

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
SECOND SESSION — FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE  
3rd Day**

**Friday, October 13th, 1961**

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

Before the Orders of the Day:

**QUESTION RE SODIUM SULPHATE DEPOSITS**

**Mr. W. Ross Thatcher** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. Could the Minister state whether the government or any agency thereof has recently purchased the sodium sulphate deposits at Ingebright Lake near Fox Valley. If so, could he tell the House whether the purchase will have any effect on the operations of the sodium sulphate plant at Chaplin?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, negotiations have been in progress and they may be completed, but I wouldn't like to make a definite announcement right now. I might have something to announce in a day or two on that.

**QUESTION RE WATER DRILLING**

**Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane** (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I have a press release from this morning's paper stating that a joint water drilling program has been entered into between the provincial, federal and municipal governments. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him if this is in effect immediately in this province.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet** (Minister of Agriculture): — Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is in effect now.

October 13, 1961

## STATEMENT RE PROCEDURE

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to make a statement with regard to procedure in the debate on the Address-in-Reply. If it is all right I will make it now; otherwise I will leave it until the end of the debate.

Yesterday a point of order was raised, questioning a practice of this House which has pertained for some time, namely that of permitting debate on both the Address-in-Reply and the amendment thereto, at the same time. In my opinion the point of order requires not so much a ruling on the practice as an explanation of its purpose.

The Speech from the Throne is traditionally a general statement of government policy, as well as a general outline of proposed legislation. Following the speech, the House has an opportunity to debate in general terms the policies and the legislative proposals of the government on the motion for an Address-in-Reply. This debate provides the House with an opportunity to test the government on the motion for an Address-in-Reply. This debate provides the House with an opportunity to test the government on a want of confidence motion, moved as an amendment to the Address-in-Reply, and in this House such an amendment has long been regarded simply as a non-confidence motion, without in any way restricting the generality of the debate. Thus, after an amendment has been moved to the motion of the Address-in-Reply the House continues to debate the general policy of the government and not simply the specific substance of the amendment.

I must therefore rule that the point raised yesterday was not well taken, and debate will continue on the amendment and the motion.

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

### Address-in-Reply

The House then resumed the debate on the proposed motion of Mrs. Cooper, seconded by Mr. Meakes:

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourned yesterday afternoon, I congratulated the lady member for Regina, and the member for Touchwood on the very able manner in which they moved and seconded the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I also dealt with the complaint of the Leader of the Opposition, regarding the fact that members were going to be asked, commencing next Monday, to sit in the mornings throughout the duration of this special session.

I would like now to turn to the address which was delivered by the Leader of the Opposition. After listening to it yesterday, I am convinced that the one thing the Leader of the Opposition needs is a new speech writer. This is the same speech that we listened to during the previous session. It is the same speech the people have listened to all over this province. It contained the same newspaper clippings, the same quotes, the same misrepresentations and the same exaggerations. Maybe it was louder, but it certainly wasn't any better. The same old inconsistencies were there — saying that taxes are too high. For about twenty minutes he said that taxes were too high. Then he criticized the government because we hadn't built another mental hospital and because we held the hospitals down last year to an additional three per cent on their budget. He described the austerity plan for hospitals as "belt-tightening". I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a \$35,000,000 payment to the hospitals of this province could hardly be described as belt-tightening. That is more than the entire provincial budget was fifteen years ago.

The Leader of the Opposition spent a good part of his time yesterday worrying about the state of the CCF organization and of the New Democratic Party. This has always been a strange phenomenon to me. I can recall that for the past sixteen years in this legislature, members opposite have spent a great deal of time talking about the Regina Manifesto, telling us what was wrong with the CCF organization and predicting its early demise. For an organization that was going to die so quickly it has had a remarkably long life, and a good deal of fight in it as my hon. friends have found in successive general elections.

**October 13, 1961**

I want to just offer a word of kindly advice to my friends, and I won't charge them anything for it. It is this: if the Liberal party had spent less time in the last ten or twelve years worrying about the state of affairs in the CCF, and about the CCF Manifesto, and had spent more time getting together a constructive program and securing for themselves a leader who would commend himself to the people of the province, they would be in better political shape than they are today.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — Instead of that, they have tried to be all things to all men, until today they have come to the place where they are intellectually bankrupt, and have the least responsible leadership that they have ever had in their long and chequered career.

The Leader of the Opposition said yesterday that the government is supported by a party which is passing out of existence. Mr. Speaker, he knows, of course, that this is not true. He wasn't here but he knows that at the 1960 session of this legislature, the session prior to the provincial election, I gave from my place, with the full support of my colleagues, the pledge that if the CCF government were elected in 1960, it would sit for the term which it was elected as a CCF government, and that the CCF members would sit as CCF members for their constituencies. Now, it is true that the Saskatchewan CCF will affiliate with the New Democratic Party for federal purposes. This is not an unusual procedure. We formed the Saskatchewan Farmer-Labour Party in 1932. The CCF was formed in 1933. The Saskatchewan Farmer-Labour Party affiliated with the CCF for federal purposes, but remained as the Saskatchewan Farmer-Labour Party until the general election of 1938.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest because the party to which we belong on this side has changed the name of its federal affiliate, that it should resign, comes most strangely from the Leader of the Opposition. Here is a man who didn't change the name of his affiliation. Here is a man who changed his political party. He was three times elected as a CCF member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre. Then we walked across the floor of the House of Commons and sat as an independent. He made some advances, first to the Social Credit party and then to the Progressive Conservative party and when he found the welcome sign wasn't out, he joined the Liberal party. Many of the people in his constituency demanded that he should resign and come back and face his constituents, and this he refused to do. As a matter of fact when the 1957 elected rolled around he didn't even go back to that constituency which he had deserted, in order to give his constituents an opportunity to express their opinion about what

he had done. Instead he went to another constituency where he was defeated in both 1957 and 1958. For this gentleman now to suggest that a political party that has changed the name of its federal affiliate ought to resign and go to the people, seems to me takes the kind of gall that would make a government mule look like a shrinking violet.

This government has not changed its program or its policy or anything else. As a matter of fact we've had in the Farmer-Labour party and later in the CCF, trade union affiliates since the very beginning of our organization.

The Leader of the Opposition spent some time yesterday trying to tell this House that the New Democratic Party will be "labour dominated". But if he took the trouble to look at the representation at the founding convention in Ottawa, he would find that the trade union representation was about one-third of the total delegate representation at the convention. At the Ontario founding convention last Saturday the CCF delegates and the trade union delegates together represented about two-thirds. The other one-third was made up of other groups who had never belonged to either of these groups. The thirty-five farmers to whom he referred didn't cover all the farmers. There were plenty of farmers there as CCF delegates and from new party clubs. The thirty-five farmer delegates were farmers from farm organizations who had never before been affiliated with the CCF or any of the new party clubs.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — As far as Saskatchewan is concerned we have always welcomed trade union affiliates. At the convention which will commence on the first of November, trade union representatives will probably number less than one hundred and certainly not more than one hundred, out of a total delegate body of some nine hundred. I want to say that as far as the New Democratic party is concerned, we will welcome the support of trade union affiliates, anywhere in Canada.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday talked about the merging of the CCF and the Canadian Labour Congress. He ought to know that the Canadian Labour Congress is not part of the New Democratic Party. Under their constitution they can't become part of the New Democratic Party. I noticed in the press the other day that he referred to Stanley Knowles as being the president of the New Democratic Party. Mr. Stanley Knowles is an officer of the Canadian Labour Congress. He holds no office in the New Democratic Party, and cannot, nor can any of the other top officers of the Canadian Labour

**October 13, 1961**

Congress hold office in the New Democratic Party. But I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that at long last, labour groups in this country are recognizing that they have a common cause with the farmers and the small businessmen, and the white collar workers.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — When the Leader of the Opposition says that “he who pays the piper calls the tune” I’d like to know who has been calling the tune for the Liberal party throughout the years? You’ve only got to go back and remember the Beauharnois scandal and the Bren Gun scandal and the Trans Canada Pipe Line affair . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It isn’t the breweries, anyway . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — . . . and to remember that in this province a Liberal government, when we had one here, was little better than the cat’s paw for the mortgage companies and the insurance underwriters’ association. Any time anybody pays to the New Democratic Party or to the CCF it will be paid in the open where people will know who is paying.

The Leader of the Opposition said that the interests of farmer and labour are not the same. Well, of course the interests cannot be identical, but I submit that the interests of these two groups are much closer together than any other two groups in our society. They depend on each other’s purchasing power. The prosperity of the one will contribute to the prosperity of the other.

Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is right, and if their interests are irreconcilable, and if it is not possible to have a party which serves both the farmers and the industrial workers, then which of these groups does the Liberal party serve? Which? Well, I will tell you Mr. Speaker, what they profess to serve. On the prairies they talk about serving the farmer. But I know that in Ontario and Quebec for the last ten years, among the industrial workers, the people there have been told that you can’t support the CCF because it is completely dominated by western farmers. The Liberal party doesn’t support either the farmers or the industrial workers! It has supported those vested interests who have exploited both of them as long as Canada has been a nation! All the Liberal party has ever tried to do is to play the

farmer and the worker off against each other, while at the same time being the chore boy of those who have betrayed them.

The Leader of the Opposition says that the Premier deserted his desk in Regina to go about the country selling the New Democratic Party. Mr. Speaker, that statement is false. I have never deserted my desk at Regina. Since the time that I became national leader of the New Democratic Party, I have been away — apart from weekends and I assume I am entitled to spend my weekends addressing public meetings in other parts of Canada if I want to — I have been away from my desk two weeks — one week in which I went to Ottawa to attend the founding convention, and one week in which I took a series of nominating conventions and other meetings in eastern Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I assume I am entitled as are most employees of the government, to three weeks' holidays. There were a great many years for which I haven't had them. But I am entitled to three weeks' holiday and I've already spent two weeks of that holiday, as I have already outlined, and I propose to use the third week to attend the provincial convention of the CCF, which will commence on the first of November of this year.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — I need no instructions from the Leader of the Opposition as to how to discharge my duty.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — The Leader of the Opposition is also on the taxpayer's payroll, Mr. Speaker. Let's not forget that. He draws an indemnity, he draws a salary as Leader of the Opposition and he also draws a pension as a former Member of Parliament, which is also paid by the taxpayers of this country. He too has some responsibility to discharge his duties and to earn his money. I was interested in the press release which he gave at the end of the session, this past year, in which he said he had been so exhausted by the work of the session that he had to go to Europe for six weeks' holiday. I don't begrudge him having a six weeks' holiday; I just couldn't understand what had exhausted him! As I recall it, he made one speech in the Throne Speech debate. He didn't speak in the Budget debate, and when almost every major piece of legislation came up, he rose and said he hadn't had time to read it, but some other member in his group was going to

**October 13, 1961**

make a thumping speech on it. Sometimes the other member turned up and sometimes the other member didn't. Is this what exhausted the hon. member?

Mr. Speaker, when he has put as many years in this House as I have, and is able to show the people of this province as good a record of rigid application to the responsibilities which have been given to him, then he will be in a position to offer his criticisms.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, this session of the legislature was called together as hon. members know, to deal with two major matters. The first is the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act, which has just been given first reading by this legislature. I think it is significant, that in his address yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition said nothing about the basic principles of medical care. His only reference to a medical care program were those which were designed to throw cold water on the idea. First he said, "Why don't we wait for a national plan." Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure there were a lot of people in Saskatchewan who heard that and who said to themselves, "How long are we supposed to wait?" The Liberal Party at its national convention in 1919 promised a national comprehensive health insurance program. They were in office from 1921 to 1930 and from 1935 to 1957. In 1945, during the election immediately following the war, Liberal candidates went up and down the country waving a copy of the Heagerty Report and waving a copy of a bill which was never put into law, and saying, 'You elect us now that the war is over and we're going to have comprehensive health insurance'. It's true we had a Hospital Insurance Act. But it was a Hospital Insurance Act which contained within it a "joker", whereby we couldn't get a national health insurance plan until at least Ontario or Quebec along with four other provinces were willing to come into the plan. The Liberal party left office without having contributed one five-cent piece to a national hospital insurance plan.

The Conservatives then came into office. Let it be said to their everlasting credit that one of the first things they did was to take the joker out of the Act, and to make national hospital insurance available to whatever provinces were prepared to proceed with such a plan. But they had promised in 1957 that if they were elected they would not only take the joker out of the Act, but



they would extend hospital insurance to cover all hospital cases. This they haven't done. They promised to make hospital insurance applicable to mental hospital patients, and to tuberculosis sanatoria, and this they haven't done. The result is that hospital insurance in Canada today covers only 50 per cent of the hospital beds in Canada. We haven't got complete hospital insurance yet. Someone has said that we should wait for the report of the Royal Commission on Medical care which has been set up by the Government of Canada. Well, first of all most of us have done some experience about waiting for action to be taken on the reports of Royal Commissions, and if one looks at the terms of reference of that commission, one can see that it is not specifically beamed at dealing with the problem of setting up a comprehensive health insurance program. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, to say that we should wait for a national plan, is to ask the people of Saskatchewan to drag along and wait, as they have waited for thirty or forty years, for the federal government to act and knowing full well that they are not likely to act unless some province leads the way.

