial difficulties of the thirties, the plan operated for 3 years and then the region was disbanded. For this Government to indicate that they were the first ones that thought of the formation of Health Regions, that they were the first ones that gave concern to the desires and wishes of the people of this province with regard to medical service, doesn't even bear mentioning because it is so ridiculous, but because of the fact that many in this province don't realize what has taken place in the past, I feel that this review is absolutely necessary.

In 1928 the Division of Public Health Nurses was organized; the Rural Nursing Service was carried on. In 1930 the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission Act and Control Program was undertaken by a Conservative Government. In 1931 the Mental Health was transferred to the Department of Health and a unit was opened in Regina. So there we have the North Battleford Hospital, the Weyburn Hospital and even down to the clinic established here in the city of Regina before the C.C.F. was ever heard of. In 1934 the Health Services Board was created by the Provincial Government and through the drought years it provided financial assistance to doctors, dentists, and hospitals, in order to maintain services. The statue of services resulted in the formation of a Legislative Committee in 1943 and also the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council presented a report in 1944. And then, of course, we came down to the Health Services Act of which we have heard something in the House during this Session: the Health Services Act of 1944, and I don't intend to spend any time on that.

March 7, 1960

Following the election of 1944, the report of the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council was received. Then there is the Social Security and Health Services of the Legislative Committee in 1944. Then we had to pay out — I found out the other day we didn't have to pay out very much and I am quite pleased about that — for the report of Dr. Sigerest who practically backed up everything that was contained in the two previous reports that had been handed to the Provincial Government as measures to be undertaken. If my friends across the way want me to read some of them, I will.

Mr. Cameron: — Go ahead. Shake 'em up a bit!

Mr. Gardiner: — I'll just read a bit of it. Here's the proposed administrative set-up, Health and Insurance Commission. They are talking about a commission they are going to set up this year:

"Health Insurance Commission: The Deputy Minister of Health to be a member ex officio. Members of the Commission to be representatives of eligible persons, medical practitioners, dental practitioners, pharmacists, hospitals, nurses, industrial workers, employers . . ."

They were even going to have labour representatives on this Committee. I haven't heard any reference to labour being represented on the medical committee that is being established. But here in 1944, under a Liberal Government, the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council suggested that representatives of labour should be placed on this Health Commission.

". . . agriculturalists, rural women, urban women and other groups and classes, at least one representative to be appointed from each of the above groups after consultation with representative organizations.

"Administration to be provided from the moneys paid through the Legislature.

"Divide province into regions.

"Establish Regional Offices.

"Divide regions into divisions, each with a divisional office . . ."

and you can go on and on. Then you come to the Saskatchewan legislation, 1944:

"Public Health requirements".

They go into the Social Security and Health Services Plan set down by the legislature of this Province. Practically every measure in it is exactly the same as set down in the Sigerist Report and, of course, he admits that in the beginning. He said that the work of the Commission was greatly facilitated by the act, that surveys of the existing facilities had been undertaken in the past. It wasn't the very far past, just the year before. He said that extensive use was made of the brief presented to the Select Special Committee on Social Security and Health Services in 1943-44, and the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council in 1943-44. That is the statement by Dr. Sigerist, admitting that these two reports actually formed the basis of his recommendations to the Government in this province. And yet this Government wasn't prepared to accept the report of people in this province who had been asked to report to the Government with regard to health services.

No, they had to go and hire somebody from another country who they thought might be better able to advise the people on what to do in regard to health services. That has been their general practice ever since they came into office. They haven't been prepared to accept the knowledge of the people of this province; they haven't been willing to trust to the knowledge the people of this province have with regard to their own problems, and they haven't been able to accept the recommendations of the people in this province when they have been made. They have first to find someone else that they have tamed the best people in the world, to bring in, to advise them before they actually decide that it is the best thing to do.

And so we find in the Dr. Sigerist Report, Health Districts (he called them Health Districts instead of Regions) but, by and large it is exactly the same thing. We find that the mention of hospitals is much the same as in the two previous reports, with recommendations, of course, for assistance, and with the possibility of a Federal Government plan coming into operation which would make it possible in the future to provide hospitalization and health services to the people of the province.

Then, of course, we go into public health services, sanitation, health education, industrial hygiene and nutrition. We find in these various reports, even those made in 1944, by the Legislative Committee, a suggestion of sewer and water for the people of our rural communities way back in 1944. It took this Government, after it came into office, 16 years, and they just got down to the point of saying they think they are going to do something in the coming year for the people of Saskatchewan if they will elect them back into office. Practically every health measure that they have mentioned in the Budget or Throne Speech during this present Session was mentioned in reports presented to the previous Government in 1944, just before they went out of office. It has taken them 16 years to even start the program suggested by those committees, let alone the program that was suggested by the Sigerist Report.

March 7, 1960

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, when we have covered the review and the history . . . Oh, yes, 1947, hospitalization begins under the Provincial Government. There we go! And the next one is 1960, medical services discussed. Medical services discussed, 1960! I have some of the discussion here before me and I think a little bit of it bears repeating, I don't like reading newspaper clipping, but I have a couple here that I think I'll take a few excerpts out of. These are statements made by the Premier in regard to health plans. You know, it always seems odd to me that the Minister of Health isn't making all the statements with regard to the possibility of a health plan for the people of this province. All the statements that have been made have been made by the Premier, almost all, of them, as to what this plan was going to be and how it was going to be carried out. It looks to me like another man, quite a piece from here, 'Little John' down in Ottawa who dictates to most of the members of his Government what they are going to do and then he even gets up in the House and does most of the talking for them as well. I'm afraid our Premier has got into the same rut as far as dealing with questions of health is concerned.

And so we find here, November 20, 1959, the Premier had just returned from his trip to Europe and he was making a statement on health services:

"Mr. Douglas was unable to say whether legislation for a medical care plan would be introduced at the coming session of the Legislature, but he pointed out the last C.C.F. convention had called on the Government to do so."

Now, I am going to say here that anything I have heard of the plan that is supposed to have been placed before us, isn't a plan at all. We find that the Minister of Health in his address the other day said the Government had no preconceived ideas of what this medical plan should be. It's going to make some suggestions to this committee, but the committee isn't going to be bound by the suggestions of the Government. At the same time, in his remarks, Mr. Douglas states that the C.C.F. convention put down plans on what the policy should be and it should be put into effect this Session, but he is not, apparently, carrying out the request of the C.C.F. convention as he states here.

