

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
FIRST SESSION — FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE
4th Day**

Tuesday, February 14, 1961.

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

WELCOME TO GUESTS

Mr. Cliff Thurston (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to draw the attention of the Members to a group of charming ladies in the gallery. They are representing the Grand Coulee Homemakers' Club and I assure them we all welcome them here this afternoon, and hope their stay with us will be enjoyable.

WELCOME TO UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I understand that for a number of years the students from the University have invited Members of this Legislature to be witnesses at their Student Parliament, and I understand that the Legislature has returned the courtesy. I have invited them to come here on the Tuesday and Wednesday following the opening. I am delighted to welcome the students from the University here this afternoon. I must apologize that the weather is not such as they had when they left Saskatoon, but I hope their stay in the capital city will be pleasant.

I understand that later on this afternoon one of the teachers and a class from Buena Vista school, Saskatoon, will also be visiting the Legislature.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would

February 14, 1961

like to draw to the attention of the House the fact that we have in the gallery some students from Torquay who are here with their principal, Mr. McArthur.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CURLERS

Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to draw the attention of the House to a news item on the sports page of 'The Leader-Post' date-lined Saskatoon, that Mike Lacovich and his group of boys from Speers in the Battleford Constituency won the Saskatchewan Curling Championship, and I think I would like to congratulate these boys. They are a fine group of boys, and I wish them luck in representing Saskatchewan for the Canadian Championship on February 20th at Prince George, B.C.

QUESTION RE: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. W.J. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask the Government if we might expect the returns that were not handed down at the last Session of the Legislature to be filed with the Clerk prior to the Turtleford by-election.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, all the documents which are ready will be tabled, and the tabling of them has no relationship whatsoever to the date of the Turtleford by-election. The date of the Turtleford by-election seems to bother the gentleman opposite, but it hasn't bothered the Government at all.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Debate on Address-in-Reply

The House resumed from Monday, February 13th, 1961, the debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords) for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne:

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, first of all this afternoon I should like to take note of the number of students who are attending the Session today from the University of Saskatchewan. I should like to welcome them here on behalf of this group. We know that the young people of today will be the leaders of tomorrow, and we hope that it will not be too long before some of them are sitting in these benches as M.L.A.'s, preferably Liberal M.L.A.'s.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the debate I suggested there had been a number of increases in taxes which had been made by this Government since the election. One of those was an increase in insurance rates. The Premier took me to task for that statement. 'The Leader-Post' this morning carried this story of the exchange:

"Mr. Douglas interjected with a denial that auto insurance rates had been raised, whereupon Mr. Thatcher said the General Manager of the Government Insurance Office had announced they were going to be increased. 'He did nothing of the sort', the Premier snorted."

Well, I don't know if the Premier snorted or not, but he did deny it. I have in my hand at the moment the 'Leader-Post' of January 10th, and I should like to quote from page 3. The headline, 'Auto Insurance Rates Will Increase in 1961':

"There will be modest increases this year in the rates of Saskatchewan's compulsory automobile insurance according to H.L. Hammond, General Manger of Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, in an interview in North Battleford."

A couple of weeks later Mr. Hammond was making another speech, this time in Yorkton. I have a copy of the 'Yorkton Enterprise' in my hand, an issue of January 26th: 'Insurance Rate Boost Confirmed; Details to Come Later':

"Confirmation that insurance rates will be raised slightly by Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office was given here by H.L. Hammond, SGI General Manager, during the annual two-weeks' Agents' Conference last week. Amount of the increase will not be known for at least a month", he added.

February 14, 1961

Of course that month would take it after February 22nd, the Turtleford by-election.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that either the Premier does not know what is going on in his own Government agency, or that perhaps in a very mild sort of a way he is trying to mislead this House. I can't believe he would do that. Or perhaps Opposition criticism has forced the Socialists to withdraw these proposed insurance increases.

Opposition Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Another statement yesterday which I made, Mr. Speaker, was that Liberals were not very enthused about this new power building going up, and I mentioned it was going to cost \$9 million. One of my colleagues suggested to me this morning that perhaps the figure I used was not a correct one. When this building was announced, the Government announcement said it was going to cost \$4 million. A little later when the building was started it would be \$6 million. I phoned around a few places this morning and they said the latest estimate they had was about \$7¼ million. I don't know what the exact figure is, but I will say this, whether it's four million or six million or seven million or nine million, what I said yesterday stands. At a time when the socialists are curtailing a new mental hospital in Yorkton, curtailing grants for hospitals and so on, the people of Saskatchewan can ill-afford a luxury palace for either Mr. Brown or Mr. Cass-Beggs here in the City of Regina.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan on June 8th gave the Liberal Party the task of forming the Official Opposition in this House, indeed the only Opposition. Therefore, I think you would agree our 17 Members have an important task to fulfil. I think that all citizens in this province, regardless of their political affiliations, would admit that good government requires strong opposition. Our function here must be primarily to point out any weaknesses there may be in Government legislation, and from time to time, of course, to suggest alternatives. This, I assure you we will try to do methodically, systematically and constructively. It may be that on occasion our socialist friends may feel that we are being unduly critical.

Speaking personally, I want to emphasize one point. Regardless of any criticisms which I may make in this House over the next four years, I believe one thing very sincerely. That all political parties in this

province have pretty well the same goals and objectives. I believe all parties want to build a better Saskatchewan. I believe that all parties want more industries for this province; that they want full employment; that they want a better deal for our farmers. We differ not so much as to our goals or our objectives; we differ as to the road we should travel to obtain those goals. The socialists say that to build a better Saskatchewan we should travel the socialist road. Here we the Liberals differ fundamentally. We believe that private enterprise and individual initiative can accomplish a great deal more for the people of Saskatchewan than socialism.

Opposition Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, we don't deny in any way that our hon. friends opposite may be sincere and dedicated men and women. But we remind the people of Saskatchewan that history records many instances of individuals who were sincerely dedicated, yet who brought their country to ruin and chaos because their cause was wrong. I would suggest this afternoon that being sincere is not enough, if your theories and your philosophy are misguided.

We think the CCF Party is in that position today. They may be sincere enough, but they are bringing economic stagnation to this province with their impractical theories and their dogmatic socialist views.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, what is a socialist? I have heard many definitions, but I think in Saskatchewan a socialist is a man who has given up hope of becoming a capitalist.

The Throne Speech is an amazing document — not so much for what it says, but for what it does not say. It is long on propaganda, but very short on program.

I am told by the hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and others that this is one of the longest Throne Speeches in all history, and also one of the most barren. I am inclined to agree, from what I have seen of it. About 84% of the words in this Throne Speech are devoted to glorifying the past achievements of the Government. Only about 16% of the words are devoted to the policies and programs proposed.

February 14, 1961

Last week newspaper editors and television commentators described the Throne Speech as flat, unexciting, unimaginative, and so on. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Members on this side of the House certainly feel that this Throne Speech has failed to come to grips with the major problems which are facing this province today such as: Unemployment, municipal finance and reorganization; cost-price squeeze on the farmer; and the medical plan. Most people would expect, I suppose this Throne Speech to read like the victorious and confident statement of a party which just won an election. Instead, it sounds like a funeral dirge. I suppose it is a funeral dirge, because after all this may be the last Throne Speech to be brought down in this House by the old CCF Party, as such.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — The whole tenor of the Speech is defensive. Gone is the old crusading and boastful spirit of the socialists. Instead there is a kind of apologetic, remorseful pleading to the electorate.

Mr. Speaker, the first question I propose to discuss this afternoon is the question of unemployment. Unemployment today, in Saskatchewan, I believe is more severe than at any time since the dirty thirties. The latest figures released by the Provincial Department of Labour show that on February 2nd there were almost 28,000 people unemployed (27,876 to be exact). That is 1,090 more than a year ago. Regina on that date, a week ago, had 7,000 people out of work. Saskatoon had 6,500. Moose Jaw had over 2,300 and Prince Albert almost 3,300. Today thousands of young people, when they come out of collegiate, have to leave the province in order to find employment.

I fear that these young people sitting on my left may find themselves in that predicament in another year or so, unless this Government is changed.

Relatively speaking, and taking into account our lack of industry in Saskatchewan, I suggest that the employment picture is as gloomy here as it is in any province within the Dominion.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the major responsibility for unemployment must rest with the Federal Government. Nevertheless we think there are many places and many fields where this Government could contribute towards a solution of this terrible problem. The Throne Speech

indicates that, in the main, the Socialist attitude to unemployment is, "Let John do it". Only last week, the unemployed in Regina, according to a newspaper clipping which I have in my hand, were going to demonstrate and had asked to see some of the Members of the Legislature. The Government said they would meet them, but not until February 28th.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the major shortcomings of this Throne Speech is that the Government is failing to deal with unemployment. I hope that people in other parts of Canada will take note of that fact. I have followed with real interest some of the speeches made by the Premier and some of his socialist colleagues recently in other parts of Canada as they have taken part in by-elections and gone around Canada trying to sell the so-called 'new party'. Almost without exception, when speaking in other parts of Canada they paint Saskatchewan as the "land of milk and honey".

They argue that most of the problems of the working man are caused by private enterprise, and what they claim are the evils of the capitalist system. They tell Canadians in other provinces that there is an easy answer to this unemployment problem. They say, all you have to do is get rid of the old parties; form a new party; introduce government ownership; bring in social planning, and all will be well.

My old friend, the National Leader of the CCF down in Ottawa has all the answers. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the people of Saskatchewan — yes, and the people of Canada, that in this province we have had a socialist government for 17 years. That Government has experimented with socialism. That Government has tried government ownership, and it has introduced the so-called "planned economy".