The other thing the Leader of the Opposition said about the medical care program was, "What's the hurry?" He said the government is just hurrying this plan through for the publicity effect in the federal election. Yet, I remember at the last regular session of the legislature, that at least two or three members opposite asked the government when we were going to get on with the medical care plan. They pointed out that the government had promised it in the election of 1960. They wanted to know what we were waiting for — how long was the medical advisory committee going to take to gate a report down — what was holding us up? Mr. Speaker, this is surely a disorganized army. The rank and file are saying forward, and the leader is saying retreat. They had better make up their minds. Does the Liberal party believe we should have a medical care plan. Do they believe we should have it now? Do they want to postpone it? They can't be "forwards-backwards" all the time. They've got to take a stand. I think the people of the province have a right to know where they stand on this question. When the House votes on this matter they'll have a chance to see, and their constituents will have a chance to see what they think about a medical care plan.

There was one statement made by the Leader of the Opposition about medical care which astonished me. He said, 'There's not a shred of evidence to show that any person in the province has been unable to get medical attention'.

**October 13, 1961**

Surely if ever a comment indicated that an individual was out of touch with people, it is that remark. It is like Marie Antoinette at the time of the French Revolution when the people were crying for bread, saying, "Why don't they eat cake". To say that there is no evidence to show that any person in the province has been unable to get medical attention, is to fly in the face of all the facts.

The Canadian Sickness Report, 1951, conducted by the Government of Canada shows clearly that the lower income groups in the period under study had more illness and more days of disability than did the higher income groups. It shows, conversely, that the volume of medical care received by the low income groups is much less than that received by higher income groups. The low income groups because of poor diet, poor housing conditions and harder working conditions have more illness and have more disability. Yet the records show that they are the people who get the least medical care. The Canadian Sickness Report shows that the low income groups spent on an average \$58.10 per family, whereas the higher income groups spent on an average \$158.70 per family. The higher income groups spent almost three times as much per family on medical care as did the low income groups, despite the fact that the low income groups had more sickness and more disability.

If my hon. friend would take the trouble to turn to Page 58 of the Interim report of the Advisory Committee on Medical Care he would see there a table which shows that in the year 1959, 120,940 persons or families in Saskatchewan had incomes of less than \$2,500 per year. Forty-eight per cent of the income earners of this province had an income of less than \$2,500. The same report shows that thirty-five per cent of the income earners in this province didn't earn enough to pay income tax. They didn't earn \$1,000 a year if they were single, and didn't earn \$2,000 a year if they were married with no dependent children. Those figures can be duplicated right across Canada as the recent survey will show. It is sheer nonsense therefore to say that there is no evidence that people are not able to get the medical attention they require.

Now I readily grant that no doctor has turned patients away. No doctor could do so without violating his Hippocratic oath. But what happens? First of all, patients are reluctant to go to the doctor if they know they can't pay. People fail to seek medical counsel and medical advice when they should get it and they oftentimes

leave it until the situation is serious and even dangerous. The second fact is that many people who do go to doctors incur bills and debts which cripple them for years to come and this does not just apply to poor people. There are thousands of people in Saskatchewan and across Canada living on reasonably comfortable incomes who are able to make the payments on their houses and their cars and on their television set and who can get by providing two things, firstly — they don't lose their jobs and secondly, that the bread-winner doesn't get seriously ill. For such people, doctor bills amounting to large sums of money can put that family in a serious financial predicament for years to come.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday spent a good deal of time talking about the terrible costs which this would place upon the taxpayers of the province. I thought some of his sentences were gems. He said, "The Liberals believe in a medical care plan if it can be done without hardship to the taxpayer." Now, which taxpayer is he worried about — the ones that are going to be paying less under this plan than they pay now, or the ones that are going to be paying more? Which is he worried about? He goes on and says, "Many people wonder if we can afford \$20,000,000 at a time like this for a medical care plan". Many people wonder! Is he one of them? Are the members opposite among those who wonder if we can afford \$20,000,000 for a medical care plan? Let them say so.

The Leader-Post for three months has been writing editorials telling the people of Saskatchewan they cannot afford a medical care plan. Is the Liberal press speaking for the Liberal party. It is time the Liberal party got off the fence and took a stand. The Leader of the Opposition says the people cannot stand more taxes. He says that land taxes are too high. Mr. Speaker, of course land taxes are too high. I want to point out two things. The CCF government doesn't impose any land taxes. There is no provincial land tax. There was a provincial land tax when we took office, and it was put there by a Liberal government. The CCF government took it off. It was a tax of two mills on every bit of land in Saskatchewan.

I want to remind you, moreover, that by gradually increasing school grants and giving additional help to municipalities for roads, we have saved the municipality a great deal of money which they could otherwise have had to get by levying land taxes. If we had continued to pay school grants, not in the same amounts, but in the same percentage of the total cost of education that the Liberal party gave, and if we gave assistance for roads to municipalities

**October 13, 1961**

on the same basis that the Liberal party gave them, the municipalities of this province — rural and urban — would have had to impose another 17½ mills on every bit of land in the province of Saskatchewan. The generous help the municipalities have had from the government has enabled them to keep the land taxes from going any higher than they are now.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of a medical care plan is not a new cost to the people of Saskatchewan. The people of this province now are spending \$18 million to \$20 million a year for medical care. This is not a new cost. It is a different distribution of the cost — that is all. This money had to be paid before. Doctors of this province had to be paid. Everything has had to be paid for — their staff, X-ray technicians, lab technicians, these things all had to be paid for. But they have been paid for by those who were unfortunate enough to be ill. We are now saying they should be paid for by spreading the cost over all the people. We propose that the family tax which we admit is a regressive tax, since there is a flat rate on every family, and therefore bears no relationship to ability to pay should be kept as small as possible. We propose that the balance of the cost — probably two-thirds of the cost — ought to be raised by factors which have a measure of ability to pay.

Maybe this is why the Liberal press have been so vehement in their attacks on this plan. It may be that some of them begin to suspect that they are going to have to pay a part of the medical bill of some other people who are not able to pay their own.

Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition sneered at the idea of 'I am my brother's keeper'. He said, "There isn't much cream in Saskatchewan." I want to suggest that the Leader-Post and the Star-Phoenix, the Sifton interests and the Leader of the Opposition have fattened quite a bit during the term of the CCF government in office, and it will certainly not hurt them at all to make some contribution towards the medical care for those less fortunate than themselves.

**Mr. McDonald:** — There are a lot of heavy ones over there!

**Premier Douglas:** — The Leader of the Opposition when he began his remarks on Wednesday said, 'The member for Regina doesn't know what this medical care plan will cost', and 'I doubt if the government knows'.

This is strange. It's strange in the first place the government wouldn't know what it is going to cost, when the Leader of the Opposition has been going up and down the length and breadth of the province, saying that he knows what it's going to cost because he has one of the government's secret documents.

If the government has a secret document saying what it is going to cost, and the Leader of the Opposition says he's got a copy of it, how can he say the government doesn't know what it's going to cost?

This is what the September 27th issue of the Kindersley Clarion attributed to the Leader of the Opposition in a speech which he delivered at Kindersley:

“ . . . claiming to have obtained possession, through “friends on the other side”, of a photostatic record of governments plans for a medical services scheme, Thatcher declared that this document will shock everyone in Saskatchewan . . . ”

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not he has a photostatic copy of such a document. If he has, there are only two places he could have secured it. The first would be from some member of the Advisory Planning Committee on Medical Care, and I don't believe any member of that committee would give to him or to anyone else, a copy of a confidential report. The only other place that would have a copy of such a report would be from —

**Mr. Gardiner:** — The Toronto Star!

**Premier Douglas:** — We're talking now about costs. If he has a document outlining the costs which he says will shock the people of Saskatchewan, the only place he could have got it would be if some employee of the government had stolen it, and given it to him. It's the only place. As a matter of fact, I remember a year ago when he also professed to have had an advance copy of what we were going to charge for the hospital plan for the year 1961. Well, Mr. Speaker, by my standards, I have always thought the receiver of stolen property was exactly in the same position as the person who stole it.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

October 13, 1961

**Premier Douglas:** — When the Leader of the Opposition says that the government doesn't know the cost, and he doesn't know the cost, I wonder if he read a copy of the Interim Report of the Advisory Planning Committee on Medical Care. This was sent to him the very day it was released to the press. He will find that on page 85 estimates are given. They say it will cost between \$19,970,000 and \$20,570,000. If you add to that the administrative costs, which they estimate at \$1 million, this means somewhere between \$21 million and \$21.5 million, and if a utilization fee is charge, you can subtract \$1,800,000 from these amounts. There isn't much doubt as to what the cost will be. We're talking about a sum of money in the neighbourhood of \$20 million — more if you don't impose utilization fees, and slightly less if you do.

It seems to me to be begging the question to be talking about whether or not the people of this province, or the people of Canada can afford a plan to spread the cost of sickness over the entire population. This is not a new principle. This has existed in nearly all the countries of western Europe — many of them for a quarter of a century. It has been in Great Britain since 1948; it has been in New Zealand since 1935; it has been in Australia. The little state of Israel that only came into existence in 1948 has today the most comprehensive health insurance plan in the world. It has more doctors, and nurses and dentists per thousand of its population than any other industrialized country or any country for which we can get statistics.

It is not a new principle. To me it seems to be sheer nonsense to suggest that medical care is something which ought to be measured just in dollars. When we're talking about medical care we're talking about our sense of values. Do we think human life is important? Do we think that the best medical care which is available is something to which people are entitled, by virtue of belonging to a civilized community? I looked up the figures and I found that in 1959, the people of Canada spent \$1,555 million, or eight per cent of their personal expenditures on alcohol and tobacco. I would be the last person to argue that people do not have the right, if they want to, to spend part of their income for either alcohol or tobacco or entertainment, or anything else. But in the same period of time, the people of Canada spent \$944 million for medical and dental care, or four and one-half per cent of their income expenses. In other

words, in the year 1959 we spent almost twice as much on luxuries such as tobacco and alcohol as we spent on providing ourselves and our families with the medical and dental care which they require.

If we can afford large sums of money for other things such as horse-racing, and many other things, and we do — I'm not arguing against them — then I say we ought to have sufficient sense of values to say that health is more important than these things, and if we can find money for relatively non-essential things, we can find the money to give to our people good health.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — The Liberal press in this province have been running editorials regularly for months now against the welfare state, particularly attacking the welfare state in the United Kingdom. The other day they pointed out that the British government was spending on national defence. Well, this to me is not a crushing criticism. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it shows that the Parliament of Great Britain recognizes that giving people security, giving people good health, giving people the feeling of well-being, is the most important defence there is against Communism. Communities where people have security and where care is taken of the needy and unfortunate, have the kind of society in to which Communism has never been able to infiltrate. They published the figures on what this welfare state is costing the British taxpayer. They quoted as \$2.5 billion and that is approximately correct. But there are 55 million people in Great Britain. If you divide 55 million people into \$2.5 billion, this works out at less than \$50 per capita.

Mr. Speaker, \$50 per capita gives every man, woman and child in Great Britain security from the cradle to the grave. It takes care of their doctor bills, dental bills, hospital bills, optometric care and appliances. The only thing for which there is a deterrent fee is drugs, and that is very small. It gives them unemployment insurance, baby bonuses and pensions when they are physically disabled. It provides benefits in the event of death, and it provides adequate pensions for widows and their children. I say that if any government, or any country can give its people that kind of security for less than \$50 per capita, then it is worth the price, and many times over.

**October 13, 1961**

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that a medical care plan can only be financed out of one or two sources of revenue. The first one is from taxes. Everyone knows you have to pay taxes if you want services. Many people under this plan will pay less than they are paying now if they belong to a private plan. Other people will pay more, because if some of the money is collected on a basis of ability to pay, and if they are in the higher income groups, they may be paying a little more. The important thing for the government to ensure is that the part which must be collected from taxes is collected as equitably as possible in order to distribute the burden as equitably as possible.

The other source from which the government can get money, of course, is resource development. I want to remind you that this government has collected probably \$100 for every dollar which a Liberal government ever collected from resource development in this province. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition once again made a sweeping statement. He said that the crown corporations cost the people of this province millions of dollars. The fact is, of course, that the last financial statement showed conclusively that after providing for the losses on the woollen mill and the shoe factory and the tannery, the smaller crown corporations — not including gas and power and telephones — have accumulated over \$12 million in surpluses. If you include power, gas and telephones, the surpluses are over \$53 million — \$53,804,067 to be exact. The crown corporations have paid into the government treasury in royalties some \$7,870,000; they paid to the municipality in lieu of taxes \$3,609,000 and have paid out in wages over \$181 million.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province want health security. I think hospital insurance proves that. In spite of all the criticism we had when hospital insurance was set up, and in spite of the protest of the Liberal party that we should allow it to be handled by the municipalities, the fact is that today no one in this province in their right mind would suggest abolishing hospital insurance. On the contrary, our pioneering in hospital insurance proved so successful that today our example has been followed in every province in this Dominion.

I believe that the great bulk of the people of this province support the idea of the medical care plan. I believe they will indicate they are willing to pay for it, providing the cost is spread equitably on the basis of ability to pay. The only ones who are likely to oppose it are those who fear that they will have to help those less



fortunate than themselves.

Mr. Speaker, you will note from the Speech from the Throne it says this medical care plan is to be a province-wide plan, with universal coverage. This was an important decision for the Advisory Planning Committee on Medical Care to make. They had before them briefs from which advocated a partial medical care plan. In very brief terms the recommendation was that the great bulk of the people who were self-supporting would ensure themselves by joining the private plan of their choice, and that the remainder should have an extra premium paid on their behalf to the private plan, providing they could show that they were in need. Private plans ordinarily do not take people who have congenital illnesses. But if these people are in need and if an extra premium is paid on their behalf by the government, they would get medical care from private plans. Those people generally who, because of low incomes, were not able to pay the private plan premium would also be covered by the private plans if they could show they were in need and if the government would pay their premium.

It was said by those submitting this plan that this could be done for some \$3,600,000. This would be so much cheaper than a general plan. Well, the majority report of the Advisory Planning Committee on Medical Care showed that the rest of the committee were very dubious about this \$3,600,000. It also showed that they were convinced the people of Saskatchewan in the aggregate would pay much more to private plans than they are going to pay under a government-sponsored plan.

There are two basic weaknesses in the proposals which were put forward by those who wanted a limited coverage for medical care. The first is that private plans bear no relationship to ability to pay. I want to make it abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that the private plans such as Medical Services Incorporated and Group Medical Services have rendered a marvellous service to the people of Saskatchewan. In the absence of a government plan I have advised people throughout the years, if they can possibly afford it, to join these private plans. They have been well operated, and I hope that much of their experience and their facilities and staff may be made available to

**October 13, 1961**

those who will be managing the government-sponsored medical care plan. But a private medical care plan can only raise money in one way, and that is by putting flat premium on every family irrespective of whether the family's income is \$20,000 a year or \$10,000. They have no way of graduating premiums on the basis of ability to pay. Only the government can levy taxes on the basis of ability to pay. Only the government is in a position to say that those who have less will pay less, and those who have more will pay more. This is why, in my opinion, and in the opinion, apparently, of the majority of the committee, the idea of partial coverage was dropped.

The other weakness in the proposal of a partial medical care program is that a great many groups in the province would only get coverage if they could prove need. This means imposing a means test; this means probing into people's affairs, and this is a pretty serious thing to do.

I want to say that the time is surely past when people should have to depend on proving need in order to get services that should be the inalienable right of every citizen of a good society.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — It is all very well for some people to say that there is no stigma or humiliation connected with having to prove need. This is always said by people who know that they are in no danger of having to prove need. I am very glad that the committee recommended and the government decided that there will be no such stigma and that there will be no means test. Every person in the province who is self-supporting and able to pay a relatively small per capita tax, will be eligible for care and those who are not self-supporting will be covered by other programs.

I want to say that I think there is a value in having every family and every individual make some individual contribution. I think it has psychological value. I think it keeps the public aware of the cost and gives the people a sense of personal responsibility. I would say to the members of this House that even if we could finance the plan without a per capita tax, I personally would strongly advise against it. I would like to see the per capita tax some day so low that it is merely a nominal tax, but I think there is psychological value in people paying something for their cards. It is something

which they have bought; it entitles them to certain services. We should have the constant realization that if these services are abused and costs get out of hand, then of course the cost of the medical care is bound to go up.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if this medical care insurance program is successful, and I think it will be, it will prove to be the forerunner of a national medical care insurance plan. It will become the nucleus around which Canada will ultimately build a comprehensive health insurance program which will cover all health services — not just hospital and medical care — but eventually dental care, optometric care, drugs and all the other health services which people require. I believe such a plan operated by the federal and provincial governments jointly will ultimately come in Canada. But I don't think it will come unless we lead the way. I want to say that when the history of our time is written, it may well be recorded that in October, 1961, the Saskatchewan legislature and the Saskatchewan people pioneered in this field and took a first step towards ultimately establishing a system of medical care insurance for all the people of Canada.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — The Leader of the Opposition has said that before this plan is put in, there should be a plebiscite. He says this plebiscite should be held because 59 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan voted against it in the last provincial election. Mr. Speaker, that is not what he said during the election. He and the Leader of the Conservative party and the Leader of the Social Credit party went up and down the province, assuring people they were not against a medical care plan. How can this 59 per cent Liberal, Conservative and Social Credit vote now be counted as being against the medical care plan? Not one of the other political leaders in the last provincial election stood up and said they were opposed to the medical care program. They said just the opposite. The Leader of the Opposition repeatedly said that he was in favour of a medical care program, and that he wanted a medical care plan for the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this province have made it abundantly clear both from the recommendations they have made to the government and to the Advisory Planning Committee on Medical Care, that they want a medical care plan. Apart from the briefs submitted by the doctors

**October 13, 1961**

and Chamber of Commerce, the great bulk of representations, both to the government and to the committee, asked for a plan such as this. The government believes that health is too important to be left to the chance that the average family will have the necessary money to buy health services. I believe that if we put this health plan into operation it will have the same history as the Hospital Insurance Plan. I am convinced that inside two or three years, both the doctors who provide the service and the people who receive the service, will be so completely satisfied with it that no government will dare to take it away. This has proven true in the Hospital Services Plan. It has proven true in the medical care plan which has been operating in the Swift Current health Region, and which has covered over 53,000 people since 1946. No one could discontinue that medical care plan. The doctors there like it, and the people like it. The doctors like it because they know they can look after a patient without constantly thinking to themselves, 'Can this patient afford to pay? Maybe I am ordering diagnostic procedures that are going to add to this person's indebtedness. Maybe I ought to take a chance and dispense with it.' When the doctor knows there is no financial barrier, he can treat his patients and go into a thorough diagnosis. He knows that he can order whatever X-rays and other tests he thinks necessary. Obviously the doctor can practise a better type of medicine, and the patient can get a better type of health care.

Mr. Speaker, the other reason for which the legislature has been called together by His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, was to deal with the Federal-Provincial tax collection agreement, and I thought it rather significant that the Leader of the Opposition did not mention it at all. That is one of the disadvantages of taking your last-year speech and going over it again. He overlooked the things that are of prime importance. These tax collection agreements are going to affect the income and well-being of the people of this province until 1967, for these are five-year agreements. It seems to me rather strange that the Leader of the Opposition should be so completely unconcerned with the effect on Saskatchewan and its people.

My friend, the hon. member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) summarized the background of these agreements very adequately the other day, so there is no need for me to go into those. Suffice to remind members of the House

that a good deal of credit goes to the Liberal government at Ottawa for setting up the Rowell-Sirois Commission in 1937 and for calling together the first conference on reconstruction in 1945. The Liberal government under Mr. Mackenzie King was concerned, as most public men and women were, about the fact that our tax structure as set up under our constitution, gave the lion's share of taxes to those provinces who had the headquarters of large corporations located within their border. Provinces such as the prairie provinces and the Maritimes, because they did not have the head offices of those companies, did not get their fair share of the revenue. The Rowell-Sirois report asked that the Federal Government collect all these taxes, and then redistribute a portion of them on the basis of fiscal need. I ask hon. members to remember that we have never had such a system. A system of fiscal need gives to the provinces that need it most, to raise their standards of health, welfare and education up to the level of the more wealthy provinces.

The federal government under Mr. Mackenzie King in 1945 took the first step in this direction, by bringing down the Green Book proposals. They did not propose fiscal need as the basis of redistributing the revenue from these three tax fields. They suggested that the money be divided between the provinces on a per capita basis, and at least that was certainly better than anything we had ever had before. In 1956 Mr. St. Laurent made the first break away from this, as was pointed out by the member for Touchwood, when he brought in the tax-sharing arrangement by which provinces who did not rent their tax fields, would still get equalization grants.

It should be said, to the credit of the present federal government at Ottawa, that when they took office in 1957 they raised the standard rates of income tax available to the province from ten per cent to thirteen per cent. This gave each province a small amount more money than they have been getting in the past.

In 1960, the present government at Ottawa announced its intention to discontinue the tax-sharing arrangement and tax rental agreement, and forcing the provinces to go back and levy their own income and corporation taxes. Mr. Speaker, this has had serious repercussions for the people of Saskatchewan. First of all, the equalization now will not be up to the level of the two top provinces. It will be brought down to a national average. If you go

**October 13, 1961**

above the national average you get nothing. The national average, as I said at the conference, is like George Orwell's "Animal Farm" — 'Everybody was going to be treated equal but some are going to be more 'equal' than others'. All those who are above the national average, of course, will get no equalization grant.

The most serious thing is that for the first time a new factor has been introduced. The federal government will take into consideration part of the revenue from resources. This means that a province which levies very low royalties, as does the province of Ontario, for instance, will be helped. A province which puts on fairly heavy royalties will find their equalization payments cut down. I don't know whether the people of Saskatchewan realize how serious this thing is. The only thing that prevents Saskatchewan losing \$13 million a year under this agreement is the fact that there is a clause in the new agreement which says that in no year can we get less than we would have gotten under the previous agreement. But this means that for five years we will sit on the floor. Ontario will undoubtedly go up; other provinces will go up; Saskatchewan, Quebec and New Brunswick will stay on the floor. This means that the amount of money which we are getting is going to be fixed for a five-year period, and will take no cognizance of the tremendous expansion of services which will be required in this province in the next five or six years.

When this was proposed in October, 1960, all the provinces except Ontario complained violently. By the time we had met in 1961, the Maritimes had been given an additional grant, and that of course satisfied them because they were not affected by the clauses I have mentioned. However, the exception which was taken to these proposals at the inference was taken by Mr. Lesage and myself, who represent two of the provinces who are going to suffer as a result of these new proposals.

When I think of the very courageous stand and the forthright statements that were made by Mr. Lesage, I was therefore somewhat surprised when in Saskatoon I found a Liberal M.L.A. saying this, according to The Leader-Post, September 27th:

“The Saskatchewan government's idea that the federal government is the 'horn of plenty' whenever federal-provincial fiscal arrangements come up for discussion,

made the federal government take the line of least resistance and return the levying of income and corporation taxes to the provinces . . .”

This action will place the blame for tax increases on the province, where they belong . . .”

This is a statement by the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who spoke, I understand, in the city of Moose Jaw. Even the Leader of the Opposition, speaking on Wednesday, said:

“The reason the agreements are being scrapped is because of the constant criticism of the CCF government.”

Well, this criticism also apply to Mr. Lesage and Mr. Robichaud who were equally outspoken? Do I take it that the Liberal opposition in this legislature doesn't agree with our criticism? Do they consider that this is a good proposal? What has been our criticism? Our criticisms, whether there has been a Liberal or Conservative government in office, have been two-fold. The first is that they have never yet implemented the principle of fiscal need which the Rowell-Sirois Commission recommended. Secondly, our criticism was that of the total revenue from income corporation and succession taxes, the portion which was divided and given back to the provinces amounted to only about twenty-three per cent.

Our contention was that in a tax field in which the federal and provincial governments occupy jointly, the very least the provinces were entitled to was one-third of the total. Surely my hon. friends would agree with that. Why, therefore, for mere political advantage, should the Leader of the Opposition get up and say these agreements are being scrapped because of the constant criticism of the CCF government. Any premier standing here, and the premier of the province that is in a similar position to this one, would have criticized these agreements if he were loyal to the people whom he represents.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — The Leader of the Opposition yesterday complained that the plight of agriculture and the problem of unemployment had not been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. I made it perfectly clear

October 13, 1961

yesterday that it is never the custom at a special fall session to deal with general economic conditions. That is done at a regular session. This session was called together to deal with the two things I have already discussed — a medical care plan, and the Dominion-Provincial tax collection agreement. I want to say that in spite of all the Leader of the Opposition's shouting yesterday about agricultural problems, when he had finished I had not yet heard a single, concrete proposal. He talked about unemployment and he quoted from a speech I had made in January, 1944. He then tried to leave the impression that this was a program for a provincial government. I was speaking then as a Federal Member of Parliament, and the very quotation which he used yesterday, showed that I was talking about the Dominion Government, because I talked about converting all our war industries and war plants into useful peacetime production. That would hardly be within the jurisdiction of a provincial government.

