

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Fourteenth Legislature
5th Day

Tuesday, October 17, 1961

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

On the Orders of the Day:

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Debate on Address-in-Reply

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

And the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Thatcher, seconded by Mr. McDonald:

Mrs. Gladys Strum (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I am always proud of the contribution of the mover, the member for Regina, and her analysis of the report made a very valuable contribution to this debate. The seconder, the member for Touchwood, dealt very ably with the complicated and important revenue field in which we are all interested, and in a matter where our province is extremely vulnerable.

I wish to deal with an aspect of health beyond the scope of this Bill, but which affects the health, the genetic future, and even the survival of the race — namely the refusing to join the Nuclear Club — that is, the banning of nuclear weapons on Canadian soil and the strengthening of the resources of the United Nations as a law enforcement body.

I do not wish to digress into a full-scale foreign policy debate, but I feel that this body must recognize that this is a health problem that concerns not only us, but all of man-kind. First, a voice must be raised in support of the United Nations as a law enforcement body; secondly, unless we refuse to join the Nuclear Club we have no right to demand that the spread of nuclear weapons be curtailed, nor have we the right to protest

October 17, 1961

the testing of nuclear weapons.

Since moving a resolution in this House last session on this subject, the basic premise has altered very little. It is still true that the more nations there are with atomic weapons, the greater the risk, and either by design or accident, some day they will go off. Also it is true that the manufacture of atomic weapons provokes the extension of more and more deadly atomic weapons.

Now, the premise that air raid shelters can be a means of defence is a snare and a delusion, even if everyone provides his own shelter, because a very few minutes' warning would not permit him to reach it. In the meantime, the testing of atomic weapons is intensifying the risk to all human, animal and plant life on the planet, and generations yet unborn will bear the monstrous imprint of our folly.

On September 25th the president of the United States, speaking in tribute to the memory of Dag Hammarskjöld said this:

“The problem is not the death of one man; the problem is the life of this organization. It will either grow to meet the challenge of our age, or it will be gone with the wind — without influence; without force and without respect. Were we to let it die, to enfeeble its vigour, to cripple its powers, we would condemn the future, for in the development of this organization, it is the only true alternative to war— and war appeals no longer as a rational alternative.

Unconditional war can no longer lead to unconditional victory. It can no longer serve to settle disputes; it can no longer be of concern to great powers alone, for a nuclear disaster spread by winds, and water and fear, could well engulf the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the committed and uncommitted alike. Mankind must put an end to war, or war will put an end to mankind.”

So let us here resolve that Dag Hammarskjold did not live or die in vain. Let us call a truce to terror. Let us invoke the blessings of peace, and if we build an international capacity to keep peace, let us join in dismantling the national capacity to wage war. This will require a new strength and new roles for a new United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, we have protested the ban of all weapons on numerous occasions, and in petitions bearing the signatures of thousands of Canadians in resolutions passed by church bodies met in conference; university students picketing on Parliament Hill, and movements such as the Voice of Women in gaining now support weekly; in a national organization dedicated to expose and oppose radiation hazards; a committee that counts among its sponsors many distinguished journalists, such as James Minnifie, CBC Washington correspondent, and Farley Mowatt, who with our Premier, addressed the Easter march on the steps of this legislature; Bertrand Russell, an intellectual of international stature, Arnold Toynbee, the historian. Indeed, their name is legion, joined as they are by countless others such as Nobel prize-winner Linus Pawling; our own Dr. Keenleyside, and military persons as well as thousands of thinking laymen. Indeed, our former President of the Saskatchewan University, Dr. Thompson, and now moderator of the United Church of Canada, on October 6th presented to the Prime Minister a petition bearing the signature of more than 142,000 persons gathered by the committee for the control of Radiation Hazards.

I would just like to quote from The Leader-Post on this occasion, issue of October 6th, because this is a very, very important theme. The Prime Minister on this occasion exhibited a very weak and ambivalent stand on this whole matter, and The Leader-Post report this meeting in this way:

“The delegation was with the Prime Minister for an hour, and Dr. Thompson said afterwards that Mr. Diefenbaker told the group the government’s policy was what the delegation advocated, exactly. He said he supported our policy and that this was, in fact, the policy of the government — that there would be no nuclear arms for Canada in peace-time.”

October 17, 1961

“He said that if there was a world war, then NATO would have to have nuclear weapons, but he assured us they would never be used offensively.

After a Cabinet meeting to which he went hurriedly after meeting the delegation, Mr. Diefenbaker said the words quoted by Dr. Thompson were not exact, and this is where Mr. Diefenbaker begins to back-track.