Premier Douglas: — If the hon. member had read the Speech from the Throne he would know that it said legislation would be introduced, if he can read the English language.

Mr. Gardiner: — It says it will establish a committee.

Premier Douglas: — No! Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is misquoting the Speech from the Throne. It does not say 'legislation to set up a committee', but legislation to provide for a prepaid medical care program.

Mr. Gardiner: — I read the speech of the Minister of Health, as I didn't happen to be here that day, and if that's what he said, that you would be definitely laying down the program his health scheme was going to be operated under, and that is what he said, I didn't understand it from reading it. He said that a committee was going to be appointed and the only reason money has been voted in this budget is for the establishment of a committee to consider the establishment of medical services. There has been no money placed in this budget to set up medical health services in this province. There has just been money voted to establish a committee to consider the matter, and I am quite certain, I am stating here now, that the medical men and, I believe, most other people will not be prepared to sit on any committee in this province until the election is over. I think it is quite proper that they shouldn't. They should be completely removed from any political interference when the committee does meet, from any political bias, because of the election campaign which is taking place, and I am quite certain that when this committee does meet following the election, they will make recommendations in such a way that I am certain in my own mind I would not be afraid of providing the people of this province an opportunity to say what type of medical plan they want.

If this committee makes new recommendations, if they make alternate recommendations, then I think there is no doubt whatsoever the people of this province should have the final say as to what plan is going to be put into operation in Saskatchewan. The Liberal party has always supported the ideal of medical services for the people of this province, and they will continue to do so, and at the same time support it in the way and the manner the majority of the people desire to have it put into effect. I certainly think that after the votes we have had in the last few years, and I'll just number them off: one about time; one about eggs and egg boards; one about liquor. We have had three votes since these members were elected at the last election, on three different topics, liquor, eggs and time. I am quite sure that any member across the way would say that this problem that concerns us right now, of medical health services, is more important than any one of those three that we put to a vote to the people of this province to decide what course they wanted to take.

There are two things exactly, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition has asked this Government to place before the people of this province in the form of a plebiscite before putting into effect two of the most important changes that our people have facing them in the next few

March 7, 1960

years, and in both instances, our friends across the way say, "Oh, no, we will leave it up to the people in the election, if they vote us back in, that is what they are going to get; we aren't prepared to give the people of this province the right to say in a plebiscite what type of medical plan they are going to have or what type of local government system they will have after the election in 1960". These are two of the pledges that we, as an Opposition have asked from this Government. They will not be particularly expensive and cost the people a great deal; they won't cost them half as much as most of the commissions they have established to try and decide some of these things. It will not cost nearly as much to have a vote on the problem of local government as it did to have the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life. It won't cost the Government of this province a penny compared to that. It won't cost them a penny even compared to the cost of the Continuing Committee that we have at the present time. And yet, this Government across the way, this democratic Government, say they won't give the people of this province a vote on either a change in the local government system of this province, or a chance to say what type of health system they would like to have put into operation by the Government of this province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the remarks that have been made during this debate with regard to the plank in the Liberal Party platform which states they are prepared to let the people decide what form of health services they will have, I am quite certain that if both the report of the committee that will be set up under the legislation that will be established in this House and the money that has been voted in the budget, that this committee could make its report, in time for a vote to be held in 1960, so that operation of this plan, if it is approved by the people, could get underway in 1961. I am quite certain that when we take over after June that that will be the form that will be followed. The committee will take its report to the Government and then the people will have the final say as to what form of prepaid medical services they are going to have in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in closing. I do want to make reference to some of the costs that have been placed on the people of this province by the present Government. We hear a great deal about some of the buildings that have been built in the province, some of the advantages that have been derived by the people of this province from the funds that have been spent by our Government, but I quite often think that the majority of the funds that have been expended by this Government has been expended for self-glorification rather than for service to the people of this province.

It is only about two months ago that I noticed the report of an address by Mrs. Marshall, who passed away a short time ago, and who was in charge of Oliver Lodge in the city of Saskatoon. She was addressing

a meeting of the elderly people in the town of Melville, and she stated there, with regard to the Geriatric Centre at Melfort, that thousands of dollars had been expended in such a way that if care had been taken in the construction of that building, and others that have been built by this Government, that there could have been today, with the same dollars that have been spent, enough room for all those that are seeking entrance into the, geriatric centres in this provinces and the same type of service provided, at much less construction cost than what has been undertaken by the Government since it came into office.

Premier Douglas: — Who made this statement? Was it reported in the press?

Mr. Gardiner: — The name is Marshall, and it was reported in the 'Melville Advance'.

I think the same thing exists; I was around the province quite a bit, this last year, and I was in the constituency of the Minister of Works (Hon. Mr. Willis), and I am quite sure that my constituency and some others will be quite pleased at the reports he gave to the people of this province about the things that the people of his constituency has had since this Government has been in office. I was in many other centres as well as Tisdale and Melfort, and was able to see some of the construction that has been done by this Government. Now, I can tell them that in the buildings that have been built in this province there has been enough money wasted in their construction. There is enough waste space in them to look after almost all the people that are seeking admittance today to institutions, that need help and assistance from the Government at the present time.

Premier Douglas: — Name some of the buildings.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, I would say for one, the telephone building, here in Regina. There is enough room in the lobby where nobody ever is. I've been there many times and there is not even enough people to fill up that much room in it. There is a waiting room down there with two desks in it that's big enough to hold an army. I think the only time it was full was on opening day, and I doubt if they were able to fill the lobby even on occasion. You can go into every telephone building in this province, and it is exactly the same; there is room for most of the town and the people in the surrounding area to get in at once. Any time I've been in them I've been the only one there making a long distance call from the local office.

The waste that has gone into the construction of buildings in this province, since this Government came into office, I am quite certain that savings of at least \$15 million could have been made in construction alone of buildings, and have exactly the same service to the people as well.

March 7, 1960

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that most of the things that the Government has done have been for self-glorification. They have tried to take unto themselves credit for everything that has been done in the province, everything worthwhile. They've tried to establish themselves as the saviours of the underdog, although it has been pointed out, time and time again, the indications that they are not so. It has been pointed out time and time again that this Government, instead of being the protectors of the underdog has actually been the protector, in many cases, of the privileged.

I might say here, Mr. Speaker, one of the questions I asked in this Legislature since the beginning, was the question of loaning money to theatres. We come back to one of the problems that existed since 1950 and 1951, when they first started to hold out money for people and individuals in this province. I asked two questions: last year one was put on the Order Paper as to what the Department of Highways had paid for some land they had purchased from the Theatre Under the Stars which, of course, at one time was owned in partnership by the Premier of the province and the Provincial Treasurer and some other parties who were all together in that particular theatre arrangement, but, in any case, when I asked that, the answer was just simply 'nil'. I thought, well this is a very generous outfit. They are giving the land away for free. This year, I put in the same question and it was still 'nil', but they put a rider on it. They said: 'the matter is still under discussion'. I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that the matter is going to remain under discussion until the next election is over. I don't know what they'll get when the election is over. We will probably have to decide that when the time comes, but it points up again this problem that arose many years ago, and which has been an embarrassment to the Government of this province ever since it happened. We have been told that we are being unkind for even mentioning the fact, that gentlemen in the Government went into a business and then that some of their friends also went into business in connection with Government, later on, with regard to other deals. But today we find that most of the Theatre Under the Stars, one of the first business ventures of some of these individuals across the way, has proven a flop. Most of it is torn down now; it has gone by the way, and I am quite certain that the Government across the floor is going to go the same way when the election comes about.

Premier Douglas: — You're so windy!

Mr. Gardiner: — It will finally fall down and be taken apart. I am quite certain, when the election comes in June, that the people of this province, when they look back at the record of my friends across the way, the record of their expenditures of public money, the manner in which they have conducted the loaning out of money in this province to individuals and others since they have been in office, when you take into account their promises of 1944 and the unfulfillment of

those promises, when they take into account as well, the truth and record of most of the members of the party across the way and many of their friends who are no longer here, and those who were in the House of Commons as well, when they consider their records and the beginning of their political career, will understand exactly what the Government of this present time represents today. It is not a party that is supporting the underdog, not a party that believes in ideals, but a group of men who have come from almost every strata of political life at one time or another, who have wandered in the wilderness on many occasions. Indeed, our friend from Moose Jaw must still be wandering in the wilderness; he stated the other day that he had only belonged to one political party since 1944. Well, I am sure before 1944 he was wandering in the wilderness and after June, I am sure that he will be back walking in the same wilderness as he was prior to the election of 1944.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that because of the statements, the arguments of our friends across the way, the statements of the Provincial Treasurer when he presented this budget, the arguments that have been placed before the people of this province with regard to the issues in this coming election, there is no doubt, in my mind, that the Government, through this budget, is attempting to buy their way back into power. We find in the agricultural program, as I would like to indicate here now, we find that they have placed the installation of water and sewerage, which should be under my friend the Minister of Health, as far as I am concerned, they put that into the Department of Agriculture. They have also put the South Saskatchewan River Dam, which quite properly should be in the Public Works Department, under Agriculture. They then go out to the farmers of this province and say, "Here, we've increased the budget for agriculture because we have placed in these two branches, that should have been someplace else". I am quite certain they won't be able to sell the story to the farmers of this province, that by those two expenditures of money that they have increased services to the farmer and increased actual assistance, financial assistance, to the people of this province.

I regret, as others do, that the present Federal Government has not seen fit in the last two or three days to provide some relief to farmers in grain payments. This legislature agreed that we are prepared to act on behalf of the farm people of this province; that we are prepared to take some initiative in taking care of the problems of the farm people. I am quite certain that the people of Ontario and of Quebec and the Maritimes, are not going to take too great an interest in the problems of the people of Saskatchewan, when they look out here and say, "Well,

March 7, 1960

this man gets up in the Government of the province and says, we can't do anything. It's up to the Federal Government, is it any wonder that people in the rest of Canada will say to their members when they go down to Ottawa, that Government in Regina refuses to take any initiative, to do anything for its own farm people. Then when you get down there you tell them that until they do, there'll be no assistance coming from the rest of the people of Canada. I think when we get a Government in office in this province which is prepared to give service to the most important part of our economy in Saskatchewan, until we are prepared to do that, we can't expect the assistance we should have from the other people of Canada.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform you that I will not support the Budget.

Mr. G. Herman Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I want first of all to express my appreciation and my respect for you and the office you have held for the last four years in this House. I haven't always agreed, Mr. Speaker, and it is only natural that that should be the case, but just the same, I want to frankly admit that you have executed the duties of your office as well, and even better, than anyone who has been in that Chair since I came into this House in 1934. I hope that in your retirement you will enjoy life and have many, many happy years ahead of you.

I was going to speak of some of the things that my hon. friend for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) has spoken of, so I think I can just discard one or two of my files. Nevertheless, I want to say one thing on what he spoke about: Dr. Sigerist. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in the House and I was part and parcel of all these glorious things that this Government is said to have done. If they have done it, they have built it on what was here. Dr. Sigerist was brought into this province, not for constructive purposes; he was brought in to condemn what we had in the province, but he stayed here to praise what we had. That's the whole thing, he was not brought here to say anything particularly constructive, but he was brought here to condemn the system and the facilities for public health that we had in the province at that time. I am going to repeat again what he said. I have read it before, but I would like to read it again:

"A fine groundwork for health service has been laid in Saskatchewan, "Dr. Henry Sigerist, Chairman of the Provincial Health Survey Committee told the Kiwanis Club, at the luncheon meeting. " The province has a fine health record," said Dr. Sigerist, who is Dean of Medicine at John Hopkins University at Baltimore.

"Dr. Sigerist said that this survey was one of the most pleasant he had ever undertaken in his career. He had had many similar assignments, but this in Saskatchewan differed from those in South Africa and the Balkans; this was one where health services didn't have to start from scratch. "In Saskatchewan," Dr. Sigerist said, "it was a case of bringing existing facilities into more service for more people."

That's a pretty good recommendation, and I just want to say that, it is no credit to this group — I should have called them renegades, Mr. Speaker, because they are the biggest bunch of renegades I have ever seen in my life, all in one place. When I do that, I want to pay my compliments to the gentleman for Moose Jaw who was our Attorney General for a few years. He made a radio broadcast in late 1944, and he said that all the people that did not vote

March 7, 1960

for the C.C.F. were mongrels. That's what he said. I quoted it to him on the floor of this House and the Premier started to get up on his feet, but then he looked over at me and sat down. Then he said, "I could say something about that, but I guess I won't." That's what the C.C.F. think about the people of Saskatchewan. They are mongrels. This was the man who sat in this House. I want to remind them that it isn't dead yet. This man let perjurers and admitted bribers go without prosecuting them. Go back to the Rawluk enquiry and you'll have it. Some day this is going to be brought out in the open. Men die but they leave records, and they are well taken care of. Don't ever forget that.

Mr. Speaker, something has been said here by my friend from Melville on what has been done and on what these health services have been built. I am going to read this to you. It won't take many minutes. It is what the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan and Ottawa did when they were in office so far as legislation is concerned, and many of the services, as he has pointed out, are based on this legislation:

Province of Saskatchewan

Department of Agriculture:

- Land utilization and settlement, soil surveys
- Aids to irrigation
- Land drainage
- Control of soil drifting
- Livestock development
- Dairy herd improvement
- Pure bred boar policy
- Veterinary services
- Control of Animal diseases
- Seed cleaning plants
- Weed control policies
- Poultry care
- Care of bees
- Procuring farm labour
- Tax free gas in farm tractors and engines
- Aid to fairs, societies and clubs

Department of Public Health:

Legislation enabling the establishment of hospitals and union hospital districts, with grants to hospitals
...

which the Premier said was the most generous of any province in the Dominion of Canada. That is what the Premier said.

- Tuberculosis sanatoria
- Cancer care developed including free diagnosis, medical and hospital care

Mental hospitals and psychiatric wards
Municipal medical and hospital care
Mutual medical and hospital associations
Free poliomyelitis care
Free venereal disease treatment
Health insurance act
Medical college at university planned

Social Welfare:

Old Age pensions
Pensions for blind
Supplementary Pensions, Also "rights and Protection of Women and Children."
Votes for women
Marriage legislation
Property rights of married women
Homestead rights of married women
Maintenance of parents
Maintenance of deserted wives and children
Legislation regulating the employment of woman
Mother's allowance
Bureau of child protection
Care of neglected and dependent children
Adoption of children
Care of children born out of wedlock
Care of juvenile delinquents
Prohibition of sale of liquor to minors and of tobacco to persons under 16

Correctional Institutions and Care:

Jails for men
Separate jail for women
Boys' school
Institutions for care of girls

Department of Education:

Establishment of public, elementary, high and vocational schools
Establishment of university
Normal schools
School for the deaf
Education of the blind
Education of soldiers dependent children
Free text books to elementary schools
The book bureau
Grants and loans to university, normal and nursing students
Physical fitness program

March 7, 1960

Department of Highways:

8,000 miles of provincial highways, about the same as at present
1,300 miles of secondary highways
Grants for municipal roads
Built bridges on municipal roads
Ferries
Traffic safety laws and regulations

Labour:

Freedom of trade union association act
Labour relations act
Industrial disputes act
Factories act
Miner's safety and welfare act
Building trade protection act
Waters and servants act
Workmen's compensation act
Minimum wage act
One day's rest in seven
Weekly half-holiday
Apprenticeship and vocational training

Municipal Affairs:

Department of municipal affairs
Assessment commission
Virtually all present municipal services established

Northern Areas Development:

Northern areas Branch
Local improvement districts
Northern settlement program
Special assistance for schools in northern areas
Work program and other assistance to Metis people
Greenlake Metis settlement

Debt Adjustment:

The present government has made no significant change in the debt adjustment passed by the Liberal government, and all revised in 1943. Some changes were made by the present Government which was declared ultra vires by the courts

Natural Resources:

Forest production and conservation
Fish development program

Game and fur conservation
Extensive prospecting for minerals
Geological surveys

Industrial development:

Power and telephone utilities established as public enterprises
The only base metal mine now operating place in production under a Liberal government
Search for gas and oil wells developed but discontinued after 1944 because of Socialist threat
Industrial development board to encourage industries to locate in province.
All but a few of the present industries were established

Co-operatives:

Virtually all the legislation assisting and enabling the establishment of co-operatives
Most of present co-operative enterprises
Credit unions established

Now we have the Dominion legislation. Along the same lines:

Agriculture:

Legislation for the grading and marketing of cereals and livestock
International wheat agreements
Gifts of wheat to needy countries
Freight assistance on feed grains
Storage payments on excess carry over of grain
The Canadian Wheat Board
Agriculture prices support policy
Several uses of deficiency payments as in British Wheat Agreement and payments on several products under price support policies
Development of quota system
Great developments of foreign trade of especial benefit to wheat farmers whose product must be exported
Legislation to continuance of Crows Nest Pass Agreement
Extensive research and experimentation including experimental farms
Extensive development of P.F.R.A.
Establishment of P.F.A.A.
Farm Credit including long term loans, farm improvement loans and loans on grain on farms
Under Liberal government there was developed the best period Saskatchewan farmers ever experienced

March 7, 1960

Social Welfare:

The first old age pensions act in 1927 with several increases in pension.

Since 1952, the payment of 100 per cent of old age security pensions to all persons 70 and over

The payment of 50 per cent of old age assistance to persons aged 65 to 69

Pensions to disabled persons

Pensions to blind persons

Family allowances

National Health:

Extensive research

Since 1948 health grants to provinces

Provisions for payment to provinces of 50 per cent of hospital and diagnostic costs.

Labour:

Department of Labour established

Legislation for conciliation in industrial disputes

Legislation guaranteeing trade union rights and requiring collective bargaining.

Provisions for good wages, hours of employment, and conditions of work under government contracts

Equal pay for women in civil service positions

Unemployment insurance

National employment services

Vocational, apprenticeship and technical training financial assistance to provinces

Industrial Development:

Liberal government policies since the second world war have been designed to encourage the investment of domestic and foreign capital in industries in Canada and to create and maintain a climate favourable for industrial development. This resulted in phenomenal advances with constantly increasing levels of employment and wages.

A few special projects were:

Trans-Canada Highway

Trans-Canada Pipe Line

Eldorado uranium development

St. Lawrence Seaway

Trans-Canada Pipelines is one of the greatest public works that has ever been undertaken in Canada, and it was done by private capital, and will prove to be of great national benefit to Canada in saving foreign exchange for the Government of Canada today, and in the future.

Citizenship and Immigration:

Set up department of citizenship and immigration

Liberal policies of selective immigration have provided Saskatchewan with many of its valued citizens.

Overseas immigration staffs

Financial assistance to immigrants

Assistance to immigrants in establishing themselves in Canada

Canadian citizenship act creating Canadian citizens

Taxation Agreement with the provinces:

Through the federal-provincial taxation agreement and Dominion subsidy Saskatchewan now received over \$35 million a year

We should now add \$8 million to that, Mr. Speaker.

Veterans' Charter:

A series of measures providing the best of benefits and pensions to be found anywhere in the world

Those are some of the things that the Liberal government has done and all these things, Mr. Speaker, are operating to the best benefit of people in Canada and the province of Saskatchewan today.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — This Government hasn't done anything, they have only tried to develop a greater scope, but that isn't what they say out on the hustings. Oh yes, another thing, they built a few more office buildings to house the enormous civil service, I admit, but this group or party or federation (they've graduated into a party now and a wicked one at that) has sat there for 16 years and all it can do to defend its record and try to re-elect itself in the coming election is to go back to the 'dirty thirties.' I'm going to say something about the 'dirty thirties' before I sit down, Mr. Speaker. Everything they can rake up they distort, and I don't approve of distortion in this House. They are trying to scare the people; they are trying to frighten the people into voting for them this time because they know they won't do it any other way.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — You're doing, a good job of scaring them.

Mr. Danielson: — I'm getting too old to scare anybody, I can tell you that. I never had to and I was never scared myself. Mr. Speaker, that's just the time that I begin to fight.

March 7, 1960

I've been sitting here listening to some of these 'wise men', when they have developed their ideas and so on, but there is in public life a certain standard of ethics and honour, Mr. Speaker, which everybody should adhere to, particularly the members and the Cabinet Ministers over there. Today, in their distress in trying to catch a few more votes, a private member of the House, two or three months ago, went down around Estevan and all through the province and on the radio and told them all about that the Minister of Highways was going to tell us last Friday. It's the same thing, Mr. Speaker, and the most despicable thing any member can do. It is an unethical thing for a Minister to give that information to that member without telling him to keep his mouth shut.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they're laughing. The only definite thing that we heard, and this session is about four weeks old, the only definite thing we have heard from the Government side of the House about anything that we can depend on, is that we're not going to be permitted to vote on the Rural municipal Larger Units or on the medical health scheme in this province. That has definitely been said on the floor of this House.

Premier Douglas: — Who said that at Estevan?

Mr. Danielson: — The member for Estevan (Mr. Thorson) your pet, your protege. It's true. I have a report here of what happened in the Manitoba Legislature a few weeks ago. A Cabinet Minister was told to pack his grip and get out when he did something like the member for Estevan, which he did, of course, with the permission of the Minister of Highways. I'll read it:

"Winnipeg, Jan. 30. The resignation of Attorney General Sterling Lyon was demanded in the Manitoba legislature Thursday as a result of statements he made Tuesday night to the council of the Winnipeg suburb of Fort Garry.

Mr. Lyon, who represents Fort Garry in the legislature, outlined proposed public works expenditure when he appeared before the council.

Gildas Molgat raised the matter in the legislature as a matter of urgent, public importance.

He referred to a gross breach of parliamentary practices and procedures and the contempt of the legislature of Manitoba as evidenced by the actions of a minister of the Crown in revealing details of the estimates of expenditures of this Government for the fiscal year starting April 1, 1960, to persons outside this House, before such estimates had been presented to the House.

Liberal-Progressive Opposition Leader, D.L. Campbell, said: 'An apology to this house is not enough'. Premier Roblin should 'consider the matter from the point of view of asking for the resignation of the attorney-general'.

Premier Roblin replied, and the attorney-general apologized, "for not choosing my words more carefully in talking to the municipal council'. His remarks were all made subject to confirmation by the estimates of the department of public works.

"This was what I hoped we might see done in my particular area by 1960."

He made it clear that the plans he spoke of were always subject to what the estimates of the department of public works reveal when they are presented to the house. The inference could be drawn that this was a preview of information to be given to the legislature.

"I regret that this interpretation was drawn. I regret that the words I used were capable of misinterpretation, "

Mr. Molgat said during the one-hour debate that the action had been a 'prostitution of provincial interest for pure propaganda purposes."

I say to you that here is another case of prostitution of public interest. Let me quote something to you again: this is the report of an address by Mr. E.B., Joliffe, and he says this:

"Election bribes are bad enough at any time, but when they became goldbricks, they're insulting."

I say that is what this is, 'election bribes and goldbricks'. Now, I think that this should be brought to the attention of this House and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I think I have done my duty, because that is not the first time it has happened. I read in the paper last fall that something like that happened in Melville. A gentleman went around there and told them all about what the Government was going to do three months before the Minister announced it in the House.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Jimmy Gardiner always did that.

March 7, 1960

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, after 16 years in office, they are getting desperate.

Mr. McDonald: — It's looking pretty hopeless over there.

Mr. Danielson: — I'm not through with you yet. You'll have to get that smirk off your face. I was sitting at home and looking at T.V. and who was on that T.V.? If you need to know, I'll tell you: the Provincial Treasurer. He was going through just the same gymnastics as he does on the floor of the House, when he took up 90 minutes of our time. He goes on and on, trying to tell the farmers of all the blessings that this Government has poured on the farmer. When he got through with that he couldn't think of anything more, so then he started to tell them what a terrible Government we had before they came into power. Then he started in about the Power Corporation and said that the Power Corporation had a \$235,000 deficit when these 'gold dust twins' came in. The fact is, he gets the gold dust; his sidekick gets the sweepings.

In this House, Mr. Speaker, the Premier was holding forth one day and he said \$470,000 was the deficit. He only doubled the amount the Provincial Treasurer mentioned. Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, I said that I wouldn't believe any of these gentlemen on the floor of this House on their oath, and I am more and more convinced that I was right.

Now, let us take a look at the Power Commission. The Power Commission, Mr. Speaker, was started in 1930 . . .

Mr. Loptson: — It was started before that.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, but that was the first full year of operation, 1930. They paid all the interest and established a reserve of \$600,000. Ten years later the total invested in the Power Commission was \$8.3 million. There was a \$440,000 depreciation reserve set up. There was a sinking fund of \$1,746,000, a total of \$2,200,000 or nearly 16 per cent on the capital investment. In December, 1944, the year this Government took over operation, the capital investment was \$9.4 million; reserve depreciation was \$1,050,000; the sinking fund depreciation was \$2,270,000, making a total of \$3,320,000, or nearly 34 per cent of the capital invested.

Then we come to December 31, 1947, and we have an investment of \$21.5 million and a reserve depreciation of \$2,450,000 and a sinking fund of \$3,300,000 which makes a total of \$5,750,000 or 27 per cent of the capital invested. This is the organization that the Provincial Treasurer said on T.V. had a deficit. He's there so the people can look at a good-looking fellow like him. They just reserve him for special occasions.

Opposition Members: — Maybe it's because he's got more hair on his head than you.

Mr. Danielson: — The Provincial Treasurer used to kid me about being bald-headed a few years ago, and now he hasn't got as much hair on his head as I have.

Mr. Speaker, here is a public utility which was not a big operation at the time, but it has grown, and it was in first class condition. I read this in the House three times, and they said, 'Where did you get it?' I said, 'From Mr. Phelps.' I am sure that no person hearing me read this would get the impression that this Power Commission was \$235,000 in the hole, and \$470,000, as the Premier said, is even more silly.

So that's all you can depend on. It's all about the same thing; the same amount of truth in what they say, Mr. Speaker.

I'm not going to say very much about the budget, but I want to say something about the Public Debt and you can contradict it if you can. In 1944-45 to 1958-59 they increased the public debt — I'll repeat this again — they increased the public debt by \$243 million since December 31, 1948. The low point of the public debt was \$144 million at December 31, 1948, and today that public debt is about \$338 million, perhaps \$389 million. If you take the low point of public debt at \$144 million, then you have an increase in the public debt of \$243 million. When you add this to the revenue of \$1,273,920.00, collected by this Government, you have a total of \$1,517,025,000 that this Government has spent in 15 years. These are their own figures: \$1,517,025,000. Then they have the nerve (perhaps I shouldn't say nerve, because they haven't got any nerves) but stupidity and foolishness to stand up there and say, why didn't you do this and that; why didn't you blacktop highways, why didn't you build more public buildings, why didn't you spend more and more and more . . . Any man who has been in office 15 years and spent a billion and a half dollars can try and defend himself with that sort of argument — well I know what I should say, but I can't say it in this House — it's worse than 'stupid'.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — We paid off . . .

Mr. Danielson: — I'll go into that in just a minute. I'm glad you reminded me.

The Minister of Highways has money enough to build a four-lane highway from this great city of Regina to Lumsden. He no more needs that four-lane highway for the next five years than I need five wheels on my

March 7, 1960

car, but he is going to spend that money and there's thousands of places in Saskatchewan where they would be tickled to death to get a few of those millions he is going to spend near the city of Regina. This Government is not for the rural, it is for the cities, it is a city government and they look after the cities mighty well.

Mr. Speaker, every time you mention 'Cancer' in this House they giggle and they sneer on the other side of the House. This gentleman over there was much concerned about birth control a few years ago. He circulated two or three books, about four or five thousand . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I must ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement. I have never yet, in this House or out of this House, said anything about birth control. I must ask him to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr., Speaker, just give me a little time . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I'm sorry, I didn't hear the statement.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I ask for an unqualified withdrawal, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member imputed that I had something to say in this House about birth control and I want him to withdraw . . .

Mr. Danielson: — No, I didn't say that, Mr. Speaker. I said that he had supported and circulated two books. He's responsible for his department. I'll say it was his department, but I thought he was responsible for his department.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I ask him to withdraw what he said.

Mr. McFarlane: — Well, didn't you?

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member stated that, I didn't get it. Is it that the hon. member made a statement concerning birth control in this House?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I never have, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — If you will give me an opportunity . . .

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member didn't make that statement, of course he can't withdraw it.

Mr. Danielson: — I'll withdraw it as far as the Minister is concerned, but his department did. December, 1950, the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. I.C. Nollet, distributed at public expense a book entitled, "Road to Survival". He distributed 2,200 copies of this book at a cost of \$4,950 to the taxpayer. See Journals 1951, pages 171 to 201. You can look it up for yourselves. The following quotations are from "Road to Survival":

"If we are religious, we pray when we should be building dams and setting up birth-control clinics".

. . . and I am not going to read any more. Here is another:

"In December, 1950, Mr. Nollet distributed at public expense 2,450 copies of another book entitled, "The Pursuit of Plenty".

This cost the taxpayer another \$4,770. See Journals of 1953, pages 180 and 208.

With this book Mr. Nollet included a letter in which he said:

"'The Pursuit of Plenty' is a book that will require concentrated and objective study if we are to benefit from the creative thought the author wishes to convey. In this way . . ."

He sounds like the Minister of Education.

. . . the 'Pursuit of Plenty' is a good follow-up to 'Road to Survival'."

You see, they are both connected up.

Opposition Member: — I suggest they withdraw Mr. Nollet.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I must again object to the impression the hon. member is trying to convey. I don't, as he knows, agree with any particular author on any particular subject. The gentleman who wrote this book is an outstanding author and one of the most outstanding agriculturalists on the North American continent. It was a good book . . .

Opposition Member: — You admit it!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

March 7, 1960

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I couldn't agree with you. It's your own smear.

Mr. Danielson: — I haven't attributed any bad motives to him.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They say we ought to be more polite to one another . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Does he want to talk any longer? Mr. Speaker, I have a file here and it deals particularly with the controversy we had in this House with regard to population in this province and thought perhaps this might have had some influence away back on our present day low population.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That's nonsense.

Mr. Lopton: — They went out. They moved out of the province.

Mr. Danielson: — That's the reason I haven't picked up this letter. Mr. Speaker, I think we'll talk about cancer. It not a very pleasant subject, but I intend to, because on three occasions and just the last day or two here, and there was even a reference to it here tonight, to the effect that this Government which sits on the other side of the House is responsible for the institution of cancer service to the people of this province. In a minute I'll show you the reason why I bring this matter up. This is on January 23, 1960, after the Minister of Health had made a speech or two:

"The CCF prepaid medical care program is motivated by the CCF philosophy of helping people help themselves through co-operative effort," Hon. J. Walter Erb, Saskatchewan minister of public health told members of the Regina, Women's CCF club Thursday afternoon at a meeting in the King's Hotel."

I have no trouble to find at all with that subject, Mr. Speaker, but he goes on, and I'm not going to read all of this but just the part I want to bring to your attention. He said this:

"Another aspect of the provincial health program, the cancer services program, was also outlined by Mr. Erb." Just prior to the election of the CCF government in 1943, the Liberal government had passed a cancer services act, which was never implemented. In 1944 the Cancer Control Act was passed by the C.C.F. government and a cancer commission set up. There are now two cancer clinics, located in Regina and Saskatoon, which were set up by the commission for the care and treatment of cancer patients.

Free cancer treatment is available for any person who has resided in Saskatchewan for a period of three months, Mr. Erb said. However, the cancer clinics are only open to those who have been referred there by their family doctor.

That is about all I need to read on this. Since there has been a lot of reference to this particular service, I think, it's my duty to just take a little time off and deal with it.

The first cancer bill was Bill No. 53 of the 1944 regular session — and it was passed and provided that any person who was referred by their doctor could go through that clinic free of charge, but a change has been made since by this Government, and I think that was a step backward when they put the rule into effect that patients who have been referred to the Cancer Clinic by their medical doctor, if they are found not to have cancer, then they have to pay a charge for the service of that clinic.

Premier Douglas: — That is not so. There is only a nominal charge of \$10.

Mr. Danielson: — I think it is wrong. No person knows and the doctor doesn't even know whether a person has cancer or not, and that is the reason we should put a person through the clinic so they can find out.

Anyhow, that was Bill No. 53, and was passed at the regular session in 1944, and it was proclaimed on the 1st of May 1944. That was a Liberal Government then.

Premier Douglas: — And as a Liberal Government it was the end of it.

Mr. Danielson: — The Premier, of course has taken every opportunity to make statements that are absolutely contrary to the facts. For one thing, he has said time and time again, that there was no money voted for cancer.

Premier Douglas: — There was no money spent. Not a dime.

Mr. Danielson: — We'll look after this before we are through.

Opposition Member: — You're through now, Hermy.

Premier Douglas: — There was no money spent, there was no staff set up.

Mr. Danielson: — Don't ever worry about me. If you have any sympathy around for anybody, divert it to yourselves. You're the ones who are going to need it. I think you're much more in need of sympathy than I am. I'm not doing too badly. I'll run a race with you any time, political or otherwise.

In 1943-44, Mr. Speaker, we voted \$761,760 for cancer services.

March 7, 1960

Mr. McDonald: — Did you hear that?

Mr. Danielson: — That was in 1943-44!

You don't want to hear. He knows he's wrong.

This is from Mr. Patterson's Budget Address when he spoke on February 29, 1944. Here is what he said:

"Public Health increases cover the cost of providing medical and hospital treatment for patients suffering from cancer, as announced in the Speech from the Throne. It also provides an amount to cover the cost of work preparatory to establishing a Health Insurance Plan in the province."

Mr. Lopton: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — We put that in, too. We provided money for the establishing of Health Insurance. There was an increase for Old Age Pensions, and so on.

The increases in the vote for cancer was, as I said, a moment ago, from \$76,760 in 1943-44 and in 1944-45, the time Mr. Patterson spoke of, it was raised to \$215,000. There was an increase of \$138,000 in that period 1943-44 to 1944-45 and we started the Cancer Clinic on May 1, 1944.

I want to have the Premier hear this. I wish he'd turn he's turn this way or else go out where we can't look at him. You said that there was no money spent and there was no money to spend.

Premier Douglas: — The hon. member needn't prevaricate too much. I said there was no money spent. I didn't say there was no money to spend.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, these are the facts. Tell him what he said.

Premier Douglas: — I said there was no money spent; there was no agreement entered into with the doctors . . .

Mr. Danielson: — We'll come to that later on. I'll show you what your Minister said about that.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, the report of the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission for the calendar year 1957. Here is from 1932 to 1955, every dollar that was voted and every dollar that was spent each year of that appropriation. When we got down to 1944-45, which is the period in question, we spent for the fiscal year 1944, May 1st to April 30th, 1945, \$158,614.19, and the money voted was \$215,000, leaving a balance not spent at the end of the fiscal year of \$57,000. We voted \$215,000 in 1944-45 and there was a balance of \$57,000 which was not spent by the Cancer Commission in that year.

We spent \$158,614.19, and yet they say no money was spent.

Premier Douglas: — Once again, Mr. Speaker, I didn't say there was no money voted. When we took office, and I've said this to my friend repeatedly, but it hasn't come home to him: no money had been spent, no arrangements were made with the doctors, no provision whatsoever for taking care of, treatment and surgery, for cancer patients. It was set up entirely after we took office. Will you tell our hon. friend that.

Mr. McDonald: — You got caught in your own trap.

Mr. Danielson: — Here is something I want to read to you: An excerpt from the speech, delivered by the Hon., T.C. Douglas, Minister of Public Health in the Debate on the Address-in-reply to the Speech from the Throne in the legislature on Tuesday, February 20, 1945:

"May I say a word for the Department of Public Health. Free medical care, hospitalization and free drugs are now being provided to 25,000 persons, as a right — Old Age Pensioners, blind pensioners, and those in receipt of Mothers' Allowances. We are now giving free care, and treatment of the mentally incompetent. We are now giving completely free cancer treatment, not only diagnostic and X-ray treatment, but also surgery. I remember that the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. Procter) insisted, at the last Session that money had been voted in last year's estimates for surgery in cancer cases. Well, no one in my Department can find it. It is true that \$5,000 was provided, but that was to set up a clinical roster; \$5,000 would never begin to pay for surgical treatment, which even my hon. friend must admit. Now, however, anyone who comes in with a recommendation from his doctor will have free treatment from the day he comes in to the day he leaves."

Here you say there was only \$5,000. Then I go on:

"Mr. Danielson: Are you directly paying for cancer surgery now?"

Premier Douglas: Yes, we are paying the bills sent in to us. We are circulating the doctors in the province, telling them that we are paying for cancer surgery; mind you, that's for those cases which go through the cancer clinics.

Mr. Danielson: How long have you been doing so?

Premier Douglas: Ever since we came into office.

March 7, 1960

Mr. Danielson: Well, may I inform you that I met a man yesterday, who had gone through the clinic and has to go through again, and he said he had to pay.

Premier Douglas: Your information is incorrect. If he goes through the clinic, the doctor is told and the clinics have been told, that it will be taken care of by the Government."

We were up against the same thing, Mr. Speaker, that we were up against between May 1 and July 10, and this man February 20, the following year. He hadn't been able to work out a scheme or a plan or a schedule.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, come now.

Mr. Danielson: — All right then.

Premier Douglas: — We were in full operation by September 1.

Mr. Danielson: — That's all right. You shouldn't talk before you know what you are talking about.

Premier Douglas: — Well, I do know what I am talking about. You've been 15 years trying to untie that tangle you've got into. You haven't explained it to yourself yet.

Mr. Danielson: — All right now, let's continue:

"The money voted for a Liberal Government for financing free cancer treatment, the hon. Mr. Bentley, admitted in 1944, that it was still not until three months after July 10th, that it took office that the CCF . . ."

Oh, I'll read that again.

Govt. Members: — Oh, no!

Mr. Danielson: — You can come over and read it if you want to.

Govt. Member: — We could make a better job of it, anyway.

Mr. Danielson: — I'm telling you gentlemen that if you can catch me in falsehoods on the floor of this House, you point it out to me.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — I don't think the gentlemen there will . . .

Premier Douglas: — You tried two or three tonight.

Mr. Danielson: — No sir! And you know it. You are the ones.

Mr. Bentley admitted it right on the floor of this House in debate, that it was not until after three months, from July 10th, 1944 that it took office that is, since this Government took office that they

". . . had formulated the free cancer treatment regulations. It was not until several months after that, that the arrangement was made on a rate for surgical fee."

I'm not criticizing the Government. We tried to do it, but all the first class surgeons we had in the province were overseas, Mr. Speaker, and these people here would not commit themselves until later, as they weren't qualified and most of the skilled doctors were overseas in the war.

Mr. McFarlane: — They don't tell people that.

Mr. Danielson: — No, they don't tell people that.

We passed the bill; we voted the money; we put it into operation and we voted \$215,000. This was \$57,000 more than needed that fiscal year to operate it.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — And then they go around and peddle this falsehood from one end of the province to the other, they've even got it that they came into office in 1943. Not in 1944, but they've got to make a decent story of it. I can prove it by dozens of documents I have here. What did Dr. Sigerist say? You paid him about \$30,000 to come here and condemn the Liberals. Here it is, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to prove it to you. It's from the Saskatchewan Health Services Survey Commission, Report of the Commissioner, Henry E. Sigerist, Professor, History of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A., October 4, 1944. October 4, 1944. We went out of office July 10th, 1944. Between May 1 and July 10 is about 70 days. From July 10 to October 4 is about 86 days, and they hadn't done a thing then according to Dr. Sigerist, and I know he tells the truth. That's more than these fellows ever do. Here is what he said:

"The Cancer Control Act 1944 foresees that any person afflicted with or suspected of being afflicted with cancer shall be entitled to care and treatment at the expense of the Province. The intention of the Act undoubtedly is to encourage people, and to make it as easy as possible for them to seek the most expert medical advice on cancer. The Act should therefore be interpreted as broadly as possible. The two

March 7, 1960

Cancer clinics, in Regina and Saskatoon, have already rendered invaluable services, and the number of patients examined and treated has increased from year to year. In formulating policies for the future the following points should be considered:

1. While, at present, examination, radiological treatment and hospitalization are provided without charge, cancer patients still have to pay for the cost of operations. This is undoubtedly against the intention of the Act and the cost of operations should be defrayed by the Province.
2. Travelling expenses of patients referred to one of the clinics by a physician may weigh heavily on the budget of individuals living at great distances. The compensation of travelling expenses from provincial funds may therefore be considered.
3. While it is true that a large percentage of all patients examined by the clinics is found to be suffering from other diseases than cancer, yet it would not be sound to make a charge in the case of negative diagnosis. This would act as a deterrent. Accurate diagnosis, in all cases where the suspicion of cancer prevails represents an available public service. The increasing load of work put upon the clinics must be met with an increasing number of personnel."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the cancellation of debts for the rural and local improvement districts during the drought period in the 1930s. From 1934 to 1944, the Provincial Liberal Government had cancelled \$206,225,000 and the Federal Liberal Government cancelled \$215,775,000, in reduction of farm debt through the various loan boards, thus assisting in wiping out seed grain and relief debts.

The total debt cancellation by Liberal governments, Mr. Speaker, compared favourably with the \$8,793,430 cancellations by the C.C.F. Government since it came into office in 1944. Out of this amount, \$7,750,000 was on the 1938 seed grain debt.

honest farmers had paid off their relief and seed grain debts, even after it had been cancelled, but that was paid to the Municipal secretary and then the C.C.F. Government sent out their collectors and took the money from the municipal secretaries. In fact, they collected

hundreds of thousands of dollars from this source — revenues which they should never have had, Mr. Speaker.

During the 15 years since this Government has been in office, it had spent \$1,517,000,000, including \$244 million borrowed principally for the Power Corporation. They have spent all that amount, and increased the public debt by \$243,373,000, making a total expenditure of \$1,517 million, in round figures, Mr. Speaker. Before that period, before 1944, revenues had amounted to \$279 million, or an average of less than \$20 million a year. It's stupid, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and say, "Why didn't you pave more highways. It's worse than stupid."

Mr. Speaker, I think I have proved every statement I have made here tonight, and there is no comeback to it. Statements have been made and are continuing to be made, statements which are untrue and misleading, and which are on the records of this House.

I don't think I have to tell anyone that I am not going to support the budget.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m. without question put.