He went on to talk about the lack of employment opportunity in the province. I am not going to chase him around that mill again. This has been done every session. I just want to remind him again that in the Saskatchewan Economic Review, it is perfectly clear. He has heard the figures before and he can easily see them again. Take the index of employment and use 1949 as 100. The index of employment for Canada in 1960 went from 100 to 118; in Manitoba it went up to 111.2; Saskatchewan is up to 126.6 and Alberta is up to 154.1. As a matter of fact, Saskatchewan has come up from lower than the national average in 1946 to a way above the national average in 1960. If you look at the non-agricultural labour force you will find that in 1946 we had 146,000. In 1960 it was 189,000 listed — an increase of 43,000.

Then he did something which I thought was intended to place something of a strain on the credulity of the public. He got out the Gazette for Friday, October 6th, and he said, "Why here are 248 firms that have left the province." Well, Mr. Speaker, this list includes motels, and various kinds of businesses, which have been struck off the registration. Why didn't he tell the House that at the same date last year 234 had been dropped from the registration? Why didn't he tell the House that there are 434 more companies registered now than there were a year ago? Of course, the whole thing is farcical, because this has nothing to do with whether a company is in business or not in business. I have the Saskatchewan Gazette



for Friday, September 9th. It refers to a company which has been struck off the register. Here is what it says:

“Regina, September 2, 1960. In pursuance of subsection (4) of Section 214 of The Companies Act, the names of the following companies are struck off the Register of Joint Stock Companies and the companies dissolved: Thatcher’s Hardware (Moose Jaw) Limited.”

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — This does not mean that the Leader of the Opposition has picked up his business and left the country. I certainly hope he doesn’t. We would never be as lucky getting someone like him again! This simply means that probably the firm has been sold to another firm, and has changed its name. The Leader of the Opposition must think that people are credulous and that by bringing in this list of 248 names, he is going to convince them that industries are departing from the province.

Mr. Speaker, may I just close by saying that this is the last Throne Speech debate in which I shall participate. I have had the high privilege of attending seventeen regular sessions of this legislature, and three fall sessions, making a total of twenty sessions in all. I would like to say that to me these have been most enjoyable and satisfying years. I would like to think that much good has been accomplished. I would be foolish if I were to say that in all these seventeen years no mistakes have ever been made, or that my judgment or the judgment of my colleagues has always been right. Any human being who would make such a statement would either be foolish or dishonest. But I do believe that in these seventeen years, we have done some things to make this a better province for the ordinary man and woman to live in; that there are more of the amenities of life; that there is a greater measure of security and a greater measure of equality of treatment; that there is greater freedom from discrimination; and that our people have, working together, moved forward. No government, of course can take all the credit for this. A government may give leadership, but in a democracy, unless there are people — thousands of them — who are prepared to work together for the mutual good of their community and their province and their neighbour, no government can accomplish very much.

October 13, 1961

If, when the history of our period is written, it can be said that we have taken some forward steps in the past seventeen years, then the major credit must go to the people of Saskatchewan, than whom there were no finer people in all the Dominion of Canada. Here are the people, who out of their hardships and out of their suffering, have learned to work together for their mutual advantage. They were the first people to set up union hospitals on this continent; the first people to set up municipal doctor plans; and the first people to establish an Anti-Tuberculosis League. They are people who have learned that they must help each other. They learned it in the hard days when neighbors had to co-operate with one another, or face the possibility of starvation, or freezing to death. Fortunately, the traditions of our forefathers had stayed with them. Ours is a great province of self-help and mutual co-operation.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to extend my thanks to the members of the opposition for the fine personal relationship which we have had with one another. We have not always agreed politically, and that may be the understatement of the year, but we have had good personal relationships. I made up my mind when I went into politics twenty-six years ago that if possible, I would never allow my political differences to interfere with my personal friendships. The result is that during that time I have had many good friends who belong to other political parties. I can honestly say that when I leave this legislature, I shall leave it without any vindictive feelings about any member of this House, or any member of the opposition.

I would like to thank my colleagues, whose loyalty and understanding have made my task so much easier. I think I can honestly say that in seventeen years I have never had an angry word with any of my colleagues, either in the caucus or in the cabinet. I do not mean we haven't argued — this is the most arguing party that was ever created. They can argue by the hour, but we have never had a quarrel — never had a word spoken in anger.

I want to say to my colleagues, in leaving them, that the strength of our movement and of our government is that we have involved so many people in the decision-making process. We used to be criticized at one time because we took everything to our constituency and provincial conventions. It was said that no government should be dictated to by people outside the House. Of course, I

agree it cannot be dictated to. But we must involve people in the process of making decisions. This has never been a one-man show. I have never made a move without consulting my colleagues in the cabinet, and members who sit on this side of the House, and involving the members of the CCF Provincial Council, and where possible, our constituency convention. The strength of our movement is that we have a grass-roots democracy. I am sure, if my colleagues carry one with that same principle of helping people work out a solution to their problems and then giving them leadership in putting those solutions into effect, that they will continue to enjoy the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to extend a word of thanks to the people of this province, and to say that their faith has been a constant inspiration to me. I have always tried to so conduct myself in the affairs of this province that they would always have cause to feel that their confidence had not been misplaced. Many years ago Mr. George Williams, who was a former leader of our movement in this province, said to me that if any man is going to make a success in politics, he must never want anything too much. That is true. If a man is eager for money or for power, or for something he wants more than he wants to do his duty, then of course he will easily be diverted from his task. I have never been anxious either to be rich or to be powerful. I have hoped that when I left office my children would be able to walk the streets of this city, or any town in Saskatchewan, and be able to say that during the years when their father carried the responsibilities of office, he never betrayed a friend and never betrayed a trust.

I want to thank the people of this province who have made it possible to serve them, and I hope the record will show that I served them not too badly.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

#### QUESTION RE FINANCING MEDICAL CARE PLAN

**Mr. Thatcher** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, for purposes of clarification, just before the Premier sits down I wonder if I could ask one question. I didn't understand him yet to say whether or not the specific tax bills to finance this medical scheme will be brought in at the current session.

October 13, 1961

I understand they will be, from the Throne Speech, but could he tell us definitely when they will come in?

**Premier Douglas:** — Yes, the legislation will be brought in. Already first reading has been given to the Medical Care Insurance Bill, and legislation for financing will be introduced at this session. As a matter of fact, I believe it is the intention of the Provincial Treasurer to outline the whole program on the Medical Care Bill, so that the members will know even before the finance bills come in, what the total picture is. We felt this was better rather than dealing with it on a piece-meal basis.

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner** (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the Throne Speech debate, I would like to take this opportunity of extending a welcome to yourself on your return from your visit to London, representing the Parliamentary Association of this province, at the Parliamentary Association meeting which was held in that great city. I know that you will have represented the people of this province and the members of this legislature in a very fitting manner, and that you will have left with the people of the rest of the Commonwealth the view that the people of Saskatchewan have the welfare of the Commonwealth, and all the peoples of the world, in their hearts now, in the past and will have also in the future.

I would also like to take this opportunity to extend congratulations to all the speakers who have taken part in this debate up to the present time. Of course I could say as the Premier that I regret I cannot agree with everything that has been said by every speaker, but we do enjoy hearing all the members of this legislature body speak to us, and present their views on affairs of interest to the people of this province.

In the few minutes I wish to address the assembly this afternoon, I am not going to deal with the main items which are before us, because I want to leave the majority of my remarks for my address on the medical health plan on Monday. But there are one or two thoughts which I would like to leave with you today, particularly following the address of the Premier of this province, soon to leave us. I would like to say that I disagree to some extent with the leader of my party in this. I would like to see the present leader of the government stay in this province

so the voters of Saskatchewan can give him what he actually deserves, for the type of record we have experienced in the last 18 years, as they would have had he stayed here for the next election by defeating himself and his government in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — The Premier, in his usual style, ridiculing one after another, not only in this House but throughout the province, spoke of people repeating addresses that they had made in this House. Well, I have only sat in this House for five sessions, but I have heard the Premier make the same speech which he made today in everyone of those sessions, and I am quite certain that he made it at every one of the sessions since he came into this House in 1944. So when it comes to repeating, he should have his address so well memorized by now because he has had 18 or 19 sessions to present that same address to the legislature of this province.

If there is any man (and I want to leave this thought today) in this province that has done more, particularly in the last three years, to see to it that it will be more difficult for the people of Saskatchewan, whether rich or poor, to have proper medical care in days that lie ahead and there is only one man that can be accused of that, and that is the Premier, for the manner in which he has carried on in regard to this matter for the past three years. Never before in the history of this province has the health of the people, whether rich or poor, been used for the political advantages that the Premier of this province at present has used it, during the 17 years he has been in office.

The Premier said within the last few days and on other occasions that 13 years ago the medical profession in this province suggested to him that he should put into effect a medical care program. But I would say to the Premier, if at that time he had the well wishes of the medical profession, as he has stated on various occasions, why is it that the people of Saskatchewan have not had medical services for the last 13 years?

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, may I ask the hon. member a question. Did he say the medical profession offered to put in a medical care plan 13 years ago?

**October 13, 1961**

**Mr. Gardiner:** — The medical profession suggested that a medical care plan should be put into effect.

**Premier Douglas:** — Where and when?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — In Saskatchewan.

**Premier Douglas:** — What did they suggest it through, a brief, or . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — They suggested it to the Premier. I said that they had suggested this to him.

**Premier Douglas:** — Where did you get that?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I got it out of the press.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has stated, and he knows very well — he has stated it on various occasions that the doctors at that time wanted a medical plan — he said the reason they wanted it was because they couldn't collect their bills. He has also made that statement throughout this province, the reason they wanted a medical care plan was because they couldn't collect their bills. I have heard the Premier myself make that particular statement. Well, Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago he could have, and I am quite sure he could have, made a much better arrangement with the medical profession than could be made in this present day and age, when he could have made an arrangement and had a medical plan for the people in this province for the past 13 years. I say the Premier is the man who has held us medical progress for the people of Saskatchewan since 1944, and no one else.

**Premier Douglas:** — You're having a pipe-dream.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, in the last three years alone — we don't have to go back 13 years — we've had a circus going on in this province with regard to medical care. In 1959 the Premier stated that in the next session of the legislature, the government would bring in a bill to provide medical services to the people of Saskatchewan. When the Lieutenant Governor stood before us in the session of 1960, in the Throne Speech of that date this government stated that before we left this House they would present to the members a bill to provide medical services to the people of this province. What happened?

No bill was brought into this House. The members on the government side of the House, without exception, stood up and were counted, voting in favour of the fact that the government should bring in a bill to provide medical services to the people of Saskatchewan. Instead, when it came near the end of the session and the Opposition asked the Premier, where is the Bill — what was his answer? He said, “Oh, if we’d brought a Bill in it would have been only a matter of form anyway, so we’re going to appoint a committee.” Mr. Speaker, I have never been a friend of committees, as my friend the Premier will understand. I have never been a friend the Premier will understand. I have never been a friend of committees at any time, and I am going to say this, that if he felt it was worthwhile to waste two years of the time of the people, at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan, in holding committee hearings on medical care, why is it today that he is not prepared to take this program, once it is presented to this legislature, to the people and ask whether or not they favour this particular plan? If the Premier does that, I am quite certain that the majority of the people, if they favour this plan, will vote for it, but it certainly will not take as long as the committee that he put into operation two years ago.

What has happened since that time? The committee was finally appointed following the election, but the Premier, the day the election campaign started, stated in spite of the fact that they had appointed a committee, that his party had a program for medical care, and when the election was over they were going to put into effect. As I said before, we have had at least three committee reports within the last 20 years very similar in wording. This one, a complete waste of the taxpayers’ money — a complete waste of money, because the Premier himself said his party had a program and they were going to put it into effect, no matter what this committee said.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that that is his intention. This report, and this committee was appointed for one reason only — to delay the implementation of a medical care program in this province until the new party was formed, and he was elected leader of it, in order to give him an issue to take to Ottawa. The only reason why this committee was appointed was to hold up the implementation of a medical care program until he could make political use of it throughout the whole of Canada

**October 13, 1961**

That is all I intend to say with regard to the medical care plan at the present moment, except to ask the Premier and the government this: If this plan that we have had placed on our desks here today goes into effect, can he guarantee the people of this province that he has a contract with those who are going to have to provide the service? If not, this is the greatest fake that was ever perpetrated on any people in any province in the Dominion of Canada, or on the people anywhere in the world, and I am quite certain that the Premier, or the Minister of Health have not a contract with anyone to provide services which are going to be provided according to the government, under the terms of the Act that has been presented to this House.

So I say to the government that the actions of the Premier within the last two years have done more harm to the implementation of a plan to which those who are going to have to provide the services, will provide in the manner which will be of the greatest benefit to the people of Saskatchewan, and I think as he leaves, that when he has used the health of the people of Saskatchewan to promote his own political well-being in the days that lie ahead, he should not stand here and waiver as he did a few moments ago, about his past in this province, for three-quarters of his address, taking credit for practically everything his party had done, and finally he came down to the end and said, "Oh yes, but it was with the help of a lot of the rest that I die these things." He patted himself on the back two or three times during his address . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — I can reach my back!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I hope possibly it wasn't because he felt that the people behind him weren't prepared to pat him on the back, or that he was giving them an indication that they should.

But in the formation of the new political party I want to make reference this afternoon to a few comments that were made by a publication which is put out by the United Church Observer. It is the paper that is put out by the church to which I belong, and I must say that I don't always agree with everything they have to say in it. In fact, within the last few years I have been coming to the conclusion that instead of a paper representing the views of the church, it has become a political paper, and there are many others in the country who have taken the same view with regard to it. But I find this publication



gives a review of some of the things that happened at the convention which chose the Premier as the leader of the new party. I would like to comment on one or two of them. The first is to be found on page 5 of this particular publication. The writer of this must have been at the convention, because he speaks as though he had been. This is what he had to say:

“The new party was the best political convention we have covered. It was well attended; well organized and well-heeled. A number of earnest paid-their-own-way delegates demanded that there be night sessions and no time off for fun and games. But sometimes we closed our eyes and listened and thought, how they would have cheered that speech at the Liberal or Conservative convention.”

In other words, here in a church paper is an article written by someone who was at that convention definitely stating that this was the best-financed convention he had ever been at. Most of the delegates there were not there as representatives of voters of this country, but they were there, paid to be there by organizations in this country of ours.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — May I ask the hon. member a question, Mr. Speaker? (Question inaudible on record.)

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Hon. members are taking objection to some of these remarks, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — Certainly we are.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — There are certain people in the party across the way and other political parties that would like to try and leave the impression, and try to use the church as an instrument of achieving political power, and I make that accusation of the leader of the government in Saskatchewan. He would at every turn use his position as a former minister of the Christian church to try and achieve political benefit.

**Mr. Danielson** (Arm River): — He’s been doing that for 18 years.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — He’s done that for 18 years, and the people of this province, he realizes, have realized that fact as well. So we go on and we find the proof of this fact in the next article, which is written

October 13, 1961

by the editor. Why do so many preachers support the new party?

**Govt. Member:** — Read it!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Somebody said ‘read it’. Well, I’m going to read quite a bit of it, because I think there is a good deal of interest in this article, particularly to religious-minded people. It will give many people reason to wonder about these individuals who enter politics presumably because they have the welfare of the people at heart, or say they have. These are some of the reasons given. Here is the remark they claim was made by the Premier, and I don’t imagine it has ever been denied:

“The church . . . for the C.C.F. movement”, said Mr. Douglas. Ministers of the ‘thirties were so concerned with the plight of the poor and the unemployed they sought social action through politics”, he added.

It was a basement-full of unemployed young men in my church at Weyburn that sent me into politics in 1934.”

I believe from anything I have heard before that the Premier of this province was in politics long before 1934.

“ . . . and I am convinced that if we don’t have a planned economy, Canada will be condemned by automation to permanent unemployment of one million people.”

Here is a man, a previous minister of the Christian church, who attempts to make a statement because of the fact that he was a member of the political party, not called, as he says, at that time the C.C.F. party, but called themselves the Farmer-Labour movement. They change their name every time the situation suits their fancy. Every time they think the people of Canada might vote for another name, they change the name. Principle means nothing. Here is another item by the Premier again, with regard to principles:

“Two ministers told me they had joined new party clubs in order to use their influence to keep the party from going too far to the left.”

“Mr. Douglas told me, ‘It is my belief that the old-line socialists are the real reactionaries living in the past!’”

Oh what a news statement by the Premier of this province.

“I believe that the old-line socialists . . . “

(at last he admits that he believes socialism is something old instead of something new.)

“ . . . socialism, like everything else, changes. The main objective of society should be the welfare, including the moral and spiritual welfare of the people.”

This is the next thing he comes out with, which surprises me. He says:

“The way to achieve this is through a planned economy.”

Now, I don't know how you are going to achieve spiritual welfare through a planned economy, but the Premier seems to think that it has possibilities. He adds:

“ . . . socialism is part of a debased coinage today.”

Here is the Premier, who has stood up in this House and defended socialism time after time, telling a minister of the United Church, and editor of The United Church Observer “socialism is a part of a debased coinage today”.

“People have no clear idea of what we mean by socialism”, the Premier said.

Surely not, because of all the jumping around the socialists have done in this country, there is no wonder the people don't realize what this party or any other party actually means, when they say they are a socialist party at the present time. “Khrushchev”, he says, “says socialism when he means communism”. Hitler gave Germany national socialism. We have to be realistic about the term, “but you can have public control without public ownership”, he says. “Public ownership is not a means to an end.” These are strange expressions from a Premier who will turn over to this side of the House and accuse speakers

**October 13, 1961**

and members of the party on this side of the House about changing their minds. Boy, the Premier of this province has sure gone a long way towards changing his mind and ideals over the past few years.

Then we find some other interesting remarks:

“A visitor to the convention could be very confused by listening to the speeches and studying the resolutions passed.”

Very confused! I imagine Mr. Forest is a fairly reasonable man. I imagine he is a man with a good education. I imagine that he is a man who should be able to figure out something if it is at all reasonable, but he says that a visitor to the convention could be very confused by listening to the speeches and studying the resolutions passed.

“The new Democratic Party flaunted its democracy, but it voted to give the party power to veto local nominations.”

That’s something the Liberals and Conservatives would never dare to do. Here was a Minister, booed when he told the contention that Liberalism in Canada was a more respectable word than socialism, but it says:

“ . . . Mr. Sparham, who was a lay minister, had a better way of going at it, was cheered in the next speech when he said almost the same thing.”

Then we come down to the most interesting viewpoint of the editor; who, I remind you again, is one of the leading churchmen of the United Church of Canada, when he said:

“Mr. Douglas reminds us that it was a reaction against the pious in religion and the emphasis on the social gospel that sent some of his generation into politics.”

That is surely a case, Mr. Speaker, because we find here today, and he has done it ever since he became Premier and leader of this party, he has used the Sabbath Day, day in and day out to propagate the political faith and ideals that he believes in.

Then he goes on to say:

“But one has an uneasy feeling that the Ministers who left the active work for the C.C.F. years ago haven’t read any theology since. They seemed to have ended their theology growth with the social gospel.”

This is what Mr. Sparham had to say about his change to the great new party of the C.C.F.

“Mr. Sparham, who left the lay preacher’s pulpit for politics says: ‘Politics is easier’. I am much less afraid of making a mistake preaching a political philosophy than a religious dogma.”

Did you ever hear anything more hypocritical from anyone. Intellectually it was easier to take a position politically than it is theologically. I don’t blame my friend, the Premier, for having come into politics, Mr. Speaker, because he has shown down through the years that through his statement, there are other ways that he can conduct himself in a manner which, up to the present time has not held the majority of support of the people of this province than it would had he remained here for another election and brought his defeat at the hands of a great majority of the people of this province.

Here is what the final paragraph says about Mr. Sparham:

“He admits the party is still emotionally religious; he hasn’t been going to church much since he got into the new party, and I can see that he hasn’t any time, because they are so busy organizing on Sundays that he hasn’t had the time to go to church since he joined the new party.

“I should rationalize and say it is because I have been very busy, but I have to admit that there is more to it than that. I don’t quite like to say that I was just sceptical, but I found in politics that I could divert my energy into practical things rather than work my way through my religion . . .”

**October 13, 1961**

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the remarks in the United Church Observer point up very well the philosophy and views of a man who has been leading this province in the last 18 years — a man to whom nothing has been sacred in this House, or any place else since he has held that position; a man who has taken it upon himself to personally slaughter and chastise any leader of any political party, with any name-calling that he could think of. This is the man who stands before the people today and says, “Here, give me your support; give me your faith to do great things for the people of Canada.” Mr. Speaker, I am sure with the record of the type that stands on the statute books of this province for the last 18 years, that there will not be any great monument built to the first socialist leader in the western world, because of the fact that when he leaves this province he will be leaving a province which is in the worst position today of any province in the Dominion of Canada, and including the province of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island.

Why do I state that? You know, people would stay in a province if conditions were as rosy as the Premier of the province makes them out to be.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — I wish you were on the air.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — In 1929 we had more people in Saskatchewan than we have living in this province at the present time. Thirty-two years ago — more people living in the province than we have now. The only province in Canada of which that can be said. That is one statistic that the Premier can find no answer, for it is absolutely true. No other province, including Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, has a record to equal the record of the people going out of this province — perhaps not quite as fast as those leaving East Berlin to go to West Berlin, but almost as fast.

Then in his remarks, during the debate a few moments ago, to the effect that certain of the press in this province, the Leader of the Opposition, and as he said, certain friends of the Leader of the Opposition, and certain friends of the Siftons, certain friends of the Star-Phoenix and The Leader-Post, I would like to remind the Premier that when he tells the story to the rest of the people of Canada, about the elephant dancing among the chickens, there was only one elephant over a period of 16 years that I know of, he has now flown the coop, and as well as flying the coop, he not only plucked the feathers, but he took along a leghorn with him!

**Some Hon. Members:** — Is it a pink elephant, by any chance?

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — Your stories are quite fantastic this afternoon.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Premier in the debate today, I find it very hard to realize when he completed his address that he thought he had dealt with the medical care report adequately. I am quite certain that he felt the Regina lady member had done that in her address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, in moving that motion, but I would like to remind him if he thinks the Liberal party is confused, what he must think after he listened to the lady member for Regina. It's a long time since I sat and listened to a speech, where I felt the government was more confused than this government after I listened to the lady member from Regina. I didn't have any idea as to what the government was going to do, what stand she took on various issues, or what stand this government took, until I found this bill before me.

So it is quite strange that the Premier should attack the Leader of the Opposition and others for having changed stands, which of course never has been the case in this House or anywhere else, as the Premier knows. But of course, he made certain that he would get his word out to the public. He would say these things, not having with him one iota of proof to back them up. He would say them over the radio where no one could have an opportunity to answer back unless the people know exactly what the truth was.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, in regard to inconsistency, there is no one who has spoken in this House during the time I have been here, that has shown as much inconsistency for the government of this province as the lady member for Regina did in giving her review of the committee report to us in her opening address on the Throne Speech debate.

Mr. Speaker, I desire on Monday to make a full review of not only the medical committee report, but to bring to the members of this House and to the people of this province once and for all the information, and I have done this before, but it hasn't been put before the people of this province, or the people of Canada, and it is quite easy for my friends across the way to go down to Ontario and tell the people there all the fine things this

**October 13, 1961**

government has done — taking credit not only for the one or two things they did do, but for everything that has been done in the province since 1905, so I am going to make it a point on Monday to give to this House, and I can assure the Premier or anyone else, that if they can bring a shred of evidence to disprove one statement I make in that address, I challenge them to do so in the speeches that follow, and I will tell the people of this province exactly where the health benefits have been received from, exactly where they have come from since 1905, and will place on record as to the medical achievement of the province of Saskatchewan.

**Premier Douglas:** — Are you going to tell them about the Liberal plan for medical services?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I was just going to sit down, but I have neglected to mention one fact which I think should be of great interest to us all. You know, the Premier, if you mentioned the Toronto Star, he would probably jump out of his seat and tell you that you shouldn't be quoting from such Liberal periodicals, but when this report came out, who was the first one that was given an opportunity to know what was in it? Well, Mr. Speaker, it was a reporter from the Toronto Star. Oh, the premier said, he told him not to tell anybody. Of course, that's the old story. You tell a reporter something and you tell him not to tell anybody. Well, of course, I know the job of a reporter, Mr. Speaker. Of course, it's a reporter's job to report news. This happened to be news, so of course the reporter went down and before the people of Saskatchewan knew what the facts were with regard to the medical care report, the people of Toronto — his labour bosses down east, were already ringing the bell of praise for 'Tommy' Douglas, hoping to win him votes in eastern Canada for the new political party.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the only reason why they needed that was because of the initials of the name of the party.

The no-darn policy party — they didn't have any policy last August and they needed something to provide them with a policy when they went to the people of this country. So we find that Mr. Douglas says the next day in the paper, after he had been chastised by the chairman of the committee, he said, "Oh that isn't true. I said such and such, and I phoned the reporter yesterday,



and he agrees that was right.’

I would like to see that reporter speak for himself, Mr. Speaker. To my knowledge he has never denied that he was given the information that he printed in the Toronto Star by the premier of this province, and for him to think that he has come to the position where the people of this province are going to accept his word about what anyone else says or does, if he has come to that position, it is well nigh time that he left the position that he holds at the present time as Premier, or any other responsible position in this province or in this country. Until such time as that reporter speaks for himself that he was instructed, and that he did not receive the information that he printed in that paper, there is no reason for anyone not believing that the Premier intended when he gave that report to the reporter for him to do exactly what was done in the Toronto Star, and prepare the way for the new party in the eastern part of Canada.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those remarks I desire to move adjournment of the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

### STATEMENT RE NEWSPAPER REPORT

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a question of privilege. A statement has just been made about a report which appeared in the Toronto Star. I want to state categorically that no report of the Advisory Committee on Medical Care was given by me to the Toronto Star reporter. I had not seen the report. The report did not come to my desk or to any other Minister’s desk for at least twenty-four hours after the reporter came to see me. I gave him copies of the terms of reference and background material. I made it quite clear because I stated to him when he came that I didn’t have a copy of the report, and didn’t know what was in it. I have made that statement repeatedly and I think most persons will accept my word. I don’t expect the member for Melville to. He is not noted for being the kind of person with whom one could deal in terms of honour or veracity.

**October 13, 1961**

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, just in answer to the Premier's statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I would just like to say that if that is true, I am quite sure that the reporter would . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

### **MOTION FOR MORNING SITTINGS**

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, this motion is perfectly clear. It suggests that we start sitting mornings commencing on Monday, and sit from 10:00 until 12:30 each day. This has already been discussed in other debates, and I don't think I need to enlarge on it, except to point out that under the rules of the House there are eight days in the Speech from the Throne debate, including the day in which the mover and seconder made their speech. This means that the speech from the Throne Debate automatically expires next Friday, and must be voted for on Friday. Morning sittings far from curtailing discussion, will add some 12½ hours that the members wanted to the Speech from the Throne debate. I think this will give members much more opportunity than they would have in a normal session to discuss any matters that they want to.

I would therefore move, seconded by Mr. Lloyd:

“That notwithstanding Standing Order 2, this House shall, commencing Monday, October 16, 1961, meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m., each sitting day and there shall be a recess from 12:30 o'clock p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m.”

**Mrs. Mary J. Batten** (Humboldt): — I think I speak for a great number of members in the House when I say that I certainly oppose this motion. I know the hon. Premier made it clear when he spoke the other day that he thought that the private members were overpaid for the amount of time that they spent on the job, but I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the hon. Premier that the time we spend on the job is not the time we sit in our seats. There is much more important work that is done by us in preparing the speeches we ourselves make, in looking after the business of our constituencies, and answering letters and matters of that kind.

I am sure there isn't one member who comes in here, certainly not in the opposition side, but I am sure that doesn't put in at least a fifteen-hour day. Now, I think this is about as heavy a day as I for one can carry, and do full justice to the people who have elected me. I feel that it isn't the number of words that are going to be said on this debate that is important; it is the quality of those words. I think, Mr. Speaker, that no one can prepare an adequate address on a subject of this great importance to the people of Saskatchewan, if they have to sit here from ten o'clock in the morning until ten o'clock at night, with a few hours in between for meals, and listen to the speeches and then try to write a speech after ten o'clock at night. Certainly we are not going to do justice to the subject before us, if we don't listen to the other members. I for one would like to see every member in his seat for the speech of the humblest backbencher because I think we all have a great deal of knowledge about the subject, and I think we have all had experiences that we want to and need to contribute to this debate, and I think we should all listen to what the other members have to say. If we do justice to those other speeches and still try to prepare some sort of an adequate summary of our own contribution, we are not going to be doing a good job if we have to put in these hours.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know when the other members received their copies of the report, but I know all I have been able to do is to take a very summary look at it. I have read the recommendations but certainly I have not had time to digest it adequately. Surely we haven't paid out that kind of money and had these people working as hard

October 13, 1961

as this committee did work simply to put the report aside and speak without thinking. Every member I am sure wants to read this report carefully, wants to read perhaps some of the briefs that the hon. member from Regina spoke about, and we certainly can't do this. In addition to this there will be new things coming up in the speeches about which we should think, about which we should perhaps caucus, and I don't think we will be doing justice either to ourselves, to the subject before us, or to our constituents if we try to rush this through without giving ourselves the morning hours to prepare our speeches for the afternoon.

**Mr. James E. Snedker** (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, in connection with the subject presently under debate, I wish to concur with everything that my colleague has just said and add a few words of my own in connection with the matter. I don't think anybody would ever accuse me of objecting to hard work, but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we're called upon to thoroughly study the bill which I have on my desk before me at the present time, that if we are to give it our full consideration, and that if we are also to listen to the debates that are going to take place in this House, and I hope that I will be able to listen to all of them, that will involve a considerable amount of time. If we are going to work in the morning, it would preclude practically the preparation of any alternative legislation which any of us might wish to consider and place before this House and the public of the province.

This is one of the most far-reaching pieces of legislation that has ever been placed either before this legislature or any legislature of any province in Canada, or for that matter possibly in the North American continent. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. members on this side of the House, or on either side, are going to give the matter thorough discussion, and if the hon. members on this side of the House, or on either side, are going to give the matter thorough discussion, and if they are also going to be able to receive representation from the public of the province, and some of them are as much in the dark about the contents of this bill as we are — they haven't read it either. We just received it on our desks. I have read mine but the general public of the province haven't had an opportunity to read any part of it. There is a good possibility that members of the public would want to make representation to members of the government or members of the opposition, either for or against, to discuss amendments, certain parts of this thing that they think are good or bad, as the case may be. If we are to receive

representation from the public, and this goes for all members of the House, we have got to have sometime to do it. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a good time to do that would be in the morning.

I oppose these morning sittings most wholeheartedly on the grounds that we should give the public every opportunity in the world of placing their views before the members of this legislature.

The copy which I received of the interim report of the medical committee was postmarked on the fourth day of this month. I have studied mine, and other hon. members have read theirs, but the general public of this province, people who are interested in this matter, haven't had the advantages that we have had, and haven't had the advantage of making themselves thoroughly and completely acquainted with the proposals in the report and the proposals of this government. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that possibly some members of the public might wish to make representation to any member of this House, and there has to be some time left for doing it, and I think the time for that is in the morning. For that reason I don't think we should sit in the morning. For that reason I don't think we should sit in the morning. I think we are not giving the public the opportunity which they should be allowed.

**Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane** (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, my reasons for objecting to this bill that has been placed before us are probably different to those of my colleagues. After all, I want you to realize, and I want members of the government to realize that my area of Saskatchewan was probably one of the hardest hit areas in regard to drought, of any area in the province. In all the years I have been a member of this legislature, I have yet to miss one sitting day, and in fact as long as I am able to be here, I don't want to miss any sittings. My people at the present time have many and serious problems, and they are continually wanting some help here in Regina.

When I am home, not at the session I can come in with them. When I am here attending the session these delegations want to come in and they want to see the Department of Agriculture; they want to see the Department of Social Welfare, etc., because there have never been more applications in that constituency for people wanting social aid than there are today.

October 13, 1961

These are all pressing problems and the time of year is getting on. It is just about winter and these are serious. I want to be in a position where I can meet with these delegations and give them whatever help and advice I can. This morning, for instance, I think I was in touch with four different head offices in the city on behalf of my constituents. Because I too want to be able to prepare something to say on the floor of this House, I also want to peruse this bill and some of these reports, but my first obligation is to the people whom I serve, and as long as I am a member of this legislature I would like to have the opportunity to do just that, and the time that is most important to me, and to them is naturally the morning. I can't take them to these offices after 5:30, because all the government offices and all other offices in the city are closed.

This situation does not only pertain to me, but to all members, and I think on behalf of the people whom we represent, that while we are here in Regina we should at least have the mornings off so that we can look after their interests and get them their interviews with these different government departments, and any other business that may effect them in this city.

While this is sometimes referred to as a special session, it is not a special session; it is a regular session, and is at a time of year and in a year when we have many serious problems. I think we all should look after the interests of the people who sent us here first. That is why I do not approve of sitting in the mornings.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I find it very strange indeed that this suggestion should be made at this particular time. I was most impressed this afternoon with the remarks of the Premier, when he was talking about the movement that he had headed for the last 18 years and he said that the strength of that movement was in that they consulted their people, and I suppose there is some truth in that statement. Yet the very government that he heads, now bringing in one of the most important pieces of legislation that we have had to deal with for some time, before this House, does not want the average member attending to have any opportunity to consult with those people they represent, before he takes a stand on this particular matter.

Now I feel exactly as members have expressed themselves on this side of the House. In the first place I see no reason to rush through this session. If we are not finished by the time of the new party convention in Saskatchewan, I am perfectly happy to go home and have a holiday, while these people are sorting out the mess they are in. That's all right with me. I don't care if the Premier wants to go down to Ontario and lead the new party — he can go tomorrow as far as I am concerned. There is no rush to put this legislation on the statute books. He has been here for eighteen years and could have put it on the statute books any time during those eighteen years, but failed to do so.

In most every issue that comes that has little or no significance to the people of Saskatchewan, there is a great hulla-balloo and time is wasted and money spent in consulting the electorate about what we ought to do. But here, Mr. Speaker, when we're dealing with the health and the welfare of over 900,000 people in the province of Saskatchewan, we are expected to come into this chamber at 10:00 o'clock in the morning and stay here until 10:00 o'clock at night, I presume and listen to a lot of harangue that emanates from the other side of the House, pent up from the electorate, the people who ought to be making the decision as to whether we ought to have this type of medical insurance in Saskatchewan, or some other type.

I am hesitant to say that I, like the Leader of the Opposition, when any session ends, finds that I am tired and I need a rest, and I think that every session in this House is rushed to the point that we are not and have not been doing the job as it ought to be done, if we were given the time to do so. We receive the same remuneration for our services whether we stay in this chamber for four weeks, eight weeks, or six months and as far as I am concerned I am prepared to stay in this House from now until the regular session opens, to deal with this question, if need be.

I am prepared also to go even further than that. I think that this House would be well-advised that before any vote is taken on this legislation, that the members of this legislature ought to have the opportunity to go home to their constituents, to explain to those people who support them and those people who voted against them exactly what this medical plan means; who is going to pay for it; and then be sent back to this chamber directed by the people they represent, as to how they ought to vote. I am not

**October 13, 1961**

prepared to tell my people how I ought to vote. I think that the people of Moosomin should tell me how they want to vote on this issue.

There is another reason for that. The people that I represent, Mr. Speaker, voted five to one against prepaid medical services on a previous occasion. I don't know whether they've changed their mind now or not, but I would very much like the opportunity, and if I am given that opportunity I will hold a meeting in every town in the constituency that I represent and put the facts before the people with regard to this matter, and let them make the decision as to whether they want me to support it or to oppose it. I think every member in this House ought to do just that.

Here is a report! The very first pages of the report — the people who produced it are complaining they were not given time enough to produce it. The government had eighteen years to get this thing produced, and when they decided that they needed it in a hurry, they couldn't even give the commission time enough to produce a report. They couldn't wait on the final report. They had to have an interim report. Why? What is this unholy rush? I received this at my home last Friday, one week ago today. We've been talking about health insurance in Saskatchewan for a long, long time. The report comes to my home on Friday, and the House opened the next Wednesday; the legislation came down the following Friday, and I suppose the people who sit opposite would like to go home tomorrow. I am in no hurry. The people I represent I am sure, would not object to taking 30 days to put this legislation on the statute books, and the Attorney General can babble away to his heart's content, but I challenge him to go home to the constituency he represents and put the facts before the people in that area . . .

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . before he votes, and if he hasn't the courage and the time and the ambition to do so, then if I am given the time, I'll look after his seat as well as my own.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McDonald:** — I would go to every town and hamlet in Hanley, and give the facts to the people of that constituency. If he wants to play tootsie up in his office here, while I am doing it, it is okay with me.



Mr. Speaker, I object to morning sittings during this session or any other session. We are not sent in here to ram through this legislation or any other legislation. We have grave responsibilities, placed on our shoulders by those people who sent us here, and I hesitate to think what some people who sent me here would say if they knew the facts in regard to the material that has been made available to us, and the haste in which we are being asked to deal with it.

I plead with this House to not only turn down this resolution that is now before us, but I plead with this House to give the members of this House the opportunity, once all the facts are known with regard to the plan, how it is going to be administered, and how it is to be paid for, give them the opportunity to go back to their own people, to place the facts before the people, and then come back to this House and to vote as their electorate so dictates. If we are given that opportunity, Mr. Speaker, we will have a democratic procedure in this House. We will have a plan that I am convinced will meet the needs and the wishes of the people of Saskatchewan, and this is something that I am not at all convinced about at the moment, and I cannot support the motion.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — I am just a little bit amazed at what I have listened to in the last few minutes. I have been reading a newspaper over the last couple of months, and according to the articles that I read in the paper, I thought the Leader of the Opposition had every one of his members on that side of the House just chock full of speeches ready to make, and they were going to need lots of time about all the things he is going to talk about. Now apparently they are not ready to talk. This is quite a reversal of the situation . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — The difference is that we want to know what we're talking about . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . or else the Leader of the Opposition was just speaking for himself. Mr. Speaker, one of the main questions to come before the House, the medical care question, is one

October 13, 1961

that has been discussed pretty thoroughly for two or three years, and to a very considerable extent before that. I think it is rather odd if the hon. members don't know how the people of Saskatchewan feel about a medical care plan, and whether they want a medical care plan or not. I think this has been discussed very completely throughout the country over the past couple of years, and I know it has been discussed in my part of the province, and I think I know what those people want.

I would point out also that a member has some responsibility as an individual too. He represents his constituency as a person and is supposed to, instead of having to refer everything back, make his own decisions. This is the type of delegated authority which we have in our country, and when the members say that after this issue is discussed, then they want to go back and hold meetings in every town in the constituency, I don't know whether they would do all the talking or whether they would want to listen to some of the other people talk. If they did all the talking they might not learn anything more about the situation. We pretty well know what the opinion of the people of Saskatchewan is on this thing, and now we have to take some responsibility for making up our minds as to how we are going to act on it. I am just a little suspicious that some of the hon. members opposite are more interested in delaying the progress of this work than they are in getting it through.

I will certainly support the motion.

**Mr. Karl F. Klein** (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, that is about the most pathetic argument I have ever heard from that side of the House yet. The Minister says he knows how he should vote better than the people of Saskatchewan. That may be all right in Russia, but not here. Yet at the time when you wanted to find out what time it was in Saskatchewan, you saw fit to inform all the public, and take all the time in the world. When you wanted to find out whether you should sell liquor or not, and make a little profit, you found it advisable to hold all sorts of meetings. But now, you are trying to ram through legislation that is going to affect every man, woman and child, and you wish to have it all done up in a week.

Here is a piece of legislation that is going to affect every man, woman and child in this province forever more, as the Premier pointed out, because it is quite likely once it goes in it will stay in. In my case I must take into consideration that in our region, the Gravelbourg-Assiniboia area, even after being fully informed on the operations of a health region voted it down by seven to one. Therefore, I think it is imperative that time be allowed to question these people in this regard at this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think the hon. member should get to the point that is under discussion.

**Mr. Klein:** — I am showing, Mr. Speaker, the importance of this legislation.

**Premier Douglas:** — . . . sitting mornings has nothing to do with explaining it to the people back home. Surely we are away off the subject, aren't we?

**Mr. Klein:** — Mr. Speaker, I feel we should take the time to inform the people. I don't want to take the responsibility, as a Minister over there says, that he thinks he knows what is best for his people. That may be all right in Russia, but not in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I am being misquoted. He said that I said 'I thought I knew what was best for my people'. I didn't say that at all.

**Mr. Klein:** — You said you would take the responsibility of making the decision for your people. What is the difference?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I said, I thought I knew what the people in my area of the province wanted. I didn't say . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! If the hon. Minister wishes to make a correction on his quotation he may do so with the consent of the member who is speaking; otherwise he may do it at the close of the debate. I think the hon. member should proceed immediately to the

**October 13, 1961**

motion before us. We are not discussing going back to the people of the province or a plebiscite at this time. We are discussing morning sittings in this House.

**Mr. Klein:** — In order to gain sufficient time, I think if we have to sit in the morning and afternoon and evening, there would be absolutely no possibility of consulting anybody to any degree of efficiency in our area, and I am certain there are many in that area who wish to be consulted. I personally unless I hold that consultation, do not like to vote on behalf of the people, until they tell me what they desire.

**Mr. R.A. Walker** (Attorney General): — I had thought that having sat on the opposite side of the House to the Liberal party for some 12 or 13 years, that I would eventually come to understand their mentality. I must say, however, I find that the opinion I have had of the motives of the Liberal party wasn't low enough. I can hardly credit Mr. Speaker, the members opposite seeking to deny to the members of this House, the right to spend if they wish, twelve and a half extra hours in debate on the Speech from the Throne. If the government had refused to allow this extra time, I can visualize members opposite getting up and shouting — "shutting off discussions — depriving us of an opportunity to exercise our democratic rights." How they can at the same time take the view that to give more opportunity for discussion is a deprivation of democratic rights is a mystery to me, and only the devil himself, I am sure, can understand the mental process of some hon. members of this House.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Is that a parliamentary statement?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the difference of opinion about meeting next week and sitting in the mornings . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I object to the insinuation that the devil can understand my process, and I want that withdrawn.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I apologize for that. I am willing to concede that the devil himself will have difficulty with the hon. lady.

**Mrs. Batten:** — He's a good client!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — At regular sittings we have, in the second week, committee meetings, starting on the Monday after the House opens at 10:00 o'clock. We did it last year. I should say that Monday fell on the third sitting day of the regular session of the legislature, whereas Monday now falls on the fourth sitting day of this legislature, so that hon. members have already had three mornings off since the session commenced, and at a regular session they only have two, to hear delegations and to consult with their constituents.

The hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch said that he will be deprived of an opportunity to consult with his constituents. Well, I know how far Notekeu-Willowbunch is from Regina, and I am sure he is not going to go out every morning to consult with his constituents, and be back here at 2:00 o'clock.

**Mrs. Batten:** — But they can come in here.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — With all deference to the light-footed member for Notukeu-Willowbunch, I am sure he can't get down there and consult with them and back . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I am sure too that any person from my constituency who wishes to consult with me will have plenty of opportunity during the day of the session, either before 10:00 o'clock, or I could have lunch with them between 12:30 and 2:30, or in the dinner hour, or even after 10:00 o'clock in the evening, so that I don't have any problem about having time to discuss these matters with my constituents or with people from anywhere else in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is ludicrous in the extreme for members opposite to say that they are prepared to stay here until February if necessary. What is the implication in that statement? The implication is that there is so much to discuss here that it may take us until February to dispose of the government's business, and use that as an argument for cutting down the period of time

**October 13, 1961**

each day we should devote to public business. There is just no sense or reason, Mr. Speaker, in the suggestion that you can do more public business by cutting down the number of hours. I am perfectly used to working these hours, and I have no complaint about working these hours, attending to my office — I manage to get the work in my office done. I have no complaint about sitting in this House for the morning until the adjournment in the evening and still getting my regular work done and hearing complaints from my constituents.

When these complaints come from private members it only reminds me of the wonderful time we had as private members. We surely must have worked short hours, and we certainly must have enjoyed a leisurely type of existence, in order to complain about the kind of hours that are proposed in this debate.

I have no objection to the House, if it sees fit, in cutting the hours down, but I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't matter which side of this question the government had taken. If the government had suggested the hours from 2:30 until regular adjournment, we would have been criticized for not allowing sufficient time for the members to discuss pressing problems affecting the people of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — How do you know that?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — You just can't win with the hon. members opposite. We are criticized in one breath because we didn't hurry the medical care plan on, and we're criticized in the other breath by other members of the opposition because we are trying to stampede them into action that is ill-considered.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if hon. members want to have more time to discuss the medical care bill, then we should get down to business on the speech from the throne, meet at 10:00 o'clock, get our speeches made and get on with the medical care bill, perhaps earlier if that is desired by hon. members. I have no desire to hurry the matter, but if hon. members feel that more time should be given to the medical care bill, then they should welcome a chance to put in longer hours on the Throne Speech so that we can get rid of it sooner, and then get down to considering the medical care bill at an earlier date.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of childish whining, always complaining no matter what the government does, is leading to a very sorry image of the Liberal party in the eyes of the people of the province.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Who is crying now?

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner** (Melville): — I hadn't intended to take part in this discussion but after the remarks of the Attorney-General, I could not help but get on my feet for a moment. I do want to give the Attorney General credit, because once in a while I see his car out here when I arrive in the morning at 7:00 o'clock, so I know that he does a fair amount of work during the session and other times. I understand from anything I have heard that he is one of, and probably the hardest working member on the government side of the House. But I am going to assure him though, that we do, as private members, have much to do. We haven't got a department with the number of secretaries that my hon. friend has, or any of the other Ministers of the government. There are 15 members on the government side of the House who have full departmental staffs to do their work for them; to operate their departments; to write their speeches, and any other jobs they can have them do. But the members on the opposition side of the House, six or seven of us have one stenographer. The government, by this action, is asking those seven members to get all their work and correspondence done in one hour of the day, all the work and correspondence, speech-typing, seeing to the work of their constituents, and answering mail — one hour for six members to have the use of one stenographer. That is the hour from 9:00 to 10:00 o'clock.

**Some Hon. Member:** — And noon hour.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Noon hour. Well, usually the stenographer goes to dinner, and I know I don't have to eat too much, Mr. Speaker, but I think usually the stenographer should be at least allowed her time off for dinner.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Quite frequently as the Premier is quite well aware, his party holds party caucuses two or three times a week, and they are usually held after the noon-hour. So that again excludes

**October 13, 1961**

the fact that if this work is going to be done properly, that the members on the opposition side of the House are not being given sufficient time to carry out the work in the way that it should be carried on in this House, and for their constituents.

So I say as other members of the House have suggested, that we should be permitted the mornings, and I am just going to make this reference to what the Attorney General said. He spoke of committees; everybody doesn't sit on the same committees. During the regular sessions of this House, while committees are meeting practically half the members on both sides of the House are free from committee work for half of the period that those committees are meeting, because half of them are on crown corporations; half of them are on public accounts or some other committee, and we have many mornings besides those first two in order to do our work.

So I suggest here that possibly if it comes down to the time when the government feels that perhaps the business of this session can be finished in two or three days and that the time should be extended in order to do that, well then, I say that possibly the members on the opposition side of the House would be prepared to agree to make that possible, if it was a matter of finishing the business of the House in a short period of time. But when we have just been here three days, and they are asking members of this House to start this type of sitting, then I think that the members have a right, the backbenchers even on the other side have a right, to stand up and say that they should be given sufficient time to do the work of their constituency that they are sent here to carry out; the work that has been placed before them to do, and so I am going to ask the Premier and the government to withdraw this motion.

I am quite certain that if it comes down to the period when we can see that this session is going to be closed and we are completing our business, and it is felt that perhaps we should spend some mornings in session. I am quite certain the members on this side of the House, under those conditions, would be prepared to be reasonable and to give this matter consideration.



**Mr. G. Herman Danielson** (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is much left to say in this debate, but after listening to the Attorney General and some of his juvenile arguments, I think we should get down to business.

The members on the government side have had this information for at least two or three weeks, and they have had copies of reports, which is proper and I am not criticizing that, but they have had that information. The members of the cabinet no doubt had it, because the Premier went down to Ontario and told the Toronto Star reporter what was in the bill. We don't read the Toronto Star. I got this report last Saturday morning. It was likely in my box on Friday night, but I didn't get the mail because I wasn't home until late that night. On Monday I had to attend a funeral. I came down here on Tuesday morning, and I had no opportunity whatever to look at the report and to study the different plans, and I think it is a very good report, from the few glances and pieces I have read from it. I think it is a report that is well worth reading — every word of it, and it is clear and concise so that you can understand what is meant.

What is the rush. What is the emergency here? Is it for some political aspirations in certain individuals? Well, I am not going to be a party to it. I think that we have come here to do business, and in this session we are going to saddle an additional \$20 or \$22 million taxes on the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I think it is worthwhile thinking over, and studying the matter — how it is going to be done and the best way we can do this, and not inflict any hardship that can possibly be avoided on the people of this province.

I think we should have a plebiscite. I know and everybody else knows that the election was not a plebiscite, which the Premier said it was, and this thing wasn't carried by a majority by a long, long ways.

**Premier Douglas:** — What has the plebiscite got to do with this motion?

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is just the point. What has it got to do with the motion? It has this to do with the motion — that you are trying to railroad through this House a bill that is going to saddle \$22 million taxes on the people of this province — that

**October 13, 1961**

is what it has to do with this motion. That is something that has never been done before.

When you put in your hospitalization we had ample time to discuss that. It took the whole session, and we had a hearing and we had a representation from certain individuals, and so on. That is how it should be. I am not so sure there shouldn't be a provision at this session to allow municipal organizations, health organizations, hospital organizations, and all these . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . to discuss with the members what this really means, and listen to their recommendations to the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I must point out that when I stand and call for order I expect the members to take their seats.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your point . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Please be seated. Order! I am afraid that what you have been saying may have some regard to the legislation, but I cannot see that it has any bearing in regard to whether we sit mornings or not.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I said what I had to say, and I think that this government should be very careful before they railroad anything through this House. It is a form of closure. That's all right, you have been telling them all the time that this thing should be over in a week, then in two weeks, and so on, and there is unanimous agreement, I understand, over there that this thing is going to be pushed through come what may. Be careful what you do. The people will remember this session for a long, long time.

**Mr. W. Ross Thatcher** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to repeat what has already been said this afternoon, but I wonder whether, in view of the debate we have had on this motion, whether the Premier wouldn't consider some sort of a compromise. After all, this legislation does involve from \$20 million to \$22 million. When it comes up we want to be able to discuss it thoroughly. This will involve the most money of any legislation . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — As I understand it, the Premier said the tax bill is coming in this session. This will be the biggest money bill that has ever been introduced in the history of the province. The opposition therefore wants to make sure that we have an opportunity to thoroughly examine it.

I had dinner with an MLA from Ontario this afternoon. He told me that Mr. Donald McDonald, the leader of the New Democratic Party in Ontario, made a speech a few weeks ago in the Ontario House, in which he said the opposition should be given a quarter of a million dollars for research help. If we had some research help, if we had some staff in our offices, Mr. Speaker, maybe we could get along.

A point which the Attorney General made was that in ordinary sessions we have committee work, and that we are not going to have committee work this session. How do you know we are not going to have committee work? I think it might be advisable for the House to call in this Thompson Committee, and let us examine the members. We would like to inquire how they have reached their conclusions. There is too much money involved, this is too big an issue, just to rush it through. I think the Premier should compromise on this a bit. At least for the duration of the Throne Speech debate — it shouldn't be necessary to sit mornings. Perhaps a week from Monday, if it is necessary, we could start to sit mornings but for another week at least, there is a great deal of other work besides just sitting in this House, and I for one don't think we can do it with the facilities that we have.

I don't think we can do the job that the taxpayers of this province expect us to do, if we are going to have to sit as long as this resolution would demand us to sit.

**Mr. Alex. Cameron** (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to put forth one thought. The Premier is calling this a special session. Apparently it is called for the purpose of dealing with two items, as outlined in the Throne Speech. The Opposition has brought to the attention, in this debate, many other problems which we are facing, and I know that in my area we're facing many. I want to say to the Attorney-General, and to the Premier, who mentioned it yesterday, that he didn't think the members would like to sit around

**October 13, 1961**

twiddling their fingers in the mornings, doing nothing, and therefore we should sit in the mornings as well as the afternoons. That would be correct if the members were sitting around twiddling their fingers and doing nothing.

I have come here, using my opportunity and my time during these mornings to go to the various departments, seeking information and help for my people in south-western Saskatchewan. We have hundreds of problems. We have people who have applied to the municipality for social aid. We have municipal secretaries that are not conversant with the regulations. We have line-ups of people waiting to have their applications processed. We have people who are not in a position to pay their hospital tax nor their medical tax to the Swift Current health region. They want to know what arrangements can be made, if any, if they go on social aid to have their medical costs paid for them. Those are problems that I'm bringing to the heads of departments here to try to work out the solution.

So my mornings have been fully taken up. I don't think that the legislature at this time should devote its full time to debates — nothing but debates in the mornings, afternoons, and at night — sitting in this chamber and listening to one speaker after another from 10:00 in the morning until 10:00 or 10:30 at night. I don't think it is advancing the cause and the work of the legislature. Such a practice is robbing the members of the opportunity to do what is expected of them by their constituents — to use a fair portion of this time to take to the various departments, the problems they are facing in order to help them to solve them.

I think the opposition is around as early as most members in the legislature. I got the Commission report Friday afternoon. The weekend was a holiday weekend. We came in on Tuesday for the session on Wednesday. I haven't had the opportunity to give thorough study to it, and I have been using part of my mornings studying that report, looking into other suggestions that have been offered, and trying to balance and check one against the other, in order that I can contribute something worthwhile to the thinking and the assessing of the bill that is presented to us.

That is the reason why I object to morning sittings, because it is not giving me the opportunity to take my problems to the officials of the departments, because time would not permit me to interview them at the

time they happen to be in their office. It would greatly inconvenience them were they to accommodate me the time that I have left to deal with these problems. It is those things which the members are using the opportunity to assist and to work out and to find solutions to, and for that reason I object to having to sit in the morning and the afternoon and at night, and not leaving me any opportunity to do the research work that is so essential if we are to give true consideration and make a valuable contribution, both to the medical care bill and to the tax rental agreement.

I want to have something to say on the tax rental agreement, but I want to do some research work first. I want to have something to say on the medical plan, but I want insofar as my limited mental capacity will permit, to be as informed as I can be before I attempt to assess and to offer a contribution to the House. For that reason I feel that I need the time and am entitled to the hours necessary to do this research work. That is why I object to the morning sittings.

**Mr. Franklin E. Foley** (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make one or two comments with regard to this motion. Although having only looked over the bill in question, with regard to the medical plan, very briefly, in my opinion there is nothing said about the financing of the scheme, nothing mentioned about premiums.

**Premier Douglas**: — On a motion of morning sittings for the House we are now discussing the medical bill, we've discussed a plebiscite and half a dozen other subjects which are not even remotely related to this motion.

**Mr. Speaker**: — I agree. I think hon. members should endeavour to keep the discussion as much as possible to this motion — morning sittings in the legislature.

**Mr. Foley**: — I only wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of information which we had hoped to have on this matter, and the matter of whether or not we sit in the mornings certainly is related to the time we will have to gain information on this important legislation. For one thing we don't know anything about how the medical profession

**October 13, 1961**

is to be paid, or anything of that nature, and certainly I think these are some of the things that have been omitted from our information to date. We should have time to get this information.

**Mr. Bernard D. Gallagher** (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking any part in this debate, but when my learned friend, the member for Hanley constituency (Hon. Mr. Walker) got up and took as long to make his point as he did, I decided to get into it, too.

I think that the member for Hanley made it quite clear that he hasn't got the courage to do what the member for Moosomin suggested that he should do. I think we should take all the time in the world.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! It is, I believe, now 5:30. We would ordinarily adjourn to come back at 7:30 tonight. Is it the pleasure of the House that we do?

**Premier Douglas:** — It is up to the House. If the House thinks it is going to be an extended debate, then I think we probably ought to call it 5:30. If the House wants to extend and go for another fifteen minutes, if fifteen minutes will finish it up, we could finish. It is entirely up to the House, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Let's finish it now.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Very good.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Mr. Speaker, as I started to say before, I don't think the member from Hanley has the courage to do what was suggested by the member for Moosomin. I think that this is too serious a thing to be kicked around the way it has been kicked around. The member from Kelsey suggested that he was amazed to hear that the people on this side of the House were not ready to put through the legislation that this House has come in to put through at this session. I might remind the member for Kelsey that whether or not he had access to the legislation that we are going to deal with during this session, three or four months ago or not, I do not know, but I know that we only got this Advisory Committee's report last Friday and Saturday. We've only had the bill put on our desks this afternoon.

I don't know how long he has had it in his possession, or how long he might have known what it was going to contain, but I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier will consider very seriously withdrawing or at least compromising, as the Leader of the Opposition has suggested, on this motion, that is put before this House.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I personally, and I think my colleagues, have no strong feelings about this matter. We didn't expect there would be all this fuss, and I find great difficulty in sorting out the contradictory arguments that have been advanced. One member gets up and says this is an attempt to cut off discussion. Cutting off discussion means adding twelve and one-half hours to the Speech from the Throne Debate? For people who were howling that they had dozens of things they wanted to get off their chest, this seems to me to be an excellent opportunity for them to get it off their chests.

There have been one or two sound arguments, but I think it is silly to say that sitting mornings is going to interfere with getting out and holding meetings in your constituencies to see what the people think. You're certainly not going to run off every morning to have a meeting in the country. If you're going to have a meeting you're going to have to have it in the evening, so we'd better agree not to sit evenings, and sit mornings and afternoons, if you want to hold meetings in the country.

I think some of these arguments border on the ridiculous. There have been some sound arguments, and I think those are the ones we have to recognize. The member for Humboldt points up quite properly that there is a lot of study and research involved in legislation, and I think it is most unwise for members not to have an opportunity to study the legislation. As far as the report is concerned, most members have had an opportunity of reviewing it. By the way, I was never in Toronto and never talked to a reporter there. The reporter from the Toronto Star saw me on a Tuesday; I got the report on a Wednesday, and I didn't get a chance to read the report until a Saturday, when I sat down and went over it very carefully. Most members have had the same chance, and now they have a chance to spend this week-end studying the bill, but as the Leader of the Opposition says, there are financial bills to come down, and those, of course, will want some careful studying.

October 13, 1961

It seems to me that if we are going to try to find some compromise, the proposition I would suggest in this, why don't we continue sitting mornings? After all, this is what we do during regular sessions, except when we are sitting in committees. It is true that the member for Melville said the committees do not comprise the whole House. But they do comprise as high as 38 members. The crown corporations committee has 38 members which takes in the bulk of the members. Why don't we go ahead with the morning sittings, until we get the Speech from the Throne debate out of the way. When we start on this legislation, if the members feel they want more time, let's either drop morning sittings, or agree to adjourn each night at 5:30, and have the evenings to work on. We have no desire to rush this thing through. I think it is very important that every member understand it thoroughly. But we felt with the Speech from the Throne on, it was a very good time to study the medical care report. It would at least be interesting, and some of the members would have a chance to read it at that time.

I wonder if this would not be the most satisfactory way — to go ahead with the mornings. We haven't any legislation in front of us except the Medical Care Insurance Act. When we get into the legislation itself, if the members feel they would like to cut down on half days, then the Whips could confer. We could knock off the morning sittings, or the evening sittings, whichever would seem the more appropriate to the members. I wonder if this would meet the situation.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Would the hon. member permit a question? We thought — all of us, I think everybody voted for these Standing Orders, and we submitted to a form of closure on a vote — it was satisfactory to everybody. We all decided that the debate on the Speech from the Throne shouldn't last indefinitely; there should be a cut-off date and the hours at that time were firmly established. Now, we have adhered to this every other session. Why should this session be any different than any other session?

**Premier Douglas:** — There's no change in the Standing Orders as far as the Throne Speech debate is concerned. The only difference is there is going to be seven and a half to twelve and one-half hours more debating time. The Standing Order is clear. It provides for seven days debate in addition to the



day on which the Mover and Seconder speak. That makes eight days.

**Mrs. Batten:** — But we thought the time sufficient there; why is it not sufficient now?

**Premier Douglas:** — By sitting more hours per day we could finish by Wednesday if we wanted to. We could then revert to shorter days to deal with legislation. We don't have to take the full time for the Speech from the Throne. But certainly it is not cutting down the Speech from the Throne. This debate will be the same number of days, but they will be eight-hour days instead of five and one-half hour days, for five days of it. Three days have already gone. I would think this would be a satisfactory thing for everyone concerned. If the Whips get together and decide once we get through the Speech from the Throne, that the members on both sides feel they need more time, we could, if it is mutually agreeable, discontinue either morning sittings, or discontinue evening sittings. We are not pressing you to hurry up.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish we could adjourn here for about sixty seconds. That doesn't sound too unreasonable to me, but I would just like to confer with my colleagues here. Would that be permissible?

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is a rather unknown proceeding, so far as I am concerned. That is an undebatable motion.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Since the Premier has decided that is the course he wanted to take, it may be that he might leave — because of the fact that we weren't certain that was going to be it, except for the bill being on the Order Paper today, that he perhaps would leave Monday morning sitting off because there is no staff here over the weekend, and I know those of us who would be speaking on Monday would like to have some opportunity to have service, but that is just a suggestion.

**Premier Douglas:** — That would be acceptable to me. I haven't had a chance to consult my colleagues. In television you have a conference — but I haven't got a long enough neck here to have a conference with everybody concerned. Would this be accepted, that we leave the motion on the Order Paper. If we do,

**October 13, 1961**

this means that we don't sit Monday morning. We would proceed with this motion then, but somebody in the House would have to amend it, if we were going to start sitting Tuesday mornings. It would also give the Whips time to talk the thing over. Would this be agreeable?

If it is agreeable, what do I do? Move the adjournment?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The book says we can't take a vote.

**Premier Douglas:** — I can't amend my own motion?

**Mr. Speaker:** — You can't amend your own motion.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, can the Premier adjourn the debate, and take a vote on Monday?

**Premier Douglas:** — The Clerk says it cannot be amended, because I have already started a motion. Mr. Speaker, I think I have the solution, if I could have the consent of the House. If we could get a gentleman's undertaking (and that would include the member for Humboldt) — a gentleman's agreement, that I could introduce a motion on Monday without notice, I would withdraw this motion.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We will certainly give that undertaking.

**Premier Douglas:** — I would therefore, ask leave to withdraw the motion.

(Motion withdrawn)

#### **Motion re: SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN STANDING ORDERS**

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think the other motion is at all controversial, but we can leave it until Monday if you wish. It calls for the suspension of three Standing Orders; one respecting the appointment of a Committee of Supply and Ways and Means, which is a Committee which is always appointed at the beginning of the session to deal with the budget. There will be no budget so it doesn't apply.

The other is Standing Order 73, which is respecting reports of the Legislative Librarian, so it seems to me that it is purely a matter of proceedings.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Douglas, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:

Ordered, that the following Standing Orders be suspended for the duration of this Session:

- (1) Standing Order 43 respecting the appointment of the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means;
- (2) Standing Order 73 respecting lists of reports required to be tabled; and
- (3) Standing Order 105 respecting the report of the Legislative Librarian.

(Motion agreed to)

The Assembly adjourned at 5:42 o'clock p.m.