He said he had told the delegation that Canada had accepted the principle that there should be no extension of the nuclear club.

‘I told them if they accepted the Kennedy declaration that there should be no extension of the nuclear club’, Mr. Diefenbaker said. ‘We accepted the principle enunciated by Mr. Kennedy . . . ’

Then he goes on to do a little double-talk here and to imply that we had another policy.

I was shocked a little later on Thursday last, to read in The Leader-Post, that when questioned, the Prime Minister did not consider it worthwhile to protest the nuclear testing recently re-opened in Russia. To me this is a very significant and suspicious stand. Why, if we are still uncommitted, are we not protesting the pollution of our skies, and our soil, which, in some instances, recently measured up to a thousand-fold increase in atomic radiation? Why are we not protesting the use and extension of atomic arms? We cannot be on both sides. Either we are for it or we are against it. The Voice of Women is now begging for children’s teeth to test for strontium 90 and carbon 14. The sharp increase of cancer in young children should make us all alert to the danger. Cancer in children now accounts for most deaths; in fact it accounts for more young lives than the total of the next two diseases, contending for this position.

The Prime Minister’s position is, to say the least, unreliable. On one occasion a few weeks back he was all ready to face a general election on the issue of accepting nuclear warheads, but over the week-end President Kennedy’s speech at the United Nations changed our foreign policy, and on Monday the Prime Minister said that the issue would be one of the new tax agreements with the provinces.

But that is not what Mr. Harkness says. He wants to push us into the position where we dare not take a stand on atomic weapons; when the Prime Minister, out of guilt or cowardice, implied that he did not dare speak out, when Russia began testing again.

This is a short session, and I do not wish to introduce a resolution. We are on record for and against, with a few abstentions not wishing to be counted, but the urgency of the moment demands that we must stand up and be counted; that we must take our stand for strengthening the United Nations, and against the accepting of nuclear weapons as the first step in the disarmament that all desire.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I have noted upon occasion this year that several of the speakers have been following notes rather closely when they have been speaking. The rule book says that no member speaking in the House may read from a written, previously prepared speech. Last year I was rather lenient in this regard, because we had many new members in the House, but I think it would improve the debate in the House if the hon. members were to do their utmost to give their speeches without extensive use of notes. I think it would help them to give a better debate in this House.

Mr. Ian H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, as I take my place in this Throne Speech debate I should first like to congratulate the lady member for Regina for her presentation, and the member for Touchwood on his presentation on the moving and seconding of the Address-in-Reply.

I won't be too severe in my criticism of the lady member for Regina of her presentation, but I must say that when she sat down I was convinced that she was speaking for the government and had seen Bill No. 1. But after the Premier got up and put forth his ideas, I could see that I wasn't so sure. I thought the lady member for Regina was in full agreement with the Smishek minority report, and I only wish I had had time to hear all the members on the opposite side of the House, so that I could get a fairly mixed up picture of what they were thinking.

October 17, 1961

There are a few things, however, that the Premier said with which I could not agree, and I am going to state here that I don't think for one minute that communism is a disease or a result of poverty. I would say that communism is a disease of the mind; otherwise how can you account for university professors and university graduates who are certainly not in economic need, to follow the Moscow party lines? These agitators certainly have a profound influence over the students who go to university, and their viewpoints certainly are not brought forth out of poverty.

I should like to quote from a book entitled 'A Business Man Looks at Communism', and he says in paragraph 4:

“Socialism is the precursor of communism; democracy cannot exist if the government owns all property. The communists to take over in a socialist country would be no trick at all . . .”

Over on the next page, in this same report he says:

“Communism is not a disease of poverty. The children of the very rich are far more susceptible to communism than are the children of the poor . . .”

In paragraph 9, this man goes on to say (and I might say he is a director of one or two banks in the United States; one or two oil companies, and he should have a pretty good idea whereof he speaks):

“It is fairly obvious that we are in great danger, when a few unscrupulous labour leaders can compel a worker to join a union, contribute money to the union, and obey the will of these leaders, when the tremendous sums of money so realized can be used for political purpose to elect puppets of these leaders to political office, about which the worker has nothing to say — dictatorship is just around the corner.”

Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring this point home very pointedly, because when they say that giving the people this, that and the next thing is going to keep them from Communism, this is certainly not the case.

In paragraph 12, he goes on to say, to anyone who advances the communist propaganda, how wonderful communism is, ask him why there are millions of refugees from East Germany, Hungary, China and so on, and why the Iron Curtain was put up to keep those people in? It takes powerful compulsion for a man, his wife and children with the meagre possessions they can carry in their hands and on their backs, to risk death and to face an unknown future.