Surely right here in Saskatchewan, if the socialists know how to deal with unemployment, they have had ample opportunity to demonstrate that fact, but they have failed dismally and inexcusably. Indeed, instead of having all the answers, there is increased evidence daily, that their policies have aggravated and accentuated Saskatchewan's problems to a point where we may become one of the depressed areas of this Dominion, unless this Government is soon changed.

Recently the Premier addressed the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan Trucking Association, and a report of his speech was carried in 'The Leader-Post'

February 14, 1961

in the issue of January 23rd. Because this speech was typical of many he has been making lately, I would like to quote one or two lines. The heading: "Douglas Outlines Recipe for Revitalizing Economy":

"Premier T.C. Douglas outlined a recipe for revitalizing Canada's sagging economy in a speech to the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Saskatchewan Trucking Association."

Some of the suggestions the Premier made in that speech may have been good ones. I am not going to argue that point this afternoon, but for anyone who read his address carefully, I say that the significant point of his address was this: (1) that every suggestion he made for solving unemployment called for action by someone else — usually the Federal Government; and (2) that he had not one single idea of how his own Government could contribute to a solution.

The Liberal Party thinks the time has come for the socialists to spend less time telling others what they should be doing about unemployment, and more time coming to grips with the problems themselves. It is not good enough simply for the CCF simply to pass the buck. The twenty-eight thousand people out of work in Saskatchewan expect more than that.

One of the reasons for unemployment, of course, in this province and one of the causes of economic stagnation in Saskatchewan, has been the shocking failure of this Government since the war to attract new industry. In view of that failure, I am amazed at the colossal gall of the socialists to put this statement in the Throne Speech:

"Industrial growth in Saskatchewan continues to maintain an encouraging pace."

Mr. Speaker, who finds Saskatchewan's industrial growth encouraging? This is one of the most ridiculous statements ever made in this House. The Liberals have said for years that socialist policies have caused industry after industry to by-pass Saskatchewan and locate elsewhere. The Liberals have said for years that our province has been lagging behind Manitoba and Alberta.

We have pointed out that the Government has consistently frightened away private investment in Saskatchewan. This of course the CCF has denied — no one more vehemently than the Premier. And, Mr. Speaker, in presenting the socialist industrial case, the Premier time and

again has played fast and loose with facts. Out on the hustings — yes, and even in this House he suggested that investors cannot really be afraid of Saskatchewan because they are pouring so much money into the province. In order to prove his case, last year in the Throne Speech he made a statement that in 1959 the capital investment in Saskatchewan was \$620,000,000. More recently in his New Year's message he said this and I quote:

“New Investment in Saskatchewan during 1960 is estimated at \$600,000,000 . . . This indicates the faith investors have in the great future of Saskatchewan.”

The Premier never says so specifically, but he leaves the impression that this is the figure which business and industry have invested in Saskatchewan during the year. But what are the facts? The figure he uses so glibly is taken from a report which is put out by the Federal Department of Trade and Commerce. It is a white paper, entitled “Private and Public Investment in Canada.” Actually, that figure represents not only investment in ordinary industry, it includes for example all the money put by farmers into farm implements and repairs during the year. It includes all the money spent by municipal governments and provincial governments, roads, hospitals, schools and so on. It includes money spent by private investors, stores, houses, apartment buildings, churches, stores and so on. So in other words, when you boil it all down you find that private investors last year, as far as manufacturing plants were concerned, they didn't put \$600 million into this province; they put \$23 million into this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech stated, and I quote:

“During the year, 32 new industries located in the province.”

Just how gullible does the Government think the people of Saskatchewan are? What were some of these industries? Most of them were so small that in any other province they wouldn't even have been counted. Propaganda sheets from the Industrial Development Office lists most of them. Time will only permit me to mention a few of them this afternoon. One of them was a foundry in Lumsden, which turns out bees-wax and religious art objects for Canadian churches. The total employees, I am told, at peak periods — two.

Another industry — I have a copy of it here in my hand for the Minister in case he should have some

February 14, 1961

doubts as to the veracity of my word. A whole page in this bulletin put out by the Government: "Unique Industry in Saskatoon Area Produces Concrete Lawn Ornaments." The story takes a half a page to tell about a resident of Saskatoon who went down to the United States for a trip and saw out on a front lawn some lawn ornaments. He decided to come home and manufacture some himself. According to the bulletin, and I quote:

"... a factory building has been erected at the rear of the family home in the Sutherland area of Saskatoon. The owner designs his own models and makes his own molds."

Total employees — one — the owner, and when there is a peak load the wife also works.

Here is another one: a plant manufacturing septic tanks at Wynyard. According to the report there is a sales office in Saskatoon, Regina and Moose Jaw. The firm currently has five people employed.

Then the July-August issue of "Industrial Saskatchewan" says that a new television tube manufacturing plant is being set up in Saskatoon, and it is claimed that five people will be employed in that plant.

The December 1960 issue goes on to say that a plant to manufacture soap is going to be built in Regina; it hasn't been built yet but it is on the way. That is going to employ eight people.

Mr. Speaker, these are only five industries but they are typical of the 32 that were mentioned in the Throne Speech as being evidence of the diversification that is taking place in Saskatchewan under the socialists. Of course these plants are welcome, but let's not kid ourselves that they represent any very great diversification as far as manufacturing is concerned.

Before the last election socialist cabinet Ministers and the army of political workers they maintain on the public payroll stumped this province telling us that industries were springing up like mushrooms. When the Premier got through with his usual eloquence, many people who heard him said they could see smoke-stacks on every horizon. The socialists have been doing this for years, but I am here today to say that the socialist industrial story has been little more than a mirage. Our unemployed workers of Regina and Saskatoon and Moose Jaw discovered that recently when they went to the National

Employment Offices to seek jobs in the non-existent factories.

Mr. Speaker, 2600 years ago a famous Greek was born. His name was Aesop. He has been known down through history as the greatest of all fable tellers. For 2600 years Aesop's reputation has been secure. But recently it has been challenged — it has been challenged by the Premier of Saskatchewan.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Because the Premier has told fables that make old Aesop look like a piker!

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his colleagues since 1944 have announced new industries as though they were playing the old shell game — now you see it, now you don't. With more fanfare than a circus band, they have broadcast the news of one development after another that never happened. You can find these make-believe industries in just about every other issue of their industrial bulletin.

I want to give the House, and of course the people of Saskatchewan, a few examples of what I mean. One of the industries carried in the October issue of the 'Industrial Saskatchewan' says:

“The Hoesch Werke Company of Dortmund, Germany, is going to build a \$3 million plant in Canada.”

I quote from the Government pamphlet:

“Announcement of the new pipe industry for Saskatchewan was made in August by Premier T.C. Douglas and G.W. Anderson, agent for the German firm. It will be the Hoesch Company's first production unit outside Germany.”

Now, the next issue a month later came out and it has a picture of the Premier sitting on the bull-dozer, turning the sod for this pipe dream. The story on page 8 says:

“At a reception following the sod-turning, Premier Douglas congratulated the Hoesch Company on its promptness in starting construction work.”

They dug a hole — the election was over, and that's the last we heard of the Hoesch Werke Company of Dortmund

February 14, 1961

Germany.

But, Mr. Speaker, in case one plant wasn't enough to win the election the socialists decided they had better announce a second one. I quote again from the November, 1955 issue of 'Industrial Saskatchewan':

"U.S. Firm to Build 2nd Pipe Plant

Formation of a new steel pipe firm to build a plant in Regina, costing over \$3,500,000 is to go into production April 1, 1956 has been announced by the Fluor Corporation Limited, of Los Angeles, Calif."

Further on in the story it was reported that 400 men would be employed. Another socialist fable — no one has heard of that mill since the announcement was made.

Mr. Speaker, probably the biggest whopper of them all was told by the Premier in the 1956 election when he announced the now famous pulp mill for Prince Albert. I would like to refresh the memory of some hon. Members in this House. This is what the July, 1956 issue of the bulletin had to say:

"Saskatchewan's first pulp and paper mill was announced May 31. A big pulp plant estimated to cost between \$50,000,000 and \$60,000,000 is scheduled for construction on a site near the city of Prince Albert.

"Announcement of the largest single industrial project to date for the province of Saskatchewan was made jointly by Premier T.C. Douglas and Robert G. Campbell of Vancouver."

"The mill will employ 3,000 persons." The Premier, incidentally, again had a picture taken signing this agreement. Another socialist fable. No one has heard of that pulp mill since.

But the socialists weren't discouraged when the pulp mill at Prince Albert didn't materialize. Within a matter of months they announced another one. This one was to be in Meadow Lake area. April 2, 1957 — I quote:

"Meadow Lake Area to get \$10 million Pulp Mill"

This time the Minister of Natural Resources got into the publicity.

“An American business group has signed an agreement with the Saskatchewan Government for the construction of a \$10 million pulp mill in the Meadow Lake area”, it was learned Monday.

“Natural Resources Minister A.G. Kuziak confirmed . . .” and so on.

These socialists can tell fairy tales better than Hans Christian Anderson. They tell me that some of the Indians (some of them in Turtleford, incidentally) are still looking around for that pulp mill to get the jobs that were problems them.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has 12 million acres of timber land. Large areas in this province are being left to rot or to burn, while the socialists engage in proverbial fiddling. Last week a Canadian Press dispatch came out of Edmonton, and I just want to quote a couple of paragraphs for the benefit of the Minister of Natural Resources:

“Provincial Government officials describe the pulp and paper industry as ‘the awakening giant of industrial Alberta’.

Among the reasons for the optimism are four projected new pulp mills, representing an estimated investment of more than \$125 million.”

Well, they have been getting quite a few of them and when my friend, the Minister, was asked to comment on why Alberta could get four new pulp mills, and why Saskatchewan could not get any, what did he say? High freight rates, long distances from markets are the major obstacles. While Saskatchewan gets socialist promises, Alberta and Manitoba are getting the pulp mills.

Here is the next fairy tale that I would like to tell you about — coming from the Premier again:

“200,000 Plant for Production of Mobile Homes to begin operation in Weyburn early in 1958.

Production of mobile homes in Saskatchewan is to start early in 1958 at a new factory in the City of Weyburn.

Premier T.C. Douglas announced that L & C Trailer Co. Ltd., had chosen a Saskatchewan location to manufacture complete home trailer units for an all-Canada market.”

February 14, 1961

This report points out that the new industry initially will employ some 75 workers, but gradually get up to 125. Well, that factory, as far as I can find out was just also a figment of the Premier's imagination. I have asked a number of people down at Weyburn if they could tell me where it was, and they had never heard of it.

The 6th never-never factory I think we should mention is the Truck & Body Company up in Saskatoon which appeared in April, 1958 issue of the Government pamphlet:

“The manufacture of truck and van bodies in a Saskatoon Plant, marks the start of still another new industry in Saskatchewan . . . name of the new firm is “Larmak Industries Limited.”

I checked both the telephone directory and the city directory, but I couldn't find anything about Larmak Industries Limited. So I wrote a prominent lawyer in Saskatoon and asked him to try and trace it down. Here is what he wrote me:

“So far as I can find out, a firm under this name has never operated in Saskatoon.”

I charge that this is one more story put out by the Government Industrial Development Office, which is eyewash.

In November, 1956 the Government pamphlet beat the propaganda drums to announce a new blockboard industry for the Sturgis area. I quote the bulletin:

“Two million dollar Blockboard industry to be established near Sturgis. Saskatchewan's newest forest industry, a \$2 million blockboard plant, is to be constructed next year at Sturgis . . .

An agreement has been signed with the California group for construction of the plant. The new project was announced by Resources Minister A.G. Kuziak, November 9th.”

the plant, said the report, would employ between 60 and 70 persons. For two years we heard nothing of this plant. For two years I am told the people of that area looked for their first new factory and nothing happened. But then another election was around the corner, so in their 1958 issue of 'Industrial Saskatchewan' the socialists announced that plant all over again. That

is just what they did in their April, 1958 Bulletin, but this time they said, “we’re not just going to employ 60 or 70 men, but 250 men and women.” This is what the Bulletin says:

“Construction of the new Blockboard plant will begin by July 1st, 1958. It is expected to be in operation by early spring of 1959.”

But despite that announcement the plant remains another CCF dream — or maybe I should say a CCF night-mare!

Mr. Speaker, the next never-never factory I want to mention is really a dandy — one of the fables concocted by the Premier just before the 1956 election. I quote ‘The Leader-Post’ of March 24, 1956:

“Beet Sugar Refinery Interested, says Douglas”

“Moose Jaw — An unnamed beet sugar refinery company is conditionally willing to build a \$30 million plant in Saskatchewan, said Premier T.C. Douglas, addressing the Provincial CCF Nominating Convention in Moose Jaw, Thursday night.”

Five years have passed — we have heard no more of the beet sugar industry.

The Premier got a lot of propaganda mileage also, as I recall, out of those iron ore developments at Choiceland. According to the story, the potential is almost unlimited — the mines may employ hundreds and hundreds of men. Speaking in North Battleford a year ago according to ‘The Leader-Post’ February 1, 1960 (by coincidence, of course, just before the election) the Premier said:

“If the Choiceland iron ore deposits prove practical to mine, it is possible that within a decade Saskatchewan could become the Pittsburgh of western Canada . . .”

Well, it could be, but we are still waiting to see the first person employed by this so-called “New Pittsburgh.”

In March, 1958, the Government’s organ ‘Industrial Saskatchewan’ announced that a new dye-casting factory would be in my home city of Moose Jaw. According to that story the factory would be in production by the summer of 1958. I wish the Premier or the Minister of Public Works would tell me where it is. I wrote the

February 14, 1961

Mayor the other day and he had never heard of it.

When the Premier starts talking about potash, though, that is the time when he pulls all the plugs. Three years ago in his New Year's message, the Premier said this, according to 'The Leader-Post', and I ask hon. Members again to note that it was three years ago:

“One of the highlights of the New Year in Saskatchewan will be the start of Canada's first potash production.”

Not many months ago during the election campaign he had potash mills strung across this province all the way from the Alberta border to the Manitoba border. Saskatchewan was going to be the new potash capital of the world.

February 2nd, 1957, according to 'The Leader-Post', the Premier told reporters this:

“When Saskatchewan's infant potash industry gets rolling, it is expected to provide direct and indirect employment for 12,000 persons” Premier Douglas said, Friday night.

Is it any wonder we say Aesop has a new challenger in the telling of fables?

Typical of some of these potash stories that have been going around in the Government pamphlet here, from the Town of Melville: The heading: '\$25 million Potash Development in Prospect for Melville Area':

“A \$25 million potash development is being planned for the Melville area of Saskatchewan. A drilling program will get underway this summer to test for the best location. Robert G. Campbell, Vancouver, announced that potash withdrawal rights had been obtained . . .

“Mr. Campbell and a group of associates have also announced plans to establish a pulp and paper mill in northern Saskatchewan.”

I asked a lot of people around Melville if they knew anything about a potash plant, and again most of them have never heard of it.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I have spoken about long enough on these industries, although there remain one or two things I should say. As far as potash is concerned we have two plants in this province. Neither one of

them is in production, and several of the potash companies that were exploring a few years ago pulled out of the province. The Government has soft-pedalled the technical and financial problems harassing these two plants.

Some months ago, the industry submitted a brief to the Government. They asked for co-operation and help in solving some of these problems. What happened to that brief. It got lost in the bureaucratic maze of some Government department.

All hon. Members will recall the trip which our hon. friend, the Premier, made a year or so ago to Europe at the taxpayers' expense. The hon. Members will recall that when he returned he announced that British and Italian interests were interested in establishing a petrochemical industry in this province. I am told that the press conference to get that bit of fiction across to the voters was as big as some of the conferences called by the American President. But that's the last we've heard about the petrochemical plant!

In both Alberta and Manitoba, petrochemical industries have been established to produce a large range of products from petroleum. Saskatchewan has all the raw materials necessary for such an industry. But this is one more field where the socialists have given us promises while Alberta and Manitoba get the industries.

I have in my hand another press release made by the Premier. "Light Fixture Plant to Open at Weyburn", says the headline:

"One of Canada's leading manufacturers of lighting fixtures, Electrolier Manufacturing Company Ltd. of Montreal, has chosen Weyburn for an extension of its operation into western Canada.

Premier Douglas made the announcement Thursday evening. The Company's program calls for a start of actual fabricating in 1960."

The story says that 50 or 60 people will be needed at once. Well, I checked last week in Weyburn. I wrote an old friend of the Premier's, the former Mayor, and I said: "Could you bring me up to date on this plant." This is what he wrote me, and I have his letter in my hand:

"There are four persons employed at the present time. According to my information there has been no manufacturing carried on, but the company has been operating as a distributing point for the parent company down in Montreal."

February 14, 1961

The socialists announced in April 1958, in their propaganda sheet, a \$500,000 forming mill to manufacture metal buildings would be formed in Regina. It had an appropriate name — Miracle Buildings Limited. But the miracle never happened; the plant never did get off the ground.

Something else puzzles me, Mr. Speaker. I have been trying very hard to locate all these Japanese industries which we heard so much about a year ago. Why for a time there was nothing in the local papers but announcements made by one socialist or another, particularly the Deputy Minister of Industry, telling us about all the factories that were going to come to Saskatchewan from Japan. I think the Deputy Minister even took a trip to Japan. I suppose a trip on the taxpayers — to pin some of them down. Where are these Japanese industries? Like the sugar refinery; like the pulp mill; like the iron mine and so many others; gone with the wind!

The City of Saskatoon was supposed to get a \$3 million distillery. That one turned out to be a lot of moonshine, too. Well, that's the way the story goes, Mr. Speaker. One could go on and on because there are a good many more of these phantom industries which have been announced by the socialists — only to vanish into thin air.

I say that many of these stories have been little more than a hope and a promise. Socialists have been using these deceptive announcements to create the fiction that thousands of new jobs have been created under their regime. Official figures show that the insignificant number of new industries that have come to this province since 1944 even failed to maintain employment in manufacturing industry at the same level it was when the CCF took office. Who has been responsible for the industrial fiasco in Saskatchewan? Who has been in charge of the industrial portfolio most of these years? The Premier himself!

Only about a year ago, as the picture got worse steadily, did the Premier quietly unload the portfolio. The new Minister put his chest out; he was quite flattered; he thought he was being given something. At first out on the hustings he started to make the same old socialist propaganda speeches. All is well: Saskatchewan is leading the way, and so on. Then suddenly at the year-end he changed his tune. For a socialist, he made some amazing admissions. According to newspaper reports he is quotes as saying at the year-end: "In beginning new

industries,” the Minister cited, “there are certain obstacles,” and he woefully offered a series of excuses as to why Saskatchewan wasn’t getting any industries; high freight rates; small population; great distances involved in hauling goods from the market of the primary materials; and a lack of capital.

Mr. Speaker, Alberta and Manitoba have the same physical handicaps, surely. They have high freight rates, they have a small population, they have great distances, yet, they are getting six and seven times the amount of primary industry that we are getting.

Liberals have been saying for years that there is a lack of investment capital in Saskatchewan. Of course there is. We are glad that the Minister of Industry has finally wakened up to that fact. We’re going to let the Minister in on a little secret. There will continue to be a shortage of investment capital in manufacturing so long as this Government treats private enterprise as though they are part of an Al Capone crime syndicate. And I’ll go further, there will continue to be a shortage of industrial investment in this province so long as we have a socialist Government.

Mr. Speaker, what’s the CCF answer to the charge that we are lagging behind industrially. Well in measuring economic progress, and I’m sure the Premier tomorrow afternoon will do this, the socialists like to compare the picture in Saskatchewan today with what it was back in the depression years and in the war years under the Liberals. Why? Because any other comparisons makes their efforts look feeble and ineffective. In the past, out in the hustings, sometimes they’ve got away with those tricky and superficial comparisons. But today, Saskatchewan citizens are not satisfied with that kind of a game. The whole nation, indeed, the whole world has progressed since 1944. Our people want to know how Saskatchewan has progressed since 1944, as compared to the rest of Canada, particularly as compared to our sister prairie provinces, Manitoba and Alberta. When that kind of a comparison is made, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan certainly does not appear in a favourable light.

Since the end of the war, Canada, by virtually any statistical standard, has grown more rapidly, perhaps, than any other nation in the world. Thousands of new factories have been built. Hundreds of thousands of new jobs have been created. Yet it is difficult to find one industrial comparison where Saskatchewan compares favourably to other provinces. Take factory output — Last year, 1960, Saskatchewan’s factory output was

February 14, 1961

\$340 million dollars. One of the highest in history. Manitoba, however, had \$815 million and Alberta had \$900 million.

As for new investment in manufacturing, Alberta last year had \$118 million, Manitoba \$52 million, while Saskatchewan ran only a poor third with \$23 million. Probably one of the best measures of progress in manufacturing is the number of employees engaged. And as I say, across Canada since the war hundreds of thousands of new jobs have been created. Now, what about Saskatchewan? The CCF came to power in 1944. I have heard the Premier time and again discuss the figures that I am going to place before this House. So I have the official D.B.S. figures of manufacturing industries of Canada. When you turn to page 22 you find that in the year 1944 there were 12,361 persons employed in manufacturing industries in this province. The 1960 figures are not available from D.B.S. They are not yet ready. I did the next best thing possible, I went down, as the Premier at one time suggested I should do, to one of the Government's own agencies, The Economic Advisory and Planning Board, and in essence I said, "Can you tell me how many employees you had in 1960, here in Saskatchewan, in manufacturing." they replied, "We can't give you the exact figure, but we can give you an estimate that we believe is almost accurate." What was the figure they gave us for total employees in manufacturing? I have the sheet in my hand from the Government's agency — 12,300. Now what is the significance of those figures, Mr. Speaker? It means that today 17 years after the socialists took office we have fewer people engaged in manufacturing than when they came into power in 1944. Yet they boast of new industrial development. Is it any wonder that our young people have to leave this province to find a job? D.B.S. figures show that only Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island have fewer people engaged in manufacturing than Saskatchewan. In the case of Newfoundland with about half the population, the province has only a handful fewer.

So anxious are these socialists to show that there has been some industrial development in Saskatchewan, that they actually name seven companies in the Throne debate — companies that were established in 1960. I added up the capital investment of those companies. Do you know what it came to — \$3,550,000.00. Even my socialist friends would surely admit that that's a pretty feeble effort. For this petty figure we need a special Minister — for this we need a Deputy Minister and a special staff — for this we need an Industrial Development Office, which this year will cost the taxpayers \$180 thousand dollars.

Compare that puny effort with what's been going on in Alberta. I've got a copy here of Western Business — last September — and it lists some of the industries that were established for the first time in Alberta — just for 8 months. Page after page of them. I'm not going to bore the House which reading them, but I am going to mention a few of them: Gas Processing Plant, B.A. Oil, \$19,500,000; Camrose Tubes Limited steel tubes — \$10,000,000; Jefferson Lake Petrochemical, \$10,000,000; Shell Oil Refinery — \$10,000,000; Firestone Tire and Rubber, Calgary — \$7,500,000; Canadian Oil Refinery — \$7,000,000; Consolidated Mining and Smelting — \$5,000,000; Goodyear Tire and Rubber, \$4,500,000; Inland Cement, Edmonton — \$4,500,000; Canadian Chemical, Edmonton — \$4,300,000; Dow Chemical — \$3,000,000; Canada Packers, Lethbridge — \$1,000,000. I could go on and on. As I say, there are many more.

I say again, last year, new industry in Alberta amounted to \$188 million, in Manitoba \$59 million, and in Saskatchewan under the socialist a poor \$23 million dollars.

In passing, Mr. Speaker, there is one socialist habit, I don't want to appear nasty, but I feel it is my duty as Opposition Leader, to mention it — the practice of Cabinet Ministers and top civil servants taking trips overseas and elsewhere at the taxpayers' expense. Repeatedly Ministers have made these jaunts in the past decade, using as an excuse the fact that they were searching for new industries. But the new industries never seem to arrive. Travelling to promote industry may be in some cases justifiable, but where these trips yield nothing but propaganda and free vacations, I think it is high time this kind of freeloading was stopped.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now, I have been speaking about manufacturing. Figures for all industries reveal pretty well the same situation. The uranium area in the north is in trouble. There is a good deal of talk as men are being laid off in the north, that Uranium City may soon become a ghost town. The socialists haven't even made a token gesture to help out Uranium City. I suggest they might take a leaf from Premier Frost, and emulate what he's doing in the Blind River Area.

What about oil and gas? Oil and gas production, increased modestly in the past year, yet the industry is providing fewer jobs for people than a year ago. The

February 14, 1961

oil and gas industry is laying off personnel, laying off employees, at an ever increasing rate. I have yet to meet a single oil man who had a good word for the oil policies of this Government. Several years ago the Liberal party warned the CCF that their policies would have harmful effects to the industry. Yet nothing was done about it. Recently we have seen dozens of oil companies pull out of this province, lock stock and barrel, and move to other provinces where the political climate is more favourable. Exploration work in oil and gas today is at a standstill almost, in this province. Mr. Speaker, Oilweek of February 6th, and I have a copy in my hand, indicates that on that date there was only one geophysical crew left in the whole province doing exploration work. There were 50 in Alberta, 29 in British Columbia, 8 in the North-West Territories. Hundreds of thousands of acres of freehold land, that the farmers up to that time obtained revenue, have been dropped. The farmers have lost that revenue.

I could mention forest production also. 1942-43 forest production was 63 million cubic feet in Saskatchewan. 1958-59 under the socialists it was down to 19¼ million cubic feet.

Mr. Speaker, the lack of industrial development has had many ill-effects on our economy. One of the most serious has been the manner that it has curtailed population growth. I think every hon. Member knows that since 1944 most of our provinces have gone ahead by leaps and bounds as far as population is concerned. Canada as a whole has grown by 51%, B.C. has increased by 75%, Alberta has gone up 62%, Manitoba by 25%. Only Saskatchewan under the socialists has virtually speaking, stood still. It has gone up about 9%. That is one of the reasons why in the next federal redistribution we will likely notice either three or four fewer seats at Ottawa.

If socialism has so much to offer the people of Saskatchewan, why is it that the cream of our people, hundreds of thousands of them, have left in the past 15 to 17 years? This Government has succeeded in doing something that no other government in the civilized world has succeeded in doing. It has stifled population growth in the middle of great national prosperity.

Now Mr. Speaker, what is the reason for the lack of development? Why have we lagged behind Alberta and Manitoba. In my opinion, of course, there is only one answer: the CCF attitude towards business and industry.

We must realize that there is one fact overshadowing all industrial development in Saskatchewan, and that is the fact that we have a socialist Government whose fundamental ideology is opposed to private enterprise. Naturally, private enterprisers aren't anxious to come into a province and put their money into it where the Government is pledged to eradicate the whole system.

I charge this afternoon, that the impractical theories of the CCF caused millions of dollars of investment capital to avoid this province. This face above all others has caused Saskatchewan to have under the socialists the poorest record of manufacturing expansion in the Dominion. I am going to go further, I suggest that until we get rid of this socialist Government we must expect Alberta and Manitoba to continue to expand at our expense. I hope people in other parts of Canada will study the socialist record, because it demonstrates with hard irrefutable facts the futility of socialism. I don't think there are many people who study that record who will be very interest in the New Party.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the most contentious issue in the province today, the problem of municipal reorganization. For some years it has been evident that the socialists wanted to introduce some kind of a county system, regardless of all opposition or any opposition. It appears that overwhelming opposition to this plan in the country has come as somewhat of a shock to the socialist, but I think they are still determined sooner or later to proceed. The Throne Speech made only a vague reference to municipal reorganization. It said that the report of the Continuing Committee would be received at a later date. I repeat today what I said last week: I believe that for one reason or another the Continuing Committee report is not being brought into this House until after the Turtleford by-election.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — It is an open secret the Continuing Committee will recommend either a county system or a modified county system. It will also recommend that a vote be permitted on only which of those two systems our people want. Well I can tell you, Sir, that kind of a vote will not suit the Liberal Party.

Our people would like to know just who started all this agitation for the county system. Obviously it wasn't the people. Last June we had a provincial election. Why did the socialists not make this one of the election issues, if they were determined

February 14, 1961

to proceed. Why did they wait until after the election to disclose their plans. Only one reason — because they'd have been trimmed if they had.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — In recent months this Government has spent thousands upon thousands of the taxpayers' money, although they say an economy drive is necessary, disseminating propaganda promoting the county system. They have used every possible media including radio, television, newspapers; they have set up rural committees, continuing committees and so on. The propaganda hasn't been impartial; it hasn't been analytical; it has been completely one-sided. It has been designed to saturate the public mind with the need for the county system or the larger municipal system. Somewhere along the line the socialists seem to have blundered, because the people of Saskatchewan today are up in arms over this issue. They are determined that they will not be regimented. We have seen something like a grass roots insurrection. We've seen something like a rural revolt. Most people will agree that there may be some merit in larger units, but the socialists, by the method they have used in proceeding, caused a great deal of apprehension and odium in the rural areas. Over the past few months I've talked to many farmers on this issue. They seem to have many fears but one stands out above all others. Farmers remember that the larger unit system as far as schools were concerned, meant very substantial higher taxes. They fear that larger municipal units may mean the same thing. I can tell you that regardless of politics, farmers in Saskatchewan today are fed up with higher taxes, and if the larger county system means higher taxes, they don't want any part of it.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Certainly there were many people who felt that about all that came out of the meetings of the Continuing Committee with the public was a definite understanding that if this system was brought in the new proposal would cost more. If the Government hasn't got money now to increase municipal grants, where is it going to get them after it redraws the boundaries.

People of Saskatchewan would also like to know why this Government refuses to give the people a plebiscite. Why do they refuse to let the people decide whether they

want this county system or not? Some people say it is not practical. Well this Government thought the liquor question was important enough for a plebiscite, the time question, the marketing of eggs and so on. I suggest that this issue is infinitely more important. The socialists refuse a plebiscite for only one reason, because they know it would be defeated if it went to the people.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Last November and December when at meeting after meeting of the Continuing Committee, it became increasingly evident that this Government was going to ride rough-shod over all opposition, when it became evident that the Government had no intention of permitting a vote, officials of the SARM took matters in their own hands. They called on the local municipalities to conduct their own vote. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question of the right of the municipalities to follow that procedure. The right was conferred on the rural municipalities by the Municipal Act of 1960. The results of those votes were unmistakable. Municipality after municipality overwhelmingly defeated any suggestion of larger county systems. Not one single municipality in this province to my knowledge voted in favour of the larger units. Personally I think the SARM officials should be commended for having found out what the people of this province really want.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — It is quite interesting to see the way the Premier spoke a few years ago before an election about this problem. According to 'The Leader-Post', March 5, 1959, addressing the convention of the SARM he said this,

“The provincial Government would accept the wishes of the rural people. No arbitrary action will be taken by the Government, nor will any pressure be exerted to bring about changes, either in the structures or the boundaries of local government.”

That, of course, was before the election. Pretty soon after the election when the SARM went ahead, the Premier said the votes were a waste of time, and he said 'they didn't have any value.' Well, Mr. Speaker, what is the attitude of the Liberal Party? The Liberal Party on this question of local government has many

February 14, 1961

times stated both inside and outside the House that they are not opposed to municipal reorganization, so long as a vote of the ratepayers concerned is taken first.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — But we are unalterably opposed to any kind of a scheme being rammed down the throats of the people whether they want it or whether they don't. Surely, if local government reorganization is going to be put into effect, it is important that it is based on the well-considered support of our people.

Mr. Speaker, merely altering boundaries isn't going to get to the crux of the municipal problem in Saskatchewan. Since the CCF took office land and property taxes have tripled. We think what is needed is a fairer sharing of the tax dollar between the federal, provincial and municipal governments.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — This year, under the Dominion-Provincial agreements, Saskatchewan will receive, I think, in the neighbourhood of \$44 million dollars. Liberals say a much larger share of that money should be passed on to municipalities with no strings.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — We think that kind of assistance would do much more to relieve the tax burden than redrawing the boundaries. I can assure the House, I can assure the province that one of the first major objectives of a Liberal Government, when we form it in three years, will be to implement policies which will permit farm taxes to be reduced in the rural areas.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — In the meantime I would suggest that the people of Turtleford have a major responsibility. Let them on February 22nd tell this Government in no uncertain terms that they do not want regimentation on the municipal question. Their vote against the CCF candidate can make that issue crystal-clear.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I know that many hon. friends opposite in their caucus have not been enthused about the way this matter has been pushed by some of the ‘higher-ups’. I know that some of the hon. Members wish they could get out from under this policy. The Opposition is going to give them a chance. We are going to move an amendment to the Throne Speech.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, move, seconded by the hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) that the following words be added to the Address:

“But this Assembly regrets that Your Honour’s advisers have failed to provide assurance to the electors concerned that they will be given a vote on the question of whether or not there should be any basic change in the organization of local government.”

Mr. Speaker: — I have possibly a few reservations in regard to the admissibility of this motion, but with the Assembly’s consent, I will allow the hon. Leader of the Opposition to continue his remarks, and take the motion into consideration later.

(The debate continuing on the motion and amendment):

Mr. Thatcher: — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure when you study that motion with your usual impartiality you will find it is a very good motion, and is in order.

Mr. Speaker, I come to a matter which was not mentioned in the Throne Speech — the so-called “New Party”. Over the past few months there has been a very significant change in the political picture of Saskatchewan. During the June election, Liberal speakers out on the hustings repeatedly warned the people of Saskatchewan that the CCF Party, as such, was on the verge of extinction. We suggested that because of the dismal failure of the socialists to sell their party across Canada these past 27 years, that the hierarchy was proposing to scrap the old CCF and form some kind of a new party. We also warned that the new party which, when it was formed, would be formed by an amalgamation with the Canadian Labour Congress, and it would inevitably be dominated by union officials, some of whom might not even live in Canada. Many farmers are dubious. I have some come to me after meetings, and they would say: “Tommy Douglas is too smart to go for that kind of a deal.”

February 14, 1961

Well, the provincial election was only over about two months when on August 9th the CCF Party held a national convention in Regina. What was the main business? The New Party formation! The delegates voted overwhelmingly to proceed with the formation of the new party. What did this mean to the people of Saskatchewan? It means that agricultural Saskatchewan, after next August which is the date of the forming of the New Party, will be governed by a party which, in reality, is a Labour party. Mr. Speaker, Liberals are not anti-labour, nor would we condone anti-labour policies, even though our socialist friends may say the opposite. But we feel very strongly that neither the interests of this province, nor the interests of this country can best be served by a party which makes its appeal on class prejudice.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — The people of Canada have always opposed class distinction. We don't think the CCF are doing a useful service to our province or to our country by trying to introduce it.

I can tell hon. Members opposite that there are certainly a great many trade union leaders, and rank and file members, who are not overly enthused about this proposed merger. They believe that when unions are politically independent they are wooed by all political parties who aspire to office. They are afraid that if they become members of a small political party, particularly a socialist group, then their influence with other parties will be dissipated in advance.

Most trade unionists know that under private enterprise the workers of Canada and the United States have achieved the highest living standards in the world. I am quite sure that most of those trade unionists will not be anxious to give up those living standards for the control and the regimentation of socialism. We Liberals believe that labour needs all the friendship and all the assistance it can get, from men and women of all political parties. It will have these in increasing measure if it maintains its freedom to give its support where that support will serve the common good. So I say that many trade union members are apprehensive today about this merger.

But if trade unions are apprehensive, I can tell you that the farmers of Saskatchewan are much more suspicious, and believe me they have reason for that suspicion. They know that in the New Party labour would

have an overwhelming majority of the members. I suppose the farmer would be out-voted by 10 to 1, it might be 15 to 1, I don't know, but certainly the farmer would be a very junior partner. The people of Saskatchewan have heard our friend, the Premier, out in the hustings, so many times, I've sat on the platform myself and listened to him, and he's had a famous saying, "He who pays the piper calls the tune."

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, in the New Party, it is a well known fact that labour is going to be putting in most of the money, whether the members like it or not, and I can tell you a lot of them don't like it. So, if we are to believe the Premier, labour will be calling the tune. Will that tune be satisfactory to the farmer? Mr. Speaker, the CCF claim that the interests of the farmer and the interests of the labour groups are the same. Some of those interests are identical. We all have some interests which are identical, but farmers know that on many occasions their interests may be just exactly opposite. A series of events happened last year, last November — December which made the farmers rather think that this could be so. Last fall, in Saskatchewan grain quotas and grain deliveries were at a very low ebb. Our elevators were jammed to capacity because of slow export sales. Just at that time a number of unions in Canada chose to go on strike and tied up shipping on the Great Lakes just a few weeks before freeze-up time. Now I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that just when Canadian Durham wheat was moving into European markets in unprecedented quantities, it was moving in competition with American Durham wheat. We stood a chance because of that strike of losing some of that market. The strikers weren't much concerned, and neither were the socialists opposite us. I didn't read one single newspaper report of any protests made on that strike on behalf of the farmer by any of socialist leaders.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Then in early November the elevator employees in Vancouver went out on strike. That of course tied up shipments of all grain going to Vancouver. Well, we Liberals asked the federal Government to take some action, because we knew that there were Japanese ships in the harbour of Vancouver, who had to go down to Seattle to pick up grain, rather than wait for a settlement of this strike.

February 14, 1961

What was the attitude of the Socialists? When the Premier was asked to comment on the strike, he said this, and I quote from the Regina Leader Post:

“The grain companies have exploited farmers in the past and it is possible they may be exploiting the workers now.”

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Who were these grain companies, about which the Premier complained? One was the Alberta Wheat Pool, another was the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, third was the United Grain Growers. How were these farm owned co-ops exploiting their workers? Before the strike, the minimum wage of sweepers was \$4,900 and the average wage was \$5,100. When the Liberal Party chided the Premier for failing to take a stand on this issue, what did he say — “The Liberals are trying to create a phoney issue.” Those farmers who were on a 300 unit quota didn’t think it was a phoney issue.

Then on November 15th, the railroad employees announced the non-operating unions were going to go out on strike. Such a strike would have paralyzed the whole railroad system. Coming as it did on top of the other strikes, it would have worked havoc as far as the farmer was concerned. So once again we protested to the Prime Minister, and asked him to take action. I think most of us were very glad that he did take some action to prevent another strike. What did the socialists say about the strike? The Leader Post reporter went to see the Agricultural Minister on November 16th and I quote from the, (yes he’s up in Turtleford today, but he can maybe find this out later.) The Agricultural Minister said: “It is too premature to comment on the affects of a non-operating strike.” Our socialist Premier took the same attitude, he said, and I quote the Regina Leader again: “The matter is not under provincial jurisdiction.”

Since when did our Premier become too timid about commenting on matters under federal jurisdiction. I’ve known him for a long time. That’s about all he has done for 25 years — give gratuitous advice to Ottawa. I say that on this grave issue, where the very economic life-blood of the farmer was at stake, our Premier had no comment while the strike was on. It was a matter of federal jurisdiction.

Well, Mr. Speaker, CCF leaders continue to insist that the economic interests of the farmers and trade union are identical. Last year we saw socialist leaders

trying to ride two horses going in different directions, and most farmers know that that is a pretty hard thing to do. But, I think it will not go unnoticed by Saskatchewan farmers that during those strikes, rather than antagonize labour votes, CCF politicians for the most part maintained a profound silence, and when they had to choose between the farmer and labour, they chose labour. It is small wonder that the farm unions don't want to have very much to do with this New Party.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that Liberals have tried to build their party on a foundation which includes men and women of all economic circumstances, men and women of all races, all religions, of all creeds. We favour equal treatment for all individuals in all groups, and we favour no special treatment for any individual or any group.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I concede that the Premier is a very wily and a very able politician, but I also suggest that even he with all his abilities cannot sell a straight labour dominated party to agricultural Saskatchewan. Today, as this Throne Speech is being debated, the mask is off. The pretence is over. The CCF party is being scrapped by its own members. Why? Because the movement has failed. In my opinion the formation of the new labour-dominated party will ultimately mean the death-knell of socialism in this Province. It will fail here, as it failed in Great Britain, as it failed in Australia, and has recently failed in New Zealand. I believe even the Premier recognizes the fact, and I suppose that's one of the ideas, or one of reasons why he is toying with the idea of going down to Ottawa. Whether he stays or whether he goes, I don't think will make too much difference. In the long run the CCF is going to go out of existence. I think his departure will simply hasten the socialist collapse.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Yes, and you have taken 15 years too. Of all the people to talk about promises that weren't brought in. You were going to eliminate the education tax, now you are going to put it up. You were going to give free medical services, now you are going to put extra taxes on and so on. Don't you talk about forgotten promises, I know too much about yours.

February 14, 1961

Mr. Speaker, if any medical scheme is introduced into this House, which is economically feasible, practical and within the ability of the taxpayer to finance, it will receive our support. But, in any legislation, we feel very strongly that there must be real and genuine safeguards against run-away costs. Of course, we will reserve the right to criticize details on the legislation. Now that does not mean to say that we favour a state medical plan that would make the doctor a civil servant, or deprive the patient of freedom of choice of doctor. On the contrary we would oppose that kind of a scheme with everything we have.

During the election campaign Liberals suggested that before any scheme was adopted there should be a province-wide plebiscite held. Why did we take that position? We felt, prior to the election, and we feel today, that before the Saskatchewan taxpayer is asked to undertake the awesome burden of a medical plan he should be consulted. The amazing feature of the socialist plan is that nobody seems to know how much it's going to cost. The closest I was able to get was a speech the Premier made in Estevan in the last election. He said at that time that it would likely cost about \$20 million. That is a staggering sum of money, but I wonder if even such a sum would cover it. We remember that when the hospitalization plan came in, it was supposed to cost \$5 million. This year, it's costing \$33½, and, of course, the plan would be in real trouble had the federal Government not come to the aid of the plan with \$13½ million last year. We know too, that in Great Britain when they brought their plan in, it was going to cost, I believe, 70 million pounds. Today it's costing 800 million. All of these social welfare schemes, once they have started, have a tendency to go up very rapidly as far as costs are concerned. We fear the same sequence of events with the CCF medical plan. All social welfare measures have to be paid for, and the medical scheme can only be financed from the pockets of the taxpayers. So we took the position in the last election, that the first duty of the Government is to find out what a medical plan would cost. Then knowing the cost they should find out what taxes would be needed to pay the bill. Then they should give the information to the people honestly and accurately and leave the question up to them to decide.

Mr. Speaker, on election night the Premier went on the air to say that he believed he had been given a mandate to proceed with the medical plan. Well I don't know that 41% is a mandate. As a matter of fact 59% of the people voted against the Government, so, if you want to work it the other way 59% voted against the medical plan. During the campaign, while the Premier was looking

for votes, he made this statement. I quote the Leader Post of June 1st:

“Answering a questioner at North Battleford Mr. Douglas replied that his Party would put the medical plan through, if 51 per cent of the electorate voted in favour of the CCF.”

He was far short of his 51 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, there have been several major developments, as far as medicine is concerned, since the provincial election, which make many people wonder if it would be wise for the Government in the next few months to rush head-long into any prepaid compulsory plan.

The first is the deteriorating financial position of the provincial treasury. An economy drive is supposed to be underway. I've told that the grant to the University has been cut by \$350,000 — my source is pretty good, I think it is accurate. I read the other day that the Yorkton Mental Hospital is being postponed. Grants for hospitals have been curtailed. We know that trimming expenses in the Government's last resort, when the taxpayers can no longer stand trimming. That's about the position the CCF is in today. Tax increases have been announced recently, without, I may say, the approval of the Legislature. I mentioned some of them yesterday. The hospitalization tax, insurance rates, telephone and so on. Let's not forget that our provincial debt has gone out of all reason. Our gross provincial debt \$140 million to \$400 million. I'm waiting for the Provincial Treasurer (\$405 million is the latest figure) to get up and say, well that isn't really all debt. Some of it's dead-weight debt, some of it is self-liquidating debt and so on.

Mr. Danielson: — Dead-weight's disappeared.

Mr. Thatcher: — Yes, the dead-weight's disappeared, that's putting it mildly. I say then, Mr. Speaker, that there are indications that when the new Provincial Treasurer brings down his budget he could have a deficit. Of course he may juggle his figures around so much that he doesn't end up with one, but if he doesn't do the usual socialist juggling he is likely going to have a deficit. If on top of that deficit we have another \$20 million expenditure for the medical plan, what taxes are going to be raised? I think this should be clarified before Turtleford.

Is the sales tax going up from 3 to 5 per cent? Is the gasoline tax going up? Is the motor license tax going up? Will land taxes be affected? How much of a head

February 14, 1961

tax are we going to need? I wish the Minister of Health and the Premier would answer some of these questions. It is quite certain that some taxes are going up if we get a bill for \$20 million for a medical plan.

What is the second major development, since the election? The Conservative Government at Ottawa has set up a Royal Commission to study the whole field of health. They suggested at least some Cabinet Ministers have suggested that likely their party will go into the next election with some kind of a scheme of prepaid medical care. And, of course, hon. Members know that at the last federal convention in Ottawa, the Liberals adopted a program of prepaid medical insurance.

And so, Mr. Speaker, since these are the only two parties which have any chance of forming a federal Government, no matter which one of them attains power, we are likely to have a medical scheme at Ottawa within a year or a year and a half. In our opinion there are a number of advantages to having a prepaid medical insurance plan emanate from Ottawa. The main advantage, of course, is that a federal plan would be backed by the resources of the nation as a whole. We could have prepaid medical insurance on a federal basis without a sales tax of 4 or 5 per cent, without a high head tax, without increased gasoline taxes or motor license taxes, without maybe even increased liquor taxes, without straining the very solvency of this province.

At this moment, a provincial committee is studying the whole problem. There are some very reputable and very capable citizens sitting on that committee. There are others, indeed a majority, however, who, we regret, were appointed for purely political reasons. The federal committee will range further than this. Its approach will be on a national basis. Well, these two developments that I have suggested, Mr. Speaker, the financial position of the province, and the developments at Ottawa, give added emphasis, in my opinion, to the need for caution, commonsense, and careful consideration in approaching a medical plan.

There have been suggestions that the CCF late in this Session may rush a program in, or they may call a special Session. I think such a course would be fraught with dangers and pitfalls. It could be adopted for one reason, and one reason only: because the socialists wanted to present a *fait accompli* at the founding convention of the New Party; because they wanted to advance the fortunes of the New Party in the next Federal election by boasting that they had the first medical care plan.

Liberals think that this question is far too important to be treated on the basis of political expediency, rather than in the public's interest.

Mr. Speaker, I think we live in a wonderful province, one of the richest in all Canada. We have fine land, rich natural resources, wonderful people. But in 17 years it has been unmistakably demonstrated that these resources will never be developed under a socialist Government. Under this administration our province remains a shell, while the rest of Canada goes ahead. Mr. Speaker, as hon. Members know, some years ago I left the CCF Party. I did so because I concluded socialism wouldn't work, because I concluded that socialism was ruining this province of Saskatchewan. Recently there have been some people who have suggested that the Liberal Party is veering off to the left — that the Liberal Party may become too socialistic.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Where are you going next, Ross?

Mr. Thatcher: — Well Mr. Speaker, and I say this to the Attorney-General, any man can make a mistake, but no one but a darn fool will continue doing so.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, as I say some people have suggested that the Liberal Party is veering to the left. This I do not believe. Speaking personally, I did not leave one socialist party to join another socialist party, and so long as I may be the leader of this provincial party, any influence which I may have with this group will certainly be used to see that we travel, as Mr. Pearson put it, the middle road, neither to the left nor to the right, but forward.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Liberals believe in social security, certainly, but we believe in social security without socialism. We believe in social welfare, but we believe in social welfare without regimentation and without control. Let no one make any mistake, we believe in private enterprise, because, as I said earlier, we know that private enterprise has given our people the highest living standards in the world. We believe that any Government should have sound business principles because before any Government can give a dollar to one person, it must take that dollar

February 14, 1961

away from some other person. Now because of the split private enterprise vote in the last election, this socialist Government is able to maintain its grasp on power for another Session. During that time we shall be in opposition. In opposition we are going to do all in our power to urge a return to commonsense administration.

Among other things we shall advocate an end to costly socialist experiments which have drained off millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. We shall press for a halt to the skyrocketing provincial debt with its ever-increasing interest charges. We shall press for a more aggressive drive to curtail unnecessary Government expenditures and a balanced budget under normal circumstances. We shall advocate an all-out bid to attract new industries, by tax incentives, competitive power rates or any other desirable measure. Yes, my friend, and I can tell you we could get more industries in a year if we formed a Government than you have had in the last 17 years.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — We shall ask the Government to make a major effort to try and get back the oil and gas companies which have left; try and introduce sensible regulations which are competitive with other provinces. Maybe the oil companies then will be interested in coming. We shall advocate that a genuine effort be made to reduce farm costs by introducing such measures as permitting farmers to use purple gas in their trucks, abolishing the mineral tax, increasing municipal and school grants and lowering property taxes.

As the gross product increases we shall urge (if it does increase under this socialist Government) that at least a portion of the additional revenues be used for general tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan could have a progressive and prosperous future. Saskatchewan could catch up economically to Manitoba and Alberta. But these goals cannot be realized in the stifling atmosphere of socialism. That is why, for the next three years we shall continue to suggest to the people of Saskatchewan that it is time for a change of Government in this province.

Mr. Speaker: — I would like at this time to take a few minutes to consider the admissibility of this amendment. I will read it again:

“But this Assembly regrets that Your Honour’s advisers have failed to provide assurance to the electors concerned that they will be given a vote on the question of whether or not there should be any basic change in the organization of local government.”

In considering amendments, there are certain basic principles that must be taken into consideration. One that I would think might have some application in regard to this would be the rule regarding relevancy. It is a little hard to discuss relevancy in regard to a debate such as the Speech from the Throne, but Mr. Beauchesne does not exclude an amendment to the Address-in-Reply from the necessity of being relevant to the motion. I do believe there was a reference in the Speech from the Throne in regard to reorganization of local government, so I think this amendment would qualify in that regard.

I have some reservations with regard to the possibility of this matter being under the consideration of a committee at this time. But this Committee is not a committee of the Legislature, and neither is it a judicial committee. What is requested here is something, I believe that could quite conceivably be done by the Government, without any direct reference as to what is being considered by this Committee at this time. My first reaction with regard to this amendment is that it should be admissible at this time, but being a most inexperienced man in this position, I would be glad if we could take a few minutes of the time of the House to hear any representations from older Members here in regard to how they feel pro and con with regard to the admissibility of this amendment.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, like yourself I am relatively new in this House. I do find that the rules here are quite different than they are in the House of Commons. Realizing that I am a bit green, I took this motion down to the Clerk and invited him to make sure the motion was in order. My understanding is that he thought it was in order, and therefore I am hoping that Your Honour will feel the same way.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to argue extensively on this resolution, or this amendment to the motion on the Speech from the Throne. The only point I would raise, and I suggest Your Honour might take it under

February 14, 1961

consideration, is that there is a Continuing Committee and part of the terms of reference of that Continuing Committee is the form of consultation which the Government should hold with local governing bodies regarding any reorganization which the Continuing Committee may recommend. Therefore the Government could not properly, without discourtesy to the Committee, announce prior to receiving a report from the Committee, what form of consultation the Government intends to take. We have a perfect right, when we get the report, to accept or reject the form of consultations they may recommend. They may recommend a vote or some other form of consultation. We would have a perfect right to accept it or reject it, when we receive it. But to say before we get the report that we will adopt a form of consultation of our own seems to me would be quite out of order. Therefore I simply suggest that the amendment is questionable to me, since it asks the Government to do something which we could not do, having due regard to the situation in respect to the Continuing Committee.

I leave this for your consideration, I don't feel strongly about it and I am perfectly prepared to vote on this motion at any time.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, on this point I wish to draw your attention to the fact that this Committee is not a Legislative Committee, as has been pointed out. This Committee is not going to report to this Legislature at all. This Committee is simply set up by the Government in the Government's own interest. The Government may reject all its proposals; it may consider them; it may table the report; it may not table the report. The Government could, at any time, set up any Committee it pleases and thereby, if this were a ruling, merely because a Committee is set up we couldn't discuss medical coverage; we couldn't discuss a million and one topics that might be under consideration by some Committee that the Government has set up for its own aid.

I don't think there is any analogy between this and a judicial decision which has not been handed down. That type of thing, of course, is covered by Beauchesne specifically. Beauchesne says this has been legislative procedure throughout the years that anything that is before the court is not to be discussed in the Legislature. Certainly this is not the case of any Committee. The Committee's activities have been discussed extensively and perhaps excessively in this House, if Your Honour will remember, and I do not think there is any point in the objection. The fact that any matter is under study

or discussion by a Committee or a Commission that is not reporting directly to this Legislature should not, I think make that topic taboo for that reason.

I submit this amendment is quite in order on that ground.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I at no time suggested that the existence of a Committee would prevent discussing the subject matter which the Committee has under consideration, but rather this is not what this is doing. This is asking the Government, or criticizing the Government for not making an announcement regarding something which it has referred to the Committee.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier speaks of reference he made to the Committee; he speaks of local government organizations and made the statement that the references were made that they would consult the local government organizations. This amendment does not mention local government organizations; it mentions the electors, as such. Now the present Government here can consult with those organizations before it holds a vote. This particular amendment does not mention local government organization; it is strictly that a vote be taken of the people before any basic change is made in local government, and so I think that the amendment is in order.

Mr. Speaker: — I might say at this time that the question that any Speaker must decide in regard to these things is not the advisability or the feasibility of a motion in itself. He must take into consideration whether it is admissible on strictly formal legal grounds in regard to this Legislature itself. I think, if my memory serves me correctly, we have had motions of this type before the House in the last two or three years since this Committee has been set up, and I think that the precedent we have had set in that regard would indicate that this amendment would be admissible, so I have taken into consideration all these things and I will rule this amendment to be in order.

The debate will continue on the amendment and the main motion, as has been the procedure here in the past.

February 14, 1961

The debate continuing on the motion and the amendment:

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, in commencing the few remarks I intend to make before the adjournment, may I extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my heartiest congratulations on the high office to which you have been elected by the Members of this Assembly. They say that it is a fitting tribute to the high regard in which we all hold you. We are convinced that you will discharge your duties with fairness and impartiality to Members in all parts of the House irrespective of their political affiliations.

I too would like to extend a word of welcome to the university students who are here today, and to say how pleased we always are when they come down here at the beginning of the Sessions to pay us a visit, to listen to the debates on the Speech from the Throne. I don't think our debates are as much fun as theirs. But this is part of the penalty paid for getting older and having responsibilities. We do hope you will get some insight into the democratic processes which are here in our parliamentary system of government. We do hope that some of you will be back to visit us again next year.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to extend my congratulations to both the mover and the second of the motion, the Member for the Battlefords and the lady Member for Saskatoon, who have discharged the responsibility which was given to them, I thought, with very great credit, both for themselves and for their constituents.

I was particularly interested when the Member for the Battlefords spoke about the close interdependence of farmer and labourer. I noticed that that was one of the first things which the Leader of the Opposition picked up, in making his remarks yesterday. He indicated, while the Member for the Battlefords thought that labourer and farmer could work together, he certainly must have forgotten about the grain handlers' strike, and the railway strike and all the other disputes that have gone on. In his remarks today you will notice that the Leader of the Opposition is still holding to the old thesis that the farmer and the labourer can't work together because their interests are diametrically opposed. I assume, therefore, that anyone that is for the farmer must be against labour, and anyone who is for labour must be against the farmer.

The Leader of the Opposition hasn't yet told us which he's for. Is he for the farmer and against labour, or for labour and against the farmer? No, as a matter of fact he wants to be with both. This afternoon

he said, “Why, the highly paid trade unionists don’t want to get in with the farmer. That wouldn’t be good for them, and these farmers certainly don’t want to get in with labour.” In other words, when you are with the labour people you tell them that it would be bad for them to be with the farmer, and when you are with the farmers you tell them it would be a terrible thing to be with labour.

This is what the Liberal party has done for decades. The farmer and the worker can join together to be the stool pigeons of the Manufacturers’ Association, and the big-wigs of the Liberal party, but they can’t work together for their own interests, and to further their own economic destiny.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — The Leader of the Opposition has been trying to make his case about the farmer and labour not being able to get along, and he took a little time with the grain handlers’ strike. We even had a railway strike. Talking about phantom industries. We had a phantom strike here today — the railway strike also took place. I didn’t think it had, but it apparently took place, in his experience. He said he protested and why didn’t the Government protest? What was his protest? What did he ask the Government to do? Well, he said he was glad the Prime Minister did what he did. I notice that Mr. Pearson wasn’t glad of what the Prime Minister did. I noticed that when the Leader of the Opposition came out and repudiated Mr. Pearson’s statement, there was a pretty chilly atmosphere around Ottawa. I notice when the Liberal National Rally was held, that suddenly the doctor suggested the Leader of the Opposition should stay in Regina. Now that Mr. Pearson has an LLD., I presume that it was Dr. Pearson who prescribed staying in Regina.

As a matter of fact, of course, any time people withhold labour, whether they are farmers or workers, somebody gets hurt. But, Mr. Speaker, not since Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves has anyone been compelled to give his labour, if he wants to withhold it; he has a right to bargain for his produce! What other recourse have railway workers got? For seven or eight years they have been trying to get their dispute settled. They agreed some years ago, at the suggest of Mr. St. Laurent, to postpone their dispute. A Conciliation Board was set up. The Conciliation Board made a recommendation for very modest increases — less than half what the men had asked for, and they accepted it. The Company refused to accept. The men could sit for the rest of their lives, with the cost of living going up and their income standing still, and accept this!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — But the farmers are doing it.

February 14, 1961

Premier Douglas: — Exactly what the farmers are doing, but the answer is not to say to the farmer: “You take smaller prices” and to the wage-earner, “You take smaller wages.” That’s the Liberal policy.

Mr. McDonald: — Nonsense!

Premier Douglas: — The hon. Leader of the Opposition objects to Ottawa policies because the price of butter is too high. The fixed price, or the floor price for butter is too high.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — You don’t even buy it.

Premier Douglas: — You are objecting now because workers’ wages are too high. This is not the solution to the farmer-labour problem. In a country which can produce on as gigantic a scale as this country can, the solution is an adequate parity price for the farmer, and a decent wage for the worker.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — The Liberal Party has never had the courage to face up to it.

I was interested in noticing that when the Leader of the Opposition was replying to the Member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), he said that the Government did not need to be so pleased about having been returned because of their program. They only got 41 per cent of the vote, 59 per cent of the population voted against the Government, and that he and the party opposite spoke for that 59 per cent . . . I was interested in that. I thought Mr. Martin Pederson and Mr. Martin Kelln would be glad to know that the Leader of the Opposition is now speaking for them. He certainly suggested that. I knew he tried to join these other parties. But he has no authority to speak for them!

He said “We speak for the 59 per cent. We speak for all the free enterprise groups, as Turtleford will show.” Mr. Speaker, I have made it a practice in my political life never to start crowing before the egg is laid.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . you never laid the egg.

Premier Douglas: — But I remember not so long ago we had another by-election in Kinistino. According to the ‘Star-Phoenix’, (June 1959)

the Leader of the Opposition said: "The eyes of all Saskatchewan will be upon the Constituency of Kinistino on June 3rd, because the results of this by-election will indicate the probable fate of socialism in this province." He had it all to himself. There were no Social Credits; no Conservatives. He got the worst trimming he ever had in Kinistino! But that didn't teach him a lesson. We got into the provincial election last year, and he went up and down the length and breadth of the province saying that he was going to win 40 seats. Then he went down to Weyburn, and he came back and said: "I was wrong about the 40 seats. It's going to be 41 seats, because the Premier is going to be beaten in Weyburn." I never just knew what that "W" stood for in "W. Ross Thatcher", but I think it stands for "windy". I don't know. But I didn't get beaten. As a matter of fact I have the privilege at the moment of having the third highest percentage of the vote cast in my Constituency of any Member of the House.

This constant reiteration by gentlemen opposite and some of their satellite newspapers say that 41 per cent of the vote doesn't give the Government a mandate to put in medical care and that it doesn't give them a mandate to speak for the people of this province.

Mr. Danielson: — That's what you said; it wasn't us! You're supposed to get 51 per cent.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, I said nothing of the sort. I can't be responsible for my friend's pipe dreams.

Mr. McDonald: — We'll read it to you.

Premier Douglas: — If my friend is referring to the quotation by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, someone asked me during the question period if the Government would consider a 51 per cent vote, and I said we would certainly like to have a 51 per cent vote. But I said if we are returned with enough Members to pass legislation for a medical care program, we will pass it.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — I will deal with this tomorrow, but I do want to tell my hon. friends that no amount of wriggling and stalling by the gentlemen opposite, or by their friends outside this House, to obstruct a medical care program is going to stop it as long as I have got breath to put it through.

February 14, 1961

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — May I ask the hon. Premier a question? Did you correct the article that appeared in the press following this particular statement of yours?

Premier Douglas: — No, of course I didn't.

Opposition Members: — Yes, you did.

Premier Douglas: — I was on the road making speeches two or three times a day. I didn't even see the statement until after the election was over. My hon. friends know British Parliamentary Government as well as I do. No Government says we won't do something unless we get 51 per cent of the vote. We got 41 per cent. I want to tell my friends this, that if you accept the principle that no Government has a mandate unless it has 50 per cent or more of the vote, there is only one Member in this House who has the right to stand up and speak for his people and his Constituency, and that is the Member for Biggar, the Provincial Treasurer. There is only one Member in the House who got over 50 per cent of the vote cast in his Constituency. The Member for Biggar got 51.7 per cent. The Member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) was second, with 49.7 per cent. Weyburn was third with 48.4; the Member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) and the Member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) were tied for fourth place, with 48 per cent.

An Hon. Member: — What about the Leader of the Opposition?

Premier Douglas: — Oh, the Leader of the Opposition — if he is going to go on the percentage of the right to speak because he has got 50 per cent of the people of his Constituency, he is away down.

Mr. Thatcher: — I'm not complaining — I was glad to have that.

Premier Douglas: — As a matter of fact, the hon. Member doesn't know how glad I am that he got it, too! I have been looking forward for a long time to the privilege of having him opposite.

I also noticed the Leader of the Opposition, in congratulating the Member for Saskatoon, the lady

Member (Mrs. Strum) paying her the gracious compliment of saying she had mellowed as all socialists do. That's true. I think all socialists do mellow. We even have some socialists who go rotten!

I'm not going to deal very extensively at the moment with the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. I just want to make reference to one of them. That was his statement yesterday about the \$9 million which he said we were going to spend for a power building. I notice today he began to hedge a bit on it, but yesterday I suppose he found he was not talking behind the protection of the 'Leader-Post' who would quote his statement on the front page, and my correction on page 17 in among the want-ads, and probably turned upside down. He knew I was going to have a chance to reply to him, so he thought he had better straighten it out a bit, but yesterday over the air he went on very categorically about a \$9 million building. Well, of course it isn't a \$9 million building.

Mr. Thatcher: — It likely will be by the time you're through.

Premier Douglas: — But then I thought even more interesting was the fact that he said, "I heard from a fellow who ought to know." Now, you can't get a better authority than that. "I heard from a fellow who ought to know that they have a building that serves all of Illinois and it is not as big as this building." Well, it is rather interesting. The largest power building they have got in Illinois is the Commonwealth Edison Company Building, so that must be the one that is referred to — it is the largest building. He omitted one or two little details about it. He omitted the three other buildings the same company has of almost equal size, but not quite so big, serving the west of the State. He failed to mention that, in addition to this company handling power, there are 10 other private utilities and 53 municipal systems, and 40 gas utilities, in the State of Illinois, and that in terms of area covered, or mileage served this company in this particular building does not begin to compare with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to a person trying to make political spite for himself in any way he can, but surely he doesn't think he can kid the people of this province . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — You've been doing it long enough!

February 14, 1961

Premier Douglas: — . . . by complaining. That's an awful reflection on the people of this province. He says I have been kidding the people of the province. The people of the province have elected my colleagues and myself to where we sit today five times in succession, and my hon. friend suggests, because they are so stupid that they don't know any better. That is the implication of what he is saying. The people of this province will resent that, and I will remind them of it.

Mr. McDonald: — No doubt.

Premier Douglas: — No one is going to kid the people of this province that you can have a corporation which is doing millions of dollars of business a year, which is serving the entire province with the exception of the City of Regina with electric power, serving 95 communities with natural gas — a program which is growing every year at twice the national rate of growth for power, and do this with employees scattered over nine or 10 different buildings in the City of Regina. Plans must be taken from one building to another — some of them six or eight blocks apart. If you are going to have efficiency of administration you have got to have your staff under one roof, and you must set up proper administration proceedings.

This is not at cost to the people of Saskatchewan. It is not costing the people of Saskatchewan a five-cent piece. The money will have to be borrowed to put up this building. Indebtedness will be retired — both the interest and the principal — by paying the rents which are being paid to somebody else. My hon. friend knows the difference between self-liquidating operations to replace other buildings which are being rented, and putting up a psychiatric hospital at Yorkton. I don't want any misunderstandings about that.

He made the statement today, in answer to the hon. Member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) that it was nonsense to say that buildings had been put up without mortgaging the future. If he will take the trouble to check the records, he will find that the public buildings put up by this Government, and by the Board of Governors of the University, and by the schools, have been put up out of current revenue. No money has been borrowed to put up public buildings, or to build highways. The money which has been borrowed, which he should know about for power,

gas and telephones is not a liability upon the taxpayer. It will be paid off as people use those services and as they use power and burn gas, they will pay it off.

Mr. Thatcher: — Of course, it will be paid off by the taxpayer!

Premier Douglas: — This is the departure which this Government made from the previous Government/ They borrowed money to put up public buildings, and borrowed money to build highways, and when the highways were worn out, all they left us were the bills to pay. We're still paying off bonds which were floated to build roads that were allowed to disappear, under the previous Government.

Mr. McDonald: — Man, that's the best one I've heard yet!

Premier Douglas: — Well, my friend will hear a lot more tomorrow. I can assure him I am getting better and better. I hope that he will come along, because I have many interesting things which I wish to say to him.

Mr. Speaker, with permission of the House, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:08 o'clock p.m.