

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session – Fourteenth Legislature
17th Day

Friday, March 3, 1961

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

On the Orders of the Day:

CURLING CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. Gladys Strum: — I would like to draw the attention of this House to an event of national interest. I believe that all Members will be happy to join with me in congratulating the winners of the first official Canadian Women's Curling Championship event. This winning rink comes from the city of Saskatoon, and Miss Joyce McKee the skip, and her rink, Mrs. Barbara McEwen, Miss Sylvia Fedora, and Mrs. Rosa McKee have won for our province the first of what will no doubt become an annual event. I trust that the Government will arrange to publicly and suitably honour these Saskatchewan champions on their return to this, their native province.

WELCOME TO ORATORY CONTEST WINNERS

Mrs. Mary Batten: — I take great pleasure in welcoming to the House a group of oratory winners from my Constituency. We hold an annual contest and these young people have really earned the right to view the proceedings of this House, because they are the very best, and the very best from Humboldt is really very good, Mr. Speaker. They are Paulette Presto from Watson, Wilma Germaine from Carmel, Mary Lou Jab from Muenster, and Roger Klaus from Sennett, and Donald Lloyd Teller from Humboldt. They are sitting right over the clock, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell all the Members that they must be on their very best behaviour today.

Friday, March 3, 1961

COMPLAINT RE GALLERY

Mr. Ross Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a point of privilege to you, which affects the decorum and the dignity of this House, It was reported to me yesterday that visitors in the Speaker's Gallery were annoyed by the obnoxious political remarks of the usher. The politics of civil servants is their own business, in their own time. But when on duty, and being paid from public funds, we feel very strongly that they should not inflict their partisan political opinions on visitors in the galleries of the Chamber. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that you will take steps to investigate this incident, and take any appropriate steps to prevent its reoccurrence.

Mr. Speaker: — The Speaker of the House has not prerogative to decide as to what should be done in regard to a point of privilege, and neither is it has actual duty to decide whether a breach of privilege has in fact been committed. It is his prerogative to decide whether a prima facie case for a point of privilege has been established.

I would greatly appreciate at this time if I could have a few words of guidance from other Members of the Legislature in regard to what has been placed before us this afternoon, and whether or not this, in the consideration of the Members, actually is a breach of privilege of the House.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me obvious that if some person who comes under Your Honour's supervision has been making objectionable remarks which are annoying people who sit in the galleries, this matter ought to be investigated, and if substantiated, then disciplinary action ought to be taken. However, I know from a long experience that complaints and actual happenings do not always coincide, and I would think that the Leader of the Opposition should place whatever facts he has in your possession, and I would assume that Your Honour will take appropriate action.

Mr. A.H. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned personally, the attitude the Premier has adopted on this occasion is the proper attitude, and if the facts as referred to are

brought to your attention, I am sure you will deal with them in the proper manner. This is not the first time that similar complaints have been made, and action has been taken in the past. I am sure you will do the proper thing.

Mr. Speaker: — It would appear to me from what has been said that in the opinion of some of the Members of this House this is not actually a case of privilege, but something that comes directly under the jurisdiction of the Speaker himself as the person in charge of this Department. As such, I think that I shall rule that it is not actually a case of privilege, but something that I will be very glad to discuss with the hon. Member, and if any such thing has taken place, I shall of course, take whatever steps are necessary.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to introduce to the House, the Grade IX and X pupils from the Corning School, with their teacher, Mr. Gordon Kincaid. We haven't the largest school in Saskatchewan, but we think we have one of the best, and I am sure that members of the House will join me in welcoming these pupils to the House, and hope that the day will be both pleasant and instructive.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, I too want to concur with the remarks of the Member from Canning ton in wishing those pupils from the Qu'Appelle Wellesley Constituency a very enjoyable afternoon, and I'm sure that by the time the afternoon deliverations are over, they will have spent an afternoon long to be remembered.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. J.W. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to draw

Friday, March 3, 1961

the attention of the Members to a group of very fine young students, the Grade XII students from the Melville High School, and I'm quite certain, as stated by Mr. McCarthy, and Mr. McFarlane, that they are going to be enjoying this afternoon's Session, and that they will receive much of educational value in their visit today. They are here under the direction of two members of the staff, Mr. Exner, and Mr. Young. On behalf of all of us, I would like to welcome them here to this Session.

SASKATCHEWAN SAVINGS BONDS

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, several Members of the Legislature have inquired from me with regard to their eligibility to purchase Saskatchewan Savings Bonds. Not so much the eligibility to purchase, as to receive the payments with the interest due. I have made inquiries into this, and the information which I have is that it is quite safe for them to make these purchases and to receive payment. It is not, however, in order for them to be sub-agents for the sale of bonds, and this has to be looked after by agents.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, may I say that as at 11:30 this morning, we have in the Treasury applications, (this doesn't include the sales which have been made which may still be in the hands of dealers throughout the country or in the mail) but we have applications at 11:30 this morning to the extent of \$3,700,000.

Mr. Speaker: — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw to the attention of Members that later today, His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, will give Royal Assent to certain Bills, in this Chamber. Is it the pleasure of the House that we at this time, proceed to the Special Order.

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed from Thursday, March 2, 1961, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. W.S. Lloyd:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, (the House to go into Committee of Supply).

Mr. J.R. Barrie: — Mr. Speaker, the fact that this afternoon we have in the Chamber such an array of students, particularly these fortunate people mentioned by the hon. Member from Humboldt, doesn't add only little bit to my composure, and I hope that I won't disappoint our spectators in the galleries too badly.

Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last evening, I was dealing with certain remarks that had been made by the hon. lady Member from Regina in her address earlier in the day. One of the remarks she made was that we need not less socialism but more socialism. I assume that she meant in the province of Saskatchewan. Also, I assume she considers that elsewhere in Canada all the people are wrong and she is right. If this is such a socialist paradise in Saskatchewan, it seems queer to me that we haven't a great influx of people into this province. Well of course, the population figures and statistics indicate that the very opposite prevails. Talking about socialism, I would like to put on the record of the House definitions of socialism and statements regarding socialism made by very eminent men, not only in Saskatchewan or Canada, but in the British Empire. The first I'm going to quote is the Hon. Winston Churchill. He said:

“Socialism has been tried over and over again, but always found wanting. Socialism has never and will never work.”

Then the Prime Minister of Great Britain, not too long ago, in addressing a meeting in Leicester in England, as reported by the Associated Press, had this to say about socialism, and comparing it with Communism he said:

“There is no difference between socialism and Communism except this: Socialism is soft – Communism is hard. Socialism is pink – Communism is red. Socialism gets you down bit by bit, but a kind of anaesthetic process, that might almost be called mercy-killing. Communism just knocks you in the head.”

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I often wonder, if we do want more

Friday, March 3, 1961

socialism in Saskatchewan. Apparently we have a great number of people in Saskatchewan who are satisfied with socialism, but in the recent election last June, it was very evident that the majority of the people in Saskatchewan do not want more socialism and are opposed to socialism. I believe one of the basic factors in the elections last June was that very thing – socialism. My friend, the lady Member from Regina, I believe is sincere, and I believe that the hon. lady is so intrigued and confused with her socialism she reminds me of that proud mother who was watching her son Johnny's regiment on parade. Her admiration for, and her pride in, her beloved son Johnny was so great that she became so confused, she was convinced that all the others in the parade were out of step except Johnny.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal for a few moments with certain remarks made by the Minister of Education in his address yesterday. One of the first I wish to deal with, is the connection with the purchase of a house. He mentioned that if a person, I don't know whether it was himself or he was referring to someone else, purchased a house for \$10,000 paying \$3,000 cash they would have to assume \$7,000 mortgage. Now I don't know whether he wants any advice from me or not, possibly my Scotch ancestry has something to do with my opinions in this regard, but my advice to him, if he would seek it, would be that he should buy a \$3,000 house and live within his means.

I'm one of the people who still believes there's a place for thrift and prudence in the economy of this nation. There is still a time when these virtues should apply in Government and individual spending. There is no place, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, where these virtues are more needed than in the province of Saskatchewan.

Also the Minister of Education gave the Opposition Members a lecture. He attempted to set out the definition of what we as Opposition should be and what it should do. I think he was entirely wrong. He said we should give the Government alternatives. Well, no doubt, this is what the Minister would like us to do, but this is not the function of the Opposition. The Hon. Minister of Natural Resources seems to agree with the Minister of Education, and I'm going to go back many, many years. People I would consider authorities, set out, many years ago, what they considered was the function of an Opposition in our parliamentary system, and which I believe is correct. I am going to quote a statement made by Everett Stanley, the Earl of Derby. This is going away back many years to June 4th, 1841, when he said, speaking in the British House of Commons, and I quote:

“When I first came into parliament, Mr. Tierney, a great Whig authority, used always to say, the duty of an Opposition was very simple. It was to oppose everything, and propose nothing.”

Another man, who I think probably the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources with his great admiration for the Conservative Party, as expressed in the press in recent months, will possibly agree with because he is a prominent Conservative, is Sir Winston Churchill who, in his book “Lord Randolph Churchill” quotes Randolph Churchill as follows:

“The only duty of an Opposition, is to oppose.”

I would much prefer, Mr. Speaker, to take the opinions and advice of the gentlemen I have quoted, than the Hon. Minister of Education or the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources. However, I believe the Minister, in his definition of this function of an Opposition was in error, but there is no doubt there’s a time and a place when the Opposition should offer alternatives, and that time is in the campaign preceding an election, and those alternatives should not be given to the Government, but to the voters, the citizens of the area in which the election is taking place.

Another startling statement was made by the Minister of Education, at least it was startling to me, when he said something about the CCF prepaid medical plan. I’d like to inquire from him, what plan? If the CCF Government opposite have a prepaid medical plan already set up, then it’s a funny thing we haven’t heard about it.

Premier Douglas: — It’s the one Mr. Thatcher opposed.

Mr. Barrie: — And if the Hon. Minister of Education is correct, then I can see no justification whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, for the committee which was set up and is now touring the world in order to bring information and recommendations to this Government for a prepaid medical plan. The Premier himself, during the election, and many others, led the people of this province to think that 1961 would see a prepaid medical plan brought into this province. Now I see it has been postponed to 1962.

This is another matter I think the Minister of

Friday, March 3, 1961

Education erred in. He also made some reference to the Crown Corporations, and that certain Liberals having said they'd throw certain Crown Corporations that were losing money out of the window. I'm surprised he would mention this, because this is one case where the CCF apparently took Liberal suggestions, because they threw four of them out of the window: the Woollen Mill, the tannery, the shoe factory, and the box factory. Possibly that was before the Minister of Education was in the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to return to a matter that despite what may be said to the contrary, is a very serious and important matter to every person in Saskatchewan, it is our public debt. It is huge, and the hon. Member for Moosomin, during this debate, gave a very detailed and I consider proper, expose of our debt, backed up by official documents and figures which I think are beyond dispute. I'm not going to go into any of the details of the debt at this time, but I do want to mention that our debt is going to be substantially increased, according to the forecasts of the Provincial Treasurer, during the forthcoming fiscal year. There is going to be \$59 million borrowed during this fiscal year, if his forecast is correct. What I am interested in, Mr. Speaker, is the interest of the public debt. The interest on the public debt of Saskatchewan in the last 12 years has increased about four times, from \$5 ¼ million to approximately \$20 million, for the forthcoming fiscal year. According to the forecast of borrowing, there's going to be a substantial increase in the interest load next year.

Now I've heard the Premier of the province, and many of our CCF friends, continually harp and rant about certain people, particularly those in the United States of America, the coupon-clippers. I don't know whether their criticism is justified or not, but I want to state that according to official documents and records nearly half of the interest that is paid on the bonded debt of Saskatchewan is paid to those coupon-clippers in the city of New York and elsewhere in the United States.

Well now, take the province of Manitoba, our sister province; they have a provincial debt too, but they've been very careful over the years, and we find in the province of Manitoba that less than \$40 million of their provincial debt is payable in U.S. funds in the United States of America. When we look at our sister province of Alberta to the west of us, we find they have none payable in the United States. Now, Mr.

Speaker, I am not criticizing the present Provincial Treasure for this, naturally, but the former Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Fines, is responsible to a large degree for this predicament we are in. From time to time he gave an excuse, an alibi, that he was borrowing in the United States of America because he was able to obtain much more favourable interest rates. Well this would have been possibly a very good reason, but what astonishes me, is according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, on March 31st 1960, the province of Saskatchewan was paying the highest average interest rate of any province in Canada, with the exception of the province of Newfoundland. If he was making such a great deal in the way of interest concessions, by borrowing this money in the United States, it's a peculiar thing that we stand in this particular rank, insofar, as the average rate of interest on Saskatchewan's bonded debt.

Now we find in recent months, the exchange rate on the Canadian Dollar in relation to the United States dollar has been steadily decreasing, and if we take any pattern from the long-term course that our dollar has been in relationship to the United States dollar, the day may come when it will be at a discount. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the Members of this House, if that occurs our position in connection with debt carrying charges will be that much more serious. There will be a greater toll taken from the pockets of the people of the province of Saskatchewan in order to pay this interest. I want again to remind you that nearly 50% of our debt carrying burden is being paid to those terrible coupon-clippers in the United States of America.

This interest is a very heavy burden. As already mentioned, it amounts to approximately \$20 million for the next fiscal year. This amount must be paid by the people of the province of Saskatchewan. It is going to come out of their pockets one way or the other; there's no fairy godmother, or no outside sources, going to come in and pay this bill for us. The Minister of Education, yesterday, said it was very simple; the interest had to be paid either from taxes or in consumer power and telephone costs. He is quite correct, and I want to congratulate him on his accuracy in this regard. This, Mr. Speaker, explains the reason, one of the reasons at least, for the current high power and gas rates we pay in this province.

Now, for the sake of comparison, we use the neighbouring province of Manitoba on many occasions, and we use the province of Alberta, and locations in that province on many occasions . . .

Friday, March 3, 1961

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — . . . power and gas in Manitoba.

Mr. Barrie: — I'm going to mention the domestic gas rates that the people of Regina are paying at the present time. They are 60% higher than those obtainable in the city of Calgary. Now I know they're going to say "Oh, they're very close to the gas fields." Well, the spread is not wholly accounted for by the difference in distances of the two cities from the sources of supply.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — What about Winnipeg?

Mr. Barrie: — I also want to mention that a farmer in Saskatchewan with a monthly electric usage of approximately 400 KWH pays 69% more on such a bill to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation than his counterpart would pay in the province of Manitoba to the Manitoba Power Commission. They laugh! These are facts, and I challenge them to dispute them.

Government Members: — Sit down.

Mr. Barrie: — These are facts, Mr. Speaker, and I again challenge them to dispute these facts.

Government Members: — We will.

Mr. Barrie: — The monthly bill of the farmer I referred to with consumption of 400 KWH, in the province of Saskatchewan would be \$12.93, in the province of Manitoba he would pay \$7.65, a difference of \$5.28. That's quite a difference, Mr. Speaker. Quite a difference when you consider the socialists in Saskatchewan profess such an interest in the poor farmers of Saskatchewan.

Now we go to telephone rates, and we see they have been increased several times in recent years, most recently since last June. I believe these increases are necessary for the very reason I pointed out before — a great proportion of the heavy burden of interest that we're paying has to be borne by the people who make use of telephone, power, or gas services in the province. There is another angle, Mr. Speaker. It is there is no apparent hope of any decreases in these high rates. The prospect we have, will be further increases rather than decreases. Yes, the people of the province of Saskatchewan will continue to pay heavy taxes, they will continue to pay heavy levies for the use of the public utilities in order

to pay this heavy debt carrying charges burden of which again I say 50% will be funnelled to the coupon-clippers in the United States.

Now I want to deal, Mr. Speaker, with a matter of the Department which is now headed by a friend of mine, who I've known for a great number of years, the Hon. Minister of Social Welfare. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think I should say he was a very worthy opponent in a certain election, and defeated me in 1940. I think I owe him a great debt, because it is one of the greatest favours that ever was accorded to me by anyone, as circumstances turned out later.

I want to deal with his Department for a few moments. I haven't much time left, and I'll be very brief, but this is a Department of government that is worthy of the first consideration of every Member of this House. I was very disappointed indeed, to see that even in view of the economy drive, the increase in that even in the view of the economy drive, the increase in the estimates for the forthcoming fiscal year, for his Department, is less than a million dollars, \$952,000 to be exact. I had hoped there would be more, because the majority of that increase is being used for social aid, according to the estimates – as near as I can tell. Now, I notice in those estimates the provisions made for the geriatric centres in Saskatoon and Melfort are down, the amount provided in the estimates for supplemental allowances is down, and the blind person's allowances are down.

Recently the hon. Member for Humboldt has occasion to visit the geriatric centre situated in the city of Saskatoon. I understand she found, Mr. Speaker, conditions there very unsatisfactory, particularly in regard to accommodation provided and certain other facilities. I believe this is the same government institution that not too long ago was discussed by certain civic officials in the city of Saskatoon. The Member from Humboldt advises me that she was shocked at the conditions she found prevailing there. I believe possibly one of the reasons she was to upset and shocked was that she had just left the luxurious building, the court house in Saskatoon, with all the lush facilities and accommodation provided for legal people . . .

Hon. Mr. Erb: — The Federal authorities weren't shocked;

Mr. Barrie: — Probably they weren't, but the hon. Member for Humboldt apparently was. I'll have some more to say about this particular institution before I take my seat, I hope.

Friday, March 3, 1961

We have in the province 15,890 people in receipt of supplemental allowances. Nearly half of these 6,890 are receiving \$2.50 a month; 11,640, or 3 out of 4 are receiving less than \$10.00 a month; only 49 out of approximately 16,000 are receiving \$20.00. This provides for not only one individual, but in order to qualify it must provide for two individuals. It really boils down to this, Mr. Speaker, the maximum any individual can receive in the province of Saskatchewan as a supplementary allowance is \$10.00. The \$20.00 maximum, as it applies to two people, is a very nice catch for propaganda purposes. When we look at comparisons with other provinces paying supplementary allowances, and I know every province isn't, we find the province of Saskatchewan has the lowest rate of supplementary allowance, and the severest means test.

Government Member: — What did the Liberals have?

Mr. Barrie: — The Minister of Social Welfare, in my opinion, has provided me, as an individual with a great disappointment, because there is no apparent change to a more generous treatment of the aged. While he was an Opposition Member in the House of Commons, the Minister appeared very concerned, and was most critical of the amounts of pensions paid by the Government then, and of the means test. But the record in the budget we have before us, indicates his attitude has changed for some reason and for some other reason he hasn't been successful in bringing about those things we would like to see. If he had recognized, and I believe he should have, the increased assistance needed by many of our senior pioneer citizens, and if he had sought and obtained improved accommodation for the guests in the geriatric centres, particularly in his own city of Saskatoon, then I can assure him, if he had made an effort, had been able to convince the Members would have received the whole-hearted support of every Member of the Opposition. There's no valid excuse or alibi for failure to provide for our aged and ailing pioneer citizens. Many need increased allowances and improved accommodations.

There is no reason this couldn't be done when funds are made available to house in expensive buildings and luxuries surroundings the judiciary and members of the legal progression, in this province. I refer to the court house in Saskatoon, and the one that is just being completed here in Regina. If the Minister of Social Welfare and done equally as well for those committed to his charge and care as the Attorney-General has been able to accomplish for those in his jurisdiction, then it

could be said, Mr. Speaker, that the much used socialist phrases “Humanity First” and “More Abundant Living” were meaningful and all-embracing, not mere vote catching political slogans.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment and oppose the motion.

Mr. Karl F. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to associate myself with the previous speaker, and the Members of the House in welcoming the students here this afternoon, and I can assure them that it is a lot easier to perform in a classroom than it is in the Legislature.

During the course of the budget debate thus far, the debate has wandered into many and varied interesting fields, and I listened with particular interest to the definitions of socialism from both sides of the House. However, I do believe the Member from Pelly will have the last word in defining socialism.

Yesterday, I noticed the Minister of Education tried to present to this House a certain case. The fact that he had to drop it, indicates that the case was hopeless before he started with it. Well what was this case he was trying to make. He tried to make the case that anybody who voted against the CCF Party in the last provincial election, was voting against a prepaid medical plan. That is the case he tried to make in this Legislature; that is the case that the CCF Party tried to make in this province.

Premier Douglas: — What was what your leader said.

Mr. Klein: — Now let us put this case for the, as it should have been put, and see what was lacking. What they were deliberately trying to do was to mislead the electorate. I don’t think any opposition was ever registered against the prepaid medical care plan, but opposition was registered to the way that C.C.F.ers were trying to foist it upon the people. There were many and varied unanswered questions in the minds of many people who were sincerely interested in a prepaid medical plan.

First of all was what would this plan cost? No one knew, when the Government Members were asked what it would cost, they had to hazard a guess, just as every other person in the province had to hazard a guess as to what it might cost. No figures that they could

Friday, March 3, 1961

substantiate could stand up. They didn't know whether it would be \$20 million, \$30 million, or \$40 million. No one knew, and realizing the economic conditions of this province, no one wanted to vote for a pig in the poke at the time.

The second thing: How would this thing be administered? Would the doctors become civil servants? Would they be paid on a fee for service basis? Again no one knew.

Third: What would happen to those people who because of the company they work for are now already paying for a medical plan? Would they be exempted from the Government's plan that they were proposing, and if they were to be . . .

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Look at the terms of reference.

Mr. Klein: — I'll refer to those terms of reference in a moment. If these people were to be exempted then would the Government exempt everyone else who had a medical plan that he was content with? Again, this question was not answered. And if you exempted all those who were satisfied with the plan they now have, who would there have been left to be insured? About 30% of your population.

These were burning questions in the minds of the electorate prior to the election. But the Premier, said we have a plan. Well if he had the plan, then why on earth are we now, expending public funds on committees, some which are presently undertaking on investigations here, others who are going to travel all over Europe to bring in recommendations.

Now the Minister of Health says look at the terms of reference — a year ago they told us they had a plan, now they're telling us they haven't a plan, they're still waiting for a plan, and when you look at the terms of reference, exactly what they are asking this committee to do, is to look into the cost of this scheme, look into the business of how the doctors are to be paid. That's only being looked into now, not before the election as you tried to make the people believe. What this Government was trying to do in effect was to get the electorate to sign a blank cheque, that they would fill in at some future date when, to use a phrase that the Opposition financial critic used and coined, they wanted them to sign a blank cheque until their tax-picking fingers could find areas of picking more taxes out of the people of the province.

Now that was the greatest hoax that was ever perpetrated in the province, and apparently the Government is still proud of that hoax they tried to perpetrate before the last election.

Well budget time, of course, is that time when Governments have to account for their stewardship in this province, and they have to account for what they have done with the revenues that have been available to them in the past, and what they shall do with the revenues in the future. Now believe me, Mr. Speaker, I would hate to be a Member who has to justify my stewardship, if I were on the Government side of this House, because you may remember the parable of what happened to the steward who didn't look after his share. This Government certainly is in for some dire consequences, if not in this world, certainly in the next.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — When we look at the revenues that have been available in the fifteen years prior to this Government taking office, and for the fifteen years after they took office, we find some pretty shocking comparisons. The average revenue for the Government prior to 1944 was an average of \$19,800,000. Today, the average revenue that is available to the Government that sits opposite is \$84,900,000 annually, an increase of four and a half times what they were for the fifteen years prior to them taking office.

Now then they have to account for what they did with this increased revenue. Can anyone say that today we're receiving four and a half times as many services as we did in 1944? Can any municipality claim that they are receiving four and a half times they services today, that they received in 1944? When I look at the niggardly treatment of the municipalities, particularly in my Constituency, I can't see where there's been any improvement, and if I had the time I would like to elaborate on some of the things that have happened in our area. But there are more problems than I'd have time to deal with. The Government is quick to boast about what they're giving the municipality in regard to municipal road assistance. But they forget to mention that they turned back to the municipality all the secondary highways in those areas which the municipality now has to take over completely. Those secondary highways, Mr. Speaker, were completely maintained, and besides that all the bridges were built. Just last weekend I was talking to some constituents who have now the responsibility of putting in bridges and maintaining what once was a secondary

Friday, March 3, 1961

highway, almost forty miles of it. And they are finding that they have to do that completely out of their own pockets.

I sometimes sit back here licking my chops at all the good things that have come to certain Constituencies, and I look around in my own, and I find that none of these great things the CCF have brought to certain areas, ever come to our area. They are telling us we have the benefits of natural gas, we have the benefit of blacktop roads, we've taken our highways out of the mud, and all those sort of things. I fail to find one of these improvements in my Constituency. Not one community in that area is being served by natural gas, the highway particularly No. 13 was built who knows how long ago and if it was in the mud in 1944 it must be two feet under the mud now, because nothing has been done since they took office. In . . .

Premier Douglas: — Nonsense, it's been rebuilt.

Mr. Klein: — Nonsense my foot! You come down there and look at it.

Premier Douglas: — I've been down there.

Mr. Klein: — In 1956 before the election you undertook to build a few miles in that area from Assiniboia to points past Melaval. Then you said, you proposed to continue the highway right on down to Kincaid. Farmers got excited and started cutting down their trees, moving fences and what not, because the highway was coming. Well it's still coming four years later. I don't know when it will come, but I hope it's very shortly, but I'm a bit alarmed when now we find that services have to be cut down, and if they cut us down in that area prior to having an economy drive, what's going to happen now.

The Regina Member sits back like a cat with a bowl of cream relishing the beautiful buildings that are put up in Regina. Well, I sit back with a sort of a morbid feeling when I have to drive through our rural areas, and see once-thriving communities now with empty homes, and boarded up windows. I wish some of these benefits that come to certain segments of our society could be distributed a little more equitably in all areas.

Now the rumblings come to me, Mr. Speaker, from some segments in our corner, that if the people of my Constituency had seen fit to elect a CCF Member,

they wouldn't go short of all these things. Now I have been very loathe to believe this story, I don't want to believe it, because I don't think even this Government would stoop to such a low tactic in trying to deny services in an area, because they are not represented by a Member of their political complexion. I don't believe they'd do that. But, if they don't start and do something in our area, and give us the benefit of natural gas, give us the benefits of paved roads, like that four lane highway going down to Lumsden, then I'm going to start beginning to believe that they are using this political pressure, and I'll have to start circulating that story.

Now I want to commend the Provincial Treasurer for the economy drive that he is undertaking. It is unfortunate that we were unable to convince his predecessor that he should have undertaken this economy drive a long time ago. The Liberal Party has been saying that we better start undertaking some economic measures or we'll find ourselves in trouble. It was obvious that could not continue forever. Now, in this search around, looking for where economies might be practised, he somehow overlooked the huge bundles of paper that come from his Departments of Government, and Crown Corporations. I have here a Return supplying the name and cost of each pamphlet and publication that is put out by each Department. As you see it is quite a big volume, and when we look at some of the items in this particular document, we find some rather interesting figures. Now we find, for example, that "Saskatchewan News" cost the people of the province \$14,300 a year, "Industrial Saskatchewan" - \$2,500 a year; "Farm Light and Power" \$13,400 a year; "S.P.C. News" - \$2,000 a year; "Gas Holiday Cookbook" - \$2,265 and as far as I'm concerned they needn't send any of those "Gas Holiday Cookbooks" to my area, we just haven't any gas.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — . . . right now.

Mr. Klein: — That's like putting the cart before the horse we're putting cookbook before the gas in our area.

Some Hon. Member: — The hon. Member is too modest.

Mr. Klein: — Besides these expenditures and extravagances we can look into all the committees and commissions which they have hired to do their job for them, and we find that

Friday, March 3, 1961

the Van Vliet report cost them something like \$32,000; The Agriculture and Rural Life – the Baker commission \$458,000; the Continuing Committee - \$300,000; the question on what time it was cost them \$27,000; Research on whether they should sell liquor or not when they're making \$14 million profit cost them \$26,000.

Now this Government for some reason or other sees it very fitting that a committee would be appointed whenever they're handling a hot political potato. Why do they have a committee just at that time? We have a good example in the Continuing Committee. This Government have in their employ supposedly the best brains that you can find in the country: they have a centre for community studies; they have a community planning and technical service group; they have an Economic Advisory and Planning Board they have a Municipal Advisory Committee, and yet they are still in doubt as to what kind of municipal government we should have in this province. Why do they hire these committees? They want to have a scapegoat in case the issue becomes too hot, and they become unpopular with the people of the province. If the reaction is too violent, they say, "Well don't blame us, it is the committee that's handling it". In the recommendations of the Continuing Committee, we heard that already. As soon as the committee report was challenged, the Government said they had nothing to do with this thing. It was just an investigation. However, if it should happen to find favour with the people, they say, "Look what the great CCF have done for you, we've given you a county system", just as they do now about their great hospital plan.

And when we come to these publications, there's one other interesting one. They saw fit last year to put the Premier's speech in Debate of the Speech from the Throne into pamphlet form, and charge the people of the province \$768 for it. They titled it "Planning for People" the debate of Premier T.C. Douglas on the Throne Speech.

Now I wonder if the Premier isn't satisfied with the publicity he gets from radio and T.V. and in the press. Must he hire a group of experts to make a pamphlet of his contribution.

Now there are many other topics I would have liked to deal with, but my time is ended so I will conclude. (We have divided this radio thing between us, and we just have to stay within limits or woe betide us.)

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to say

That I am alarmed to find that Saskatchewan's economic structure today depends upon people's ability to buy and buy more, so that we have the education and hospital tax revenue. I'm alarmed to find that the economic structure of Saskatchewan relies on the ability of people to drive cars a greater distance, so that we get gasoline tax, and am alarmed at the fact that our economic structure requires people to drink as much as they did in the past and perhaps a little bit more, so that we get our liquor revenues every year. I am alarmed that it also relies on the ability of people to buy licenses for their cars and trucks. This is the situation we find ourselves in, and it is an alarming situation, that with \$145,000,000 of budgetary revenues, we find ourselves in trouble. They history of this province shows that if we have trouble with \$145 million I'd hate to think what would happen to us if history should repeat itself in this province.

What has happened to that great vision these people had a few years ago. There are many politicians with visions and these fellows across the way are no exception. They had a vision; they said planned economy is the answer, and they said how would you deal with unemployment and relief. We believe that the only way to sure unemployment is to make employment. It's their own answer. It's a remarkable statement. Then could we state that we would immediately put the employed to work, using the natural resources. Yes, we could say that. They could say that a few years ago, but they can't say it anymore. Is it not a fact that we have raw materials such as lumber, wool, and that very little is being done with these at the present time. Why not go into the manufacture of these useful products and provide full employment. I still ask you why not? You've had the revenue, you've had the time, and you've had (I hope) the experience, then you have the wool, and you have a lot of yarns besides.

What has happened to you vision? These are the things that could have been done, and should have been done, but they say, the reason for our trouble is that we don't have any economic planning. Well, Mr. Speaker, taking what we are experiencing today as a result of seventeen years of economic planning, I say Lord deliver us from any more economic planning, and I cannot support the motion.

Mr. G. Herman Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, not having had the opportunity of

Friday, March 3, 1961

speaking in this House during this present Session, I would like to take this opportunity in congratulating you on your elevation to the responsible position which now hold. I am sure that they didn't make any mistake, when you were chosen for that office. Your conduct of that office during the last three weeks has convinced me that you were the man fitted to hold this office in this House today. I hope that you will stay there for some time, and be able to carry out the arduous duties that will be coming your way. Sometimes I feel like saying that I sympathize with you in many ways. My experience here is of long duration, and I have seen good Speakers and I have seen some not so good, and the trouble with the poor ones is they depend on some advice they generally get from someone who doesn't know as much about it as the Speaker does, and that has been the case in this House for several years.

I want to congratulate every new Member in this House, regardless of where you are, whether you're on this side or on the other side, that's immaterial as far as I'm concerned. The people put you there, that's the reason you're here. I would also like to say this from my place in the House this afternoon, that I appreciate the confidence of the people of Arm River for once again putting me back in this House.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — I was very interested listening to the lady Member from Regina, the other day when she spoke in this House, and I enjoyed it very much, and I think she did too, because I think she actually believed that what she said was so. It was so convincing, but you know when she ceased to speak, a thought struck me about something I read in a magazine, I think it was the "Saturday Evening Post", sometime ago. One of these little quips that' printed there was related to a meeting held down in the United States, and there was a lady speaker in that hall, and she spoke at some length very fluently, and going out of the hall, a gentleman passed one of the darkies in the hall, and he said "what do you think about this Sam?" "Ah my, didn't she give herself a powerful recommend." Well, that of course was quite permissible, I'm not say that she didn't have a right to do this.

Many things have been said, and there has been a sort of a general refuge for these people on the other side, to go back and say so and so, and so and so, what did the Liberal Party do? Well I just looked up a file

that I have in my packing case and I accidentally ran across some of the records that take us back to 1944. I came across one here – how about your highways, what did they do before 1944? Well the Liberal Party had held office in this province for ten years, and in that time, Mr. Speaker, the highways system when we went out of office was 8,000 miles, and from 1934-44 we constructed up to standard 1227 miles of new earth roads; we gravelled 2842 miles of highway; we hard surfaced 110 miles of highway; we reconstructed 1168 of worn out highway; and of this amount, regravelled almost 667 miles.

May I say this for the information of the House, because there's many new Members here. I said this on the floor of the House four years ago, and the then Minister of Highways – and I respect Mr. Douglas very much, I think that he was a good man, and a good Minister, one of the best – he said to me, “Where did you get that information?” So I sent over to him the very thing I have here. I said that information came from the Deputy Minister of Highways. It was sometime in 1945 I think when we got it, so that is not my figuring, it's the record of your Highway Department and if you want to look it up, maybe you will then be convinced that there was some road work done, there were some roads built, and that we did this, everyone one of these miles of highway, gravelled, regravelled and rebuilt, and bridges, during that period without one penny being charged to the provincial debt.

Then I found another little item in my old files. You know when we came in in 1934, Mr. Speaker, the total revenue for the province of Saskatchewan for that fiscal year was \$11,700,000. Just think. Well that wouldn't send the Government to travel all over Europe, and it would take that much to pay their trip back.

Well what did we do? I'll tell you what we did. We reduced the motor license \$2.50; we reduced the telephone rate \$2.00; and when we went out of office the collection fee between an ordinary telephone in the town and the central was \$22.00 a year. Today it's \$30.00 a year. There was a surtax on income in the province of Saskatchewan, put on by the previous Conservative Government, a surtax of \$5.00. What is a surtax? Well that is something like the Power Corporation charges \$5.00 a month to a farm whether you use any power or not, you will have to pay that. A surtax is a tax that you pay the Provincial Treasurer of this province, whether you have the \$5.00 tax to pay or not.

Friday, March 3, 1961

We abolished this, and we refunded all gas taxes for farm purposes. This was done in 1935 when the total revenue of Saskatchewan was slightly over \$13 million. That meant \$19.50 cut in taxes to every farmer in the province of Saskatchewan, at that time. What did these fellows do? Well we heard a lot about education tax. Mr. Coldwell is famous for the expression, "Abominable taxes"; that was the term he applied to the education tax of Saskatchewan. When the CCG came into power they were going to do away with that tax. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know what happened.

I have here a list and I read it once in this House before, and I'm going to read it again – Some achievements of the Liberal Government in the province of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Liberal Government from 1905 to 1929, and again from 1934 to 1944 – a total of 34 years. During those years a lot of services and institutions were founded and developed. Following is a list of some the records of achievement of the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan.

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

PUBLIC HEALTH – Department of Public Health.

Legislation enabling the establishment of hospitals and union hospital districts, with grants to hospitals; Tuberculosis sanatoria; Cancer care developed including free diagnosis, medical and hospital care; Mental hospitals and psychiatric wards; Municipal medical and hospital care; Mutual medical and hospital associations; Health insurance act; Medical college at university planned.

SOCIAL WELFARE – Old age pensions; Pensions for blind; Supplementary pensions; Legislation regarding rights for women and children; Votes for women; Marriage legislation; property rights of married women; Homestead rights of married women; Maintenance of parents; Maintenance of deserted wives and children; Legislation regulating the employment of women; Mother's allowances; Bureau of child protection; Care of neglected and dependent children; Adoption of children; Care of children born out of wedlock; Care of juvenile delinquents; Prohibition of sale of liquor to minors and of tobacco to persons

under sixteen; Corrections Institutions and Care – Jails for men; Separate jail for women; Boy's school; Institution for care of girls.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS – Highways, Roads and Bridges: 8,000 miles of provincial highways, about the same as at present. 1,300 miles of secondary highways; grants for municipal roads; Built bridges on municipal roads; Ferries; Traffic safety laws and regulations.

LABOUR – Freedom of trade union association act; Labour relations Act; Industrial disputes Act; Factories Act; Miners' safety and welfare Act; Building trade protection Act; Masters and servants Act; Industrial standards Act; Workmen's compensation; Minimum wages; One day rest in seven; Weekly half-holiday; Apprenticeship and vocational training.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS – Department of Municipal Affairs; Assessment commission; Virtually all present municipal services were established.

NORTHERN AREAS DEVELOPMENT – Northern areas branch; Local improvement districts; Northern settlement program; Special assistance for schools in northern areas; Work program and other assistance to Metis people; Green Lake Metis settlement; The present government has made no significant changes to the Legislation passed by the Liberal Government and revised in 1943.

NATURAL RESOURCES – Forest production and conservation; Fish development program; Game and fur conservation; Extensive prospecting for minerals, and Geological surveys. I have also the Federal Government's legislation and I'm going to read that too, and if you don't want to listen to me gentlemen, there's a hole in the wall over there – crawl into it.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I would give a little advice, because they won't like this. The Liberal Government held office for thirty-six years of the sixty-three years since 1896. It would require a large volume to detail all the developments of those progress

Friday, March 3, 1961

packed years. Following are some of the major accomplishments which have been of special benefit to the people of Canada: Legislation for the grading and marketing of cereals and livestock; International wheat agreements; Gifts of wheat to needy countries; Freight assistance on feed grains; Storage payment on excess carry-over of grain; The Canadian Wheat Board; Agriculture price support policy; Several uses of deficiency payments in British wheat agreement; Deficiency payment on several products under price support policies; Development of quota system; Great development of foreign trade of special benefit to what farmers whose product must be exported; Legislation for continuance of the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement; Extensive research and experimentation including experimental farms; Establishment of the P.F.A.A.; Farm Credit including long term loans, farm improvement loans and loans on grain or farms; Under the Liberal government there was developed the best period that Saskatchewan farmers have ever experienced; Social Welfare – the first old age pensions Act in 1927, with several increases in pensions; Since 1952 the payment of 100% of old age security pensions to all persons over 70; The payment of 50% of old age assistance to persons aged 65 to 69; Pensions to disabled persons; Pensions to blind persons; Family allowances. Freedom of Trade Association Act.

I might say in passing, I mentioned something, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to recall this. A few years back when the termination of the four year British wheat contract took place, there were some difficulties. The Federal Government saw fit to provide \$65 million additional payment to the wheat producers of the three western provinces, and the Peace River Area. I want to tell this House this afternoon, that every CCF Member east of the Great Lakes, stoop up on their feet in the House of Commons and voted against that, and there were thirteen Members from Saskatchewan in the house at that time, and most of those fellows went out of their seats, and didn't come back. The gentlemen sitting over there know that is true. Sure – well I don't know whether he did or not, but if he didn't he was probably out on the street.

Now isn't that a good record for the CCF.

I'm not going to say very much, Mr. Speaker, about this medical care program. I don't mean that this Government never had the intention of putting it in, because they promised it in 1952. If the Dominion Government did not come in with a medical care program they would put it in. But, it took them until 1960 to put it in the Speech from the Throne. They put it in the Speech from the Throne last year, and somewhere

Through the middle of the Session, on April 12th, I asked the Premier on the floor of this House, when we could expect that Bill to be brought in. The Premier said "This was not possible under the circumstances, it would only be enabling legislation anyway". It had been hoped that the Advisory and Planning Commission could be set up by February or March, but the physicians and surgeons had only just agreed to make an appointment to this committee. If this committee had been set up earlier the Government would have expected the report by December 31st. The committee then advised that the report would be late. The Premier told the House that interim reports would be expected from this committee, and it would be possible to introduce a medical care program at least in 1961.

Outside the House the Premier said, "There have been no charges in the CCF plan to allow the voters in the forthcoming election to state their desire for a prepaid medical care plan." What he said there was just for election purposes. And he told us on the floor of the House that the election will be the referendum. The election will be the referendum – and I'll have to congratulate the Premier, he's a pretty smooth guy. He pulled it off all right. And when the election came on, he got into a wrangle with the medical association, and you know that went on and on, and that was just right up his alley. He propagated this difference of opinion all he could, and therefore, during the election the only thing that was mentioned was this medical care plan.

Then he went out on the highways and byways of this province, it was useful you know, for this is not a new method on the part of the CCF. Some certain individuals were hired I suppose by the medical association to speak for them, to put their arguments together in such a way that they could present them to the Government, and some of the expressions and some of the methods of dealing with this problem, I think myself were unfortunate. Nevertheless, it fitted into the scheme, so far as the CCF Government was concerned, and they took this up and they pointed out these abominable charges that had been made according to the Premier.

The Premier had a meeting at Estevan, and he just went to town on these things. He just spoke on this thing all the time, and he had his audience really up on their ears. And that was a terrible thing to do, but after all, Mr. Speaker, this was an attack on a government policy by this writer that spoke on behalf of

Friday, March 3, 1961

the medical association. But what did the CCF do? On, they didn't stoop to anything like that. Here we have a fellow by the name of Zaplitny a CCF Member, he spoke at Arcola, and he said that medical doctors in the province had given such supposition to the proposed CCF medical health plan, because they would be forced to pay their legal income taxes, since all payments to the doctors would be made by cheque. This was what Mr. Zaplitny, M.P. for Dauphin, told a political gathering in the community hall at Arcola, Mr. Speaker, and the date is May 7th, 1960.

That wasn't an attack on a government policy, that was a personal attack and an insinuation of wrongdoing on the part of medical men of this province. There's no end to the personal attacks made by the CCF. And here we have the sanctimonious Mr. Coldwell. He went all over my seat last summer. Mr. Speaker, I had the honour of having the gentleman all over my seat. I'll tell you what he told the people. He said "At last the people of Arm River would be represented by a young man in the Legislature". He told them at every opportunity he had and then the rest of the time he peddled stuff that isn't true. But what did he say about the medical profession? This was a Unity, May 30th, 1960 – "Doctors are more concerned with maintaining high fees, than serving the people of Saskatchewan." Mr. Coldwell told the audience that Canada and United States are the only democratic countries in the world, without national health plans. He covered the history of the health services which have been instigated by the CCF of Saskatchewan, such as the Anti-Tuberculosis League. That was back in 1912 wasn't it? Well I don't know how old Coldwell is.

But, even now the CCF institution the Sanatoria in this province. You know who did that, Mr. Speaker. It was the rural municipality, and the Government of that day co-operated with them. The ones that we're going to hang the rural municipalities. Free cancer treatment too. Well, the free cancer Bill, Mr. Speaker, was passed in 1944 Session, - \$215,000 was voted to operate that cancer treatment in the first year, and these guys who came into office on July 10th, 1944 had \$58,000 left in the Treasury of the \$215,000 that was voted. That was not the story that the Premier told. He said he couldn't find a penny any place. And, his own commission or the cancer commissions themselves, with the annual statement pointed out exactly what was left at the end of the fiscal year. That's the truth, so who can believe, or would accept anything from that side of the House.

Now then, these accusations against one of the highest grade of medical societies there is in any province in Canada, against a group of men, who are more disinterested in their own welfare, and more interested in the welfare of the community as a whole, these accusations come from the CCF: that they don't pay proper income taxes: that they are more concerned with their salaries than they are with the welfare of the people of this province. That's what they say. I wonder if that's abominable. Ask Mr. Coldwell.

What has this Government done? When this Government came in they had two mental hospitals in the province of Saskatchewan. Have you got any more now? Have you built any?

Government Member: — More facilities.

Mr. Danielson: — Silence.

Premier Douglas: — What do you think the training school is?

Mr. Danielson: — You're going to build something when you get more money. When you soak more taxes onto the people so's you'll get more money.

Premier Douglas: — Do you not know what the Moose Jaw training school is, and it is far from a mental hospital.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, I know what the Moose Jaw training school is, and it is far from a mental hospital.

Premier Douglas: — There are people in it who used to be in the mental hospital there.

Mr. Danielson: — That's all right. You can tell your story later.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — There were three sanatoria in this province when this Government came in, how many more have you now? Have you got any more? It is the foundation that was laid by the Liberal Government and by the municipalities, in conjunction with the municipalities, but you fellows had nothing to do with it. Practically all this Government has done in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, was to erect great fine buildings to house their staff, this modern civil service. What's the use of going to

Friday, March 3, 1961

Ottawa? Mr. Diefenbaker's office is nothing like that of the Premier of Saskatchewan. It isn't half as good.

There is one thing I would like to ask the Minister, when he appointed this committee on health, did he ever think there was such a thing as farmers in this province? Did he ever think there was farmers, any farmers in this province, or did that Baker Commission tell him that we all moved out? Here was a committee, Mr. Speaker, that was so vitally important, and what they are trying to establish here, gets out hearty support from this side of the House, and I think it will have support from the people of Saskatchewan. Let it not be said by anyone, that the Liberal Party is opposed to a prepaid medical health program in this province. There is not a man sitting there or anywhere else that can say truthfully that it has ever been said by any of us that we're opposed to that scheme. All we ever said was that they should let the people express themselves on the different plans, which we hope this Commission will bring forth. But did you ever think to put a farmer on that Committee? Of course, you don't give a dang for the farmers anyway.

Premier Douglas: — Did you say there's no farmer on the committee?

Mr. Danielson: — Who is it? Oh, blow it out. Tell us another one.

When I saw the announcement of this committee I looked it over about a dozen times, I asked the people too. That's all, Mr. Speaker, the farmers should have the right to be represented. They'll never have anything except the privilege to pay more taxes.

I might mention in passing, that when this Government came into power, seventeen years ago, the taxes on my farm were around \$276 or \$286. Last year I paid \$702, and I must point out something else in that connection. Up till a few years ago I used to farm two-thirds and summer fallow one-third, because of the higher yield. The taxes increased so now I farm one-half and summer fallow the other half, and that cuts down the amount of hail insurance that you have to pay. Seven hundred and two dollars, and it isn't exaggerated; it is right on the records; I paid it myself.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in regard to the statement. You know that for the first seven years that Mr. Fines — I don't know where he is — sometimes it's Cuba, and sometimes it's California, and somebody say him in Toronto and the other day there was a telephone

call and he was in California, so he must be seeing the country – he thought he would change them. Now it is very, very difficult to understand this account, because there's no mention of money that this Government spent that isn't in there. What I'm going to tell you here, that in 1943-44, \$31 million dollars to spend; one million on relief; one third million on capital, making a total of \$31 million approximately. In 1961-62 this Government is spending \$147 ½ million on budgetary revenue; \$40 million on what they call receipts applied as reductions of current expenditure; \$12 ½ million of hospital tax; \$12 ½ million in federal grants; \$69,000,000 they are going to borrow during the coming fiscal year, for a total of \$284 million. \$284 million as compared with \$31 million when we came into power in 1944-45.

Mr. Speaker, can you visualize anything more childish, more juvenile, more foolish, than to hear these men getting up and saying, "What did you go back in the thirties?"

We had during this Session a sort of a bird's eye view of the public debt of this province, not long ago. I call it so, because the man who was speaking, he was up in the clouds and then he floats down, and looks around and says "yes". And when he came down again he had covered a lot of territory, but nothing was mentioned. But in 1944 the net debt of this province was \$214 ¼ million. On December 31st 1948, that was the lowest point, the net debt was \$144,627,000. But what has happened in the meantime. Well it is an old story, and it's too bad a fellow is going to have to spend time on it now, but I can't help but let a little light on this. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, there had been collected from five organizations, who had to borrow money from the Government of Saskatchewan in various amounts, the amount of \$76,775,000. This, Mr. Speaker, is shown in Sessional Paper #73, Session 1952.

But, I said at the time, that the money that had been collected from other sources was over \$71 million. I don't know what happened to the Provincial Treasurer, but when he replied at the close of the debate, he said this, "I want to say very frankly that I agree with the hon. Member from Arm River that \$71 million was paid by other agencies", and later in his address he said, "I am now prepared to accept the \$71 million paid off by the Wheat Pool, by telephones and by the

Friday, March 3, 1961

Federal Government, I'm prepared to accept all these things." That was not me, that's the hon. C.M. Fines speaking on that occasion. But when the calculation was completed there was not \$71 million, but \$76,775,000. Now then, this has some bearing on the present position, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say this, without going any further into detail, that the very day that this Government took office the part of the public debt for which this Government is responsible has been going up and up.

From where does this Government get much of the money they are now spending? Well, they don't like to tell us where they get money. We have to ask some questions, and some squeezing around to find out. Last year the subsidy agreement brought them in \$42,026,000; Health grants \$2,615,000; Hospital tax \$12,770; A total of \$57,411,000. All these payments, Mr. Speaker, are made to the province of Saskatchewan by the Federal Liberal Government. Every dollar of it. They wouldn't have this today if it wasn't for the Liberal Government in Ottawa, under MacKenzie King and St. Laurent.

Health grants and hospital grants are not included as budgetary revenue by this Government, but the \$42,026,000 paid all services provided by the provincial Department of Public Health and Social Welfare. The claim that all your health expenses and social aid, are paid for by this province, is not correct; it is paid for by the money that is coming direct from Ottawa, and you have even a few thousand dollars left.

This Government frequently makes comparisons between 1944 and now. They compare the payments to the province by the Federal Government in 1943-44 was less than \$8 million, \$8,400,000 in place of \$57,411,000 at the present time. The subsidy and tax agreement payment of \$42,026,000 more than paid for all the health and social services provided by the Departments of Health and Social Welfare in 1959-60. The total expenses of the two Departments for services was \$37 million. The total expenses of the two departments with all the administration costs included was slightly over \$41 million, still leaving you several thousand dollars to the good on the amount of money which was handed in by the Government at Ottawa on the subsidy and taxation agreement payment.

I just want to say a little about this much-discussed strike, and I have never known till this Session what wonderfully good friends the labour unions were to the farmer. I also noticed that someone once said that goodwill and sympathy are cheap, and I can concur in that. I mentioned a little while ago that

\$65 million didn't have any favourable reception by the labour representatives of eastern Canada, which in effect is all CCF. Two years ago when we had the strike both on the Atlantic and the Pacific sea costs for six weeks, right during the shipping season, and there was only one place in Canada that you could dump a carload of what, Mr. Speaker, and that was at Churchill. Here we have these fellows demanding increases of 25 cents, 30 cents and 40 cents an hour, and they went on strike. It was estimated by the United farmers of Alberta that the province of Alberta alone lost the sale of 18 million bushels of wheat during that period. Now this year, the same thing happened. They were going to start a strike on the Great Lakes. Maybe there was so little of that in the press to escape the notice of the people, but it was not one company that they were going to tie up, but they were going to put five of them out of operation but, companies do? Well the companies got together and they said "Here let's fix this thing up right now" and they commenced to lay them off. The first shift that came on that day was to go; they beat them to the gun that time, and before two or three days the strike was off. That was the end of the strike. But how much friendship and sympathy was there for the farmer? Your Minister of Agriculture should tell us, because they're whooping it up about this strike all the time you had nothing to say in sympathy with the farmers a few weeks ago. What happened here? Well everybody knows what happened.

I came into the City of Regina a few weeks before the Session, about a month before the Session I came down to attend the Golden Wedding celebration of a friend of mine that used to live near Dilke. His son wrote me a letter and asked me to come down. I went down and the celebration was in the Carmichail Church Hall. I went in there and I saw three men coming in the door, and I knew two of them, I didn't know the third one. It so happened that one of these men was a Wheat Pool Director in my district. I hadn't seen him for about two years. He hadn't been too well; he was much more active when I saw him the last time, however, they were talking about this strike. It was two days after this strike at Vancouver had been settled, and I said "What was the wages paid in the lower classification". And he said the sweepers got \$2 something, and I said "What are they getting now?" Well he said, "Approximately \$2.38". Don't let me forget this thing because I want to have it correct. Well I stood there looking at him and I said "Did he buy his own broom out of this?" Then the old fellow started to laugh. "Oh no", he said, "He didn't have to buy his broom."

Friday, March 3, 1961

How many farmers in Saskatchewan do you think could get \$2.38 an hour for the work that they do? How many do you think would come close to \$1.50, if you count the hours that the farmer put in, and that would be twice what the strikers put in.

An Hon. Member: — They ought to be getting that.

Mr. Danielson: — They ought to be, but . . .

An Hon. Member: — Because of a Liberal Government in Ottawa.

Mr. Danielson: — They are not getting that. Now then, I just want to ask labour men to go back to the packing house strike of many years ago. When this gentleman over here called the Minister of Agriculture, all he said, and he laughed when he said it, “Oh, well, the farmers’ hog houses are getting bigger all the time and the bigger they got the less the farmers got for them.” You don’t remember when you said that do you? When you laughed and said, “Oh well, in the meantime the hogs are getting bigger”. But I remember. I’ve got a good memory.

Mr. Speaker, I just thought I would mention this, as many things can be said about these friendships that are expressed between the farmer and labourer, but I’ll say to you that any farmer that ties himself to the socialistic labour movement, I think he should have his head examined.

Well I’m going to talk for a few moments about something that I’ve been thinking about for many years. And that is about the under-handed, infiltrating methods of this socialistic Government, in the business affairs of this province, and I will now turn to the co-operative movement. I’ve been in that movement all my life, and today, this Session, it has been said here that the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation is the political right arm of the co-operative movement. Shame! Listen to them. When I came into this House in the fall of 1944 for a Special Session, people were all over and lined up against the Speaker here, and I mentioned these things. They were fresh from the hustings then, and you know, they didn’t have enough political sense to get up and try to deny what I said, but they tried to justify themselves. The Premier was sitting there and what was the Premier’s reaction? They’ve been doing it ever since. The Co-operative Movement in the province of Saskatchewan would be nearly twice as large if hadn’t been for that.

Yes, I know, Mr. Speaker, that when you get

politics into anything of that kind, that you isolate it from the public, from the people who should benefit from it, and that has happened in the province of Saskatchewan. A man here a year ago was bemoaning that there was hardly any increase in the volume of the business, and in the number of people who patronized the co-operatives. I want to say another thing: I'm not accusing the co-operatives of this province for mixing in politics; here sits the Party that has infiltrated themselves into not only the co-operatives but the churches and the lodges and the universities and everything else.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Will the hon. Member permit a question?

Mr. Danielson: — Oh sit down till I get through, then you can ask your question.

We all remember, Mr. Speaker, the United College in Winnipeg. That was nothing else but an underhanded, infiltration, trouble-making proposition by the CCF Party. That's what it was, and I'm going to prove it to you. This was in December 15, 1955 – Winnipeg – I want to read this so you can hear what I say. Not because it will do you any good . . .

“A former leader of the CCF student group at the University of Manitoba, today pleaded with the CCF to disassociate himself from the activities of CCF supporters at the United College.”

Stuart Barber, fourth year law student at the University, in a letter to Manitoba CCF leader Lloyd Stinson, referred to the dismissal of Prof. Harry S. Crowe by United College. Mr. Barber's letter, released to the press said:

“I am writing to you to plead that you publicly disassociate the CCF movement from the activities of CCF supporters at the United College. I believe that if prompt action is not taken, the action of this so-called socialist group will ruin the CCF Party in this province, and strip our movement of its moral influence.”

Referring to the Crowe controversy as a phony issue, the letter said:

“A small group have used this issue, not only

Friday, March 3, 1961

as a weapon, but as a cloak to cover their struggle to gain control of the college for themselves, and their own brand of cynical bitter socialism. I cannot countenance these tactics, by prominent supporters of the CCF for CCF purposes.”

You have laboured so that your churches, colleges, your universities, you co-operatives, would become infiltrated with that filthy CCF political movement. Any decent person would never, I can tell you, try to bring that thing into the community life, into the co-operatives, into the colleges, and the schools of this province, but it's there.

I have here something from a friend of mine, and a good friend of the Premier, Mr. George Urwin; I knew George Urwin before you knew him. What did he say?

Government Members: — You tell us.

Mr. Danielson: —

“An emphatic denial to any suggestion that the Federated Co-op Limited is linked with any political party, was given by George Urwin, Federated president, when speaking at the formal opening of the new saw mill July 8th. Federated is owned by about 500 local co-operatives in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, with a total membership of 155,000. Mr. Urwin declared, ‘The Members control the business on the basis of one member, one vote, and the individual investment in share capital’.”

Why did he have to go out and deny that there was any politics in that organization?

Government Member: — He heard you speech . . .

Mr. Danielson: — . . . You don't talk about socialism as a way of life anymore. Now it is the state and the co-operative. But don't forget this; a reaction has set in now. I wouldn't speak the way I do if I didn't know what I was speaking about. Today you are captive of the co-op and the labour union. You're not your own boss, you're a captive of these two organizations. And they don't give a darn for you or anybody else. They only want to push for their own interests. You take that to heart.

If there is any amusement among you, you're welcome to it. I can assure you that. You're very welcome to it.

Well, I'm going to say a few words about this famous Continuing Committee. It's two years ago now, since I first talked about this Committee on the floor of this House. In the meantime, the Premier got hold of a smearing brush, and he just painted me, I don't know what colour, but it was sure a good job done. By the time he got through, you'd think that this Continuing Committee, was a holy cow, that we weren't to mention anything about, not to touch it. Nobody had a right to say anything about that Committee. Well, there are two Members among my friends on this side of the House, who got up and supplemented some of the things that I had said. Of course, they got the same treatment from the Premier.

Now it seems to me that this has become quite a permissible topic, and now I understand they're out of a job. What are you going to give them next? Surely, after trying to push the wheelbarrow so long, as they have for you, they should have some consideration.

I would like to ask the Minister who has a competent committee sitting on this medical health scheme, - and what he overlooked, or neglected was to put a farmer on this thing, he has some good men on that committee - what did he do? He said, and I give credit to the Minister of Health for this, the committee was to investigate any medical insurance plan now operating, they could discuss any plan that they found feasible and practicable, and recommend, not exactly what the Premier wanted, but what they considered the best plan. They received briefs from the public; they asked questions and discussed these briefs. That is just as it should be.

What is the difference between that committee and the local government continuing committee? These fellows were appointed, they never had one public meeting; they never asked anybody to give them any advice or suggestion as to what the plan would do for the people. They took no notice of the Rural Municipal Association - All that was absolutely neglected. What were they there for? Well I call it the Charlie McCarthy committee, it's so much like that fellow who parrots his master's voice all the time.

Some Hon. Member: — McCarthy is right - the right term.

Friday, March 3, 1961

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, - Now Charlie McCarthy, that's the fellow.

Premier Douglas: — Joe McCarthy.

Mr. Danielson: — Well that's what you said. You said Joe McCarthy, well that's just like it.

Premier Douglas: — You're always courageous in attacking some new Member here, it's the only heroism I've ever seen you display.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — Sit down, or get out.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear what he said, let him repeat what he said. I have no objection to his repeating it.

Premier Douglas: — If it's not out of order for me to interject; I'll repeat it. I was saying to my hon. friend that the only heroism I've seen him display is in attacking people who are not in the House, and not in the position to answer for themselves. To call people Charlie McCarthy's who the hon. Member wants to attack any Member of this House, or Member of the Government, who can answer back, that is certainly proper, but to attack men who spent three and a half years in public service, and who have no chance to speak back, seems to me despicable and contemptible.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — . . . not the people he was referring to.

Mr. Danielson: — What a display he makes of himself. What a foolish attitude. Who are these men?

Premier Douglas: — Appointees of the Local Government.

Mr. Danielson: — The Government were the fellows who told this committee what to do, and maybe they did.

Now then, when Mr. McAskill goes out and attacks

Mr. Hamilton, that's another story isn't it. I have it right here. It says this:

“As chairman of the Local Government Continuing Committee, I feel it is necessary for me to comment on the personal campaign which J.J. Hamilton, SARM president, conducted in urging rural municipalities to hold plebiscites on the question of local government reorganization.

At the outset, let me say unequivocally that the Committee has always received the fullest cooperation and consideration from the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and its representatives on the Committee. It continues to do so. May I add that Mr. Hamilton is not a member of the Continuing Committee.

Our committee has no desire to interfere with the prerogatives of rural municipalities to hold votes on any questions which their councils decide are appropriate. However, Mr. Hamilton's personal campaign has been an astonishing display. He permitted the impression to be widely publicized that the local plebiscites were endorsed some time ago by the SARM executive. Not until last Friday in Saskatoon did he disclose that he alone was conducting the campaign and that his organization at that time had not taken any official action on the question.

Mr. Hamilton's personal crusade has now culminated in the announcement that ballots are being provided by the SARM office and that the plebiscites are to be held before January 7. I trust that the SARM executive has given careful and thoughtful consideration to this precipitation action.

As is well know, the Local Government Continuing Committee has grave doubts about the value of a plebiscite, even under the best of conditions, as a means of giving adequate expression to opinion on the difficult and complex issue of reorganization.”

Now, what concern is it of Mr. McAskill, what the Rural Municipalities do? They were authorized by statute in the Municipal Act to do this. They haven't always had the right to take anything. This gentleman goes out and tries to drive a wedge between the president of the organization, and the organization itself.

Friday, March 3, 1961

Now, I can tell you here, what Mr. Hamilton said about this and he did it in a very graceful manner. I don't need to prove to you, Mr. Speaker, or the Members of this House, that I'm right, because municipal men all over the province, the secretaries of the municipalities, and I have the letters on file here, have proven this themselves. I have one here that I want to read. November 19, 1960, and this has been in the press, so it's public property. The writer of this letter is Mr. Gerard H. Thorson, Secretary-Treasurer of the R.M. of Willowcreek #458, Brookby, Saskatchewan. It is a very sensible and a very appropriate letter, I am not going to read it all:

“I would like to point out that I am not opposed to the reorganization of local government but before expressing approval I must be convinced that the reorganization would give the rural people better value for their tax dollar than people better than they are receiving at present. This meeting did nothing to reassure me in this respect.

My disillusionment of the whole affair comes from the way both the Provincial Government and the commission have bungled the handling of this important inquiry. In the first place, if a commission is to have the confidence of the general public it must be unbiased and conduct its enquiry in that manner. Secondly it would be preferable if the members comprising the commission were highly capable of handling the assignment.”

Mr. Speaker: — Order! If the hon. Member does not object I wish to interrupt proceedings for the ceremony of Royal Assent.

Mr. Danielson: — Thank you, I will be glad to continue afterwards.

(At 4:50 o'clock p.m. His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor gave Royal Assent to certain Bills).

Mr. Danielson: — I was just reading, Mr. Speaker, a letter printed in the press, from the Secretary of a Municipality, which I stated at the time, and will state again in my reading, and I shall start where I left off:

“From the way the meeting was handled in Melfort I have come to the conclusion that this commission falls far short on both counts.

When a commission of this nature is appointed, its job is to make a detailed study of all aspects of the situation. It should then submit its findings to the Government and suggest methods they think will remedy the weakness they have found. After this is done their assignment should be completed.

This commission has gone much further. In the meetings they are conducting they are announcing the recommendations they intend to present to the Provincial Government and are trying to sell their ideas to the public at these meetings. In doing this they have become the pawns of the Provincial Government. This is something that neither the Government nor commission should have allowed to happen. It should be of no concern to the commission if the general public approves of its findings. This should be the Government’s worry if it chooses to implement the findings of the commission.”

Now this commission was no doubt carrying out what they were supposed to do, they hooked up and put together some sort of a scheme of reorganization of the municipalities. This was done to release the Government from any responsibility of what is done and how it’s going to be carried on.

I’m going to go back to 1946 – I think the date is March 6th. The Member for Rosthern and myself introduced a Resolution in this House to permit the people to vote on the question of municipal reorganization. It was just about the time of the municipal convention. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Brockelbank attended the convention here, and told the municipal men of the province of Saskatchewan, what he had in mind, and how he was going to do it. And he wound up something like this. I was at the convention that evening, and he said, “I understand you don’t like this, but we’re going to do it anyway”. Of course, he was a big man then. The Government was fresh from the people, and they had a big mandate; they had all the members on one side of the House. He could talk that way, but seesawing back and forth over the years until 1952 the Government found they didn’t have the backbone or courage to do it, so they said we’ll get somebody else to help us out, and that’s when they concocted the scheme of appointing a commission. This commission was going to find out all

Friday, March 3, 1961

that was wrong in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this Government told the people of Saskatchewan three or four years previous to 1944, there wasn't a solitary disability that Saskatchewan was suffering from that they did not know how to cure, and that they had a cure for. The Baker Commission was appointed in 1952. They put the Baker Commission in there for one purpose only, and I said it before, and I'll repeat it again, to get the recommendation from that commission to justify them in carrying out the larger municipal boundaries.

Now we come to the Local Government Continuing Committee. They didn't ask anybody in the Province of Saskatchewan what to do, or what they thought about it, or get any suggestion on how this thing could be done. No they didn't do that, they didn't want this, because they had to carry out the understanding that they already had before they took on that job.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, it has been said by the CCF that we Liberals are opposed to the reorganization or alteration of municipal boundaries in the province. That's absolutely false. I can take my own district, send a decent group of men up there, and they would reorganize some boundaries and the Minister of Municipal Affairs knows this. There won't be any trouble and you'll have a better municipality, and you'll have a feeling of harmony and goodwill in the community. Such a group would not be the same as this Continuing Committee, printing figures in the press, showing cost of operation which are absolutely false, and misleading, because the reeves and the municipal secretaries have refuted these figures and told them they have quoted the figures wrongly and given the wrong impression and misleading information to the public. But if you go about this thing in the right way, it can be done, and it should be done, and it should be done, but not by this method of saying, "You swallow this or else."

No, Mr. Speaker, the days have gone, when this Government can push the people around anymore, now they commence to push them back, and the worst is yet to come.

I have a lot more that I could speak on, but I am not going to take the time, and, Mr. Speaker, from what I told you, you will know that I intend to vote for the amendment and against the Motion.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. Member a question, I didn't want to interrupt him? Did I understand the hon. Member to say that there wasn't a farmer on this medical car advisory committee?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes.

Premier Douglas: — Well as my hon. friend said, this is not the time to correct it. I just wanted to see if the statement was correct.

Mr. Danielson: — Would you tell me please who he is?

Premier Douglas: — Yes, I would be glad to.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! If I may have the indulgence of the House for a moment. You realize I do not understand exactly how long the hon. Member here wishes to speak, but you remember that we did bypass the questions today, and if any of the Members did have answers to questions on their desks, if they could table them now, and report them later as being tabled, it would give the people in the office a little better opportunity to get their work cleaned up, if you don't mind.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have had the opportunity of standing in this House, as an elected Member for the Constituency of Elrose, and I want to associate myself with the former speakers who allotted their congratulations and best wishes. I think as I have been listening here for the last few days to the debate, it seems that there are only two items upon which we have agreed; one is the selection of the Speaker and the other the tax sharing agreement. I have enjoyed the debates I have heard, and I think that some of the Members displayed a good deal of wit and nimbleness. I think I would like to say to the Member from Arm River that I have looked forward to being in the house when he is there because he has become almost a tradition. I know the fact that he has served as long as he has is a tribute to him as a person, and displays a great deal of confidence between him and the people of Arm River.

In watching the debates and listening to them I think there is another thing that we can agree on; that is which one of the Members of the Opposition is the best looking — the Members for Humboldt. I had hoped to hear Mr. Cameron before this, the member from Maple Creek, because in listening to the debates on the farm, as I used to do, I always thought that he was one of the better speakers. In fact, in the country the story is that he is the brains of the Liberal Opposition, and so far they

Friday, March 3, 1961

haven't been displayed, and I don't know whether the policies have been coming back end first, or whether they have been saving the best until the last! Well, I think the Member gives me more credit than I am due because I have neither the experience nor the ability that my friends opposite have, and I am quite prepared to admit this.

The remarks of the hon. Member from Arm River though, with what limited experience I have had with farm organizations and in agricultural matters generally, certainly didn't bear out my experience, with the information he gave to this House. In the many times that I have been to Ottawa to tangle with the now late Minister C.D. Hose, who was Minister of Trade and Commerce, and with the other Members in the Federal House, over agricultural matters, I didn't find any awareness at all, or even a sympathy for the particular problems that agriculture faces other than the same type of thinking we now see displayed. That is, that this is entirely a concern within the industry; that it must pay as it goes. If there is a period of over-production, this is the fault of the farmers themselves. If the federal treasury is to be involved at all, it is at minimum price support levels, at such low levels that the industry itself could never be stabilized, and I think, Mr. Speaker, it was for these reasons that we now see very few Liberal Members in the Federal House. The farmers simply would not believe the story that they were never so well off, and that Liberal administrations had provided them with the best policies that they ever could have. They simply refused to believe it, and of course, their actions have shown this.

There were some other statements made by Members in respect to some of the things that Liberal Governments have done, and I see the hon. Member from Pelly had to go back as far as 1841 for some of the philosophical background to their present policies. I suggest that some of their policies go back further than this. In fact, I think they are in a politically schizophrenic position. They are trying to maintain a position of private enterprise and freedom of the individual to do exactly as he wishes, but in actual fact the world has moved past their point, and the only two groups that are left now, Mr. Speaker, that are in a private enterprise economy, where one competes freely with another in the market place for whatever price he can get, are the farmers and the fellows that are running the corner grocery store – the small entrepreneurs. These are the only two groups that are left, and the rest of the world has simply moved past we farmers and the small business man. In fact, private capitalism no longer exists in the form that can determine policy in the nations of the world today.

The people who are in the position where they can influence and direct policy are no longer the private capitalists, as they once were, even as little as fifty years. Now we have moved into a period that I would call corporate capitalism, and it is the large corporation that is adequately staffed, that has an executive directorship not necessarily owning the factors of production, that are determining the policy. This is the modern phenomenon of capitalism, and we farmers are still far behind. We have one or two courses to follow. We can't have it both ways, it seems to me. If we insist that each farmer can go his own way and compete freely against fellow farmers, and let the devil take the hindmost, and rely on efficiency and greater and greater production alone to bail us out, then I don't think we are keeping in step with the rest of modern industries, because, Mr. Speaker, it simply doesn't operate this way anymore. The two ways that are before us aren't really a simple choice. I suppose in the long run it will be a combination of the two, as this is the way these things are usually resolved. We can either group together in co-operatives and marketing boards, or else we can become integrated into the modern factory type of production enterprise, or else become more and more reliant on government policies, and this in most countries has become federal policies. This is the only Government having a broad enough economic base to give us the support the industry needs, to give us the type of support, and to assist me in production controls which every other nation has now adopted. Other than this, we farmers can look forward to: (a) greater and greater amounts of surpluses, depending on the type of production we are involved in and the bankruptcy of our fellow farmers, the ones having the least amount of advantage in comparison with the larger and stronger entrepreneurs. This is simply the history of private capitalism.

Now I say to you, it's up to us to decide which kind of agricultural society we wish, and I don't think it is in the long run interest of farmers, nor the industry, to only concentrate on the one side of the industry, Mr. Speaker, the production side. A present we have sums of money spent both federally and provincially giving us better breeds of cereals, finding out more ways to produce more bushels per acre, finding out ways of producing more pounds of beef per pound of feed, all these things, and while we do need to move forward to greater and greater efficiency, we must balance the industry out, it seems to me, and keep it somewhere in step with effective demands. The nation itself, having recognized the responsibility of assisting us in producing more, must also accept the responsibility of assisting us over a transition period, between a peak production

Friday, March 3, 1961

Period and until such time as the demand may pick up. Unless the nation will recognize this, it seems to me that we are stuck on the hook. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that you can get this position purely on a private enterprise type of approach. You will either have to do the one or the two types of things, and as the Member for Nipawin said here the other day, I imagine that each one of us can bring forward definitions of capitalism, definitions of socialism, and we can keep on hitting each other back and forth across this Chamber with just as little effect as has been done up to this point.

The basic point is, we all know which way we want to move. We want greater security for ourselves on our farms, just as the workers want greater security in their jobs. We want greater stability of price. We want to have a systematic and regular flow of our products onto the market. The nation has become involved on one side, that is giving us ways and means of producing more and more, without recognizing that ultimately this increase in efficiency will finally bankrupt many of our farmers, and that the answer is not to be found totally in greater increases of efficiency, and without also recognizing that as farmers are displaced the nation as a whole, as well as the province, has responsibility in assisting in this transition. I suggest to you that we are the forgotten breed. This has been the experience of the farmer in the past, and those of us who have been involved in farming and farm organizations recognize this.

I think in spite of what has been said, if the Members of the Opposition are really sincere, as I believe they are, then I think they must recognize the logic of this type of approach, and as the Member from Moosomin said the other day, he too believed in a planned economy but it depends on who does the planning. This has been borne out finally, I think, by the last National Liberal Convention. Little by little, nations and people have realized that you cannot solve all problems by going it alone because of the modern technological race and the type of economy we are now in. The planning must be there, to whatever degree we are able, and I for one am willing to plan with others and do the best I can with the knowledge we have, rather than sit and do nothing and wait until the time you think you can pay for every little hit. No nation, no industry, has ever gone on the premise that they must pay exactly every bit of the way they are going. Every industry has at some point owed a great deal, in one way or another, for the things that they have yet to produce, and we as a nation have this responsibility to our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The debate was, on motion of the Hon. Mr. Turnbull, adjourned.

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