While the Premier is leaving Saskatchewan, and while I want to personally wish him well, the only thing that we have in common is our Scottish background, but heaven forbid that Canada ever turns to his type of politics. I can visualize Mr. Douglas being Premier of Canada, and having a summit conference with Peking and Moscow, and inviting Castro to take over Prince Edward Island, and putting up a Dew Line from Russia in the north, giving Vancouver Island to Peking, and then putting up a wall between here and the United States, and saying, "Now you capitalists, you keep out of Saskatchewan and Canada."

I heard further ravings going on on that side of the House yesterday afternoon about West Germany and East Germany, and how the people were pulling themselves up by their bootstraps. I can hardly visualize Canada trying the same thing without industry and capital coming into the province.

The New Democratic Party, as far as I can see, and regardless of what the Premier says in Saskatchewan, will no doubt be dominated by his labour bosses. They will prey on class distinction, and the very idea of having labour contribute to a political party, a payroll deduction, however small, is distasteful, Mr. Speaker, to the average man who works for a living. For one thing it forces him to contribute, in many cases, to something in which he does not believe. He will undoubtedly be branded as anti-union, if he tried to sign out, and to me there is no doubt that a man belonging to an organization wouldn't think of signing out because he would be the victim of discrimination.

October 17, 1961

I feel that it is the right of an individual to belong to any political party which he so desires, but the idea of having to force \$1.25, or whatever the levy should happen to be, from workers in Canada, is certainly very foreign to Canadians. It makes little difference what the price is. The fact is that he is being forced, whether he likes it or not, and the only way he can get out of that is to sign out. If you want these people to contribute to these political slush funds, the thing is to make them sign in. I might add here, that Canada under a new party regime would undoubtedly be controlled by the labour bosses, some of whom are unscrupulous tyrants. Who, for example, in this country, wants Hoffa to have the major say in governing Canada?

In the field of foreign policy, the socialists are so missed up in Ottawa today that when these very vital issues come up, most of the CCF members in the House are conspicuous by their silence or by their absence. Mr. Argue's excuse — constituency business. Constituency business, indeed! He was rather outspoken before he lost the leadership of the New Democratic Party. If Mr. Douglas thinks he's going to control the New Democratic Party or the policies of that party, I say he's a dreamer. If, however, he knows that his orders are going to be coming from the union bosses or people elsewhere, then he is a deceiver.

I am convinced by the actions of this government that their main concern in handling the affairs of this province are not for the good of the people but for political expediency. The farmers have little or no place in their thoughts, nor have the working people, except for their votes.

I am going to illustrate this point by pointing out that last summer during the terrific drought that we had, especially in our corner of the province, a group of farmers contacted me and asked me to try to get the government to purchase some of the grain that was damaged in the Wilcox fire. I said I would do my best, so I phoned the Department of Agriculture. I couldn't get anybody. I thought then perhaps I could get some of the deputies in that department, but when I got down to about the seventh or eighth phone call before I finally got somebody, he said, "I can't really do anything. My Minister is out of town", so just about that time I discovered that the New Democratic Party was having a convention in

Ottawa, and most of the cabinet ministers and a lot of the deputy ministers were down there. They were playing politics when they should have been looking after the needs of agriculture right here.

The insurance company in this case was not entirely to blame. They were only concerned about recovering some of their losses in this fire, and they were selling this grain in 50,000 bushel lots. No farmer in any area, so far as I could see, was in a position to buy 50,000 bushel lots. No farmer in any area, so far as I could see, was in a position to buy 50,000 bushels of grain because that represents something like 25 carloads.

However, if this Department of Agriculture were awake, or alive, or even interested — do you mean to tell me they could do nothing to keep some of that grain in Saskatchewan? It would have made quite a little difference to these people to be able to purchase a few thousand bushels of this damaged grain for feed. Yet, the week before, I happened to be watching a television broadcast when the Minister of Agriculture was down in Winnipeg, crying big crocodile tears over the plight of the grain-grower in Saskatchewan. The feed situation was terrible and the Minister of Agriculture from Manitoba and from Ottawa met, but all he was doing was playing politics, and when the time came he was the little man who wasn't there.

I know of another man who wrote the Department of Agriculture, telling him that he had 60 acres of hay that could be obtained by the government if they so desired. He realized he wasn't going to be using it. He got a letter from the government. Mr. Speaker, do you know what the letter said? It said they would put him on file, and when he could buy more hay (from the government) they would let him know.

There was another case about the Department of Agriculture's inefficiency, to say the least. Some people cut hay in my area on hay permits. Just recently, in July, I believe (the man had his permit long since the first of the year) and he was all set to go out and cut his hay when he got a notice from the government in question had no chance to go out and buy other feed supplies, and hay supplies for the winter, so he contacted me and the only answer I got from the government was, well the land was given over to parkland, so it was

up to the parks to grant the hay permit. This didn't give the poor fellow much chance to go out and get any further supplies for himself. I just wonder what kind of management we have. I could say plenty — but I don't want to offend the school teacher . . .

Mr. Snedker: — That's their attitude towards farmers!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. MacDougall: — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman opposite kept his mouth shut so long that we lost the grain that we could have had from Wilcox because he was the little man who wasn't there.

I want to turn now to the medical health program — this compulsory plan that this government is about to force upon us. I feel it is fantastic for the people of this province to have this forced upon us in view of economic conditions.

Premier Douglas: — Is that statement the Liberal policy?

Mr. MacDougall: — I should like to say, especially at this time, because during the past month and a half or so, from the meagre information which we have available, I talked to at least 200 people in my constituency and asked them, what about a compulsory medical health program? I only found one person who was in favour of it. I was asking the man in the street. I wasn't going around asking big business for this. I was asking the average man in the street, and he said, "At this time I don't see how we can afford it." Many farmers told me they were having trouble paying their hospital tax at this time. Certainly we are not against a medical health program, but a medical health program that is going to cost \$30 million is a different proposition.

Where in the world is this extra money going to come from? Maybe I should wait until I hear the speech from the Provincial Treasurer to let us know where he is going to try and dig up this money — maybe it's going to grow on trees next year, I don't know.

October 17, 1961

But what makes it even more ridiculous is that a medical program at this time doesn't seem to be for the good of the people particularly. I think it is more designed for political manouvring on the part of the Premier, so he can go out to the rest of Canada and say, "I gave them free medical health program; after all, I'm my brother's keeper" — once again at the expense of Saskatchewan. I would say that the Premier is just digging himself up some more propaganda to carry across Canada. Let me point out that the socialist government in Britain implemented a medical health program which they said was free, but which was not so free, because the first year it cost them something like \$363 million.

For the first year that is what the estimate was, I should say. The actual costs were somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$950 million . . .

Premier Douglas: — The first year?

Mr. MacDougall: — The first year.

Premier Douglas: — Is that too much?

Mr. MacDougall: — The estimates were out, and the estimates you fellows are going to make are going to be out. You might just as well face it, because anything you do according to this government, is always out. This we know — experience has told us that.

I suppose the socialist advocators are the same the world over; whether their leader's name is Bevan, Gaitskill, or Tim Buck, or Mr. Douglas, or just whoever it happens to be — they are all the same. The program in Britain is largely financed out of general tax revenues, and this is probably one reason why Britons are the most heavily-taxed people in the world. Maybe some of them wouldn't be without their medical health program, but please just don't get the idea across that they are getting it free, because you only get what you pay for. Sometimes you can get these things on private voluntary plans, and they quite comparably cost a lot less money, especially since private plans are efficiently operated.

The next thing the government must consider, and I notice the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) had his own very definite ideas of what he would do if the doctors would not go along with this plan. He would

more or less force them by taking over the licensing of the doctors. In Souris-Estevan alone . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — I did not say that we would force the doctors, and I want to point out that that is a false statement.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member has a correction he may deal with it if he can get the consent of the hon. member.

Mr. MacDougall: — He can correct it if he wants. That's fine, but so far as I am concerned, this is what I understood him to say. In my constituency alone, we lost three doctors during the past six or seven months. These doctors were doctors who came from countries where they had this forced medical health plan. One of them came from Holland; two of them came from Britain and they came here with the idea that they were walking out of socialism.

So it wasn't long after the June election that they told the people that they wouldn't be looking after the long-term illnesses any longer, because if the socialists got in they would leave, and we have lost three of them. I should like to know just how many more we are going to lose. We cannot afford to lose these doctors.

In one poll at the University of Saskatchewan last year, with which I am familiar, there were 34 students contacted, and out of that 34 students who were asked how many would remain in Saskatchewan, there were only three and this to me represents a fantastic loss of freedom, and if you people think you are going to pay salaries to the doctors, which is the obvious outcome of what will happen under socialism, you will want to pay the doctor's salary, and once you take their initiative away from them the doctors might just as well leave and go where they can be free.

In the past five years we, in Estevan, have needed approximately 25 or 30 more beds for our hospital and over this past five years they have been told by the government time and time again that there was no money available. How in the world are we going to look after an increase in people coming to the hospital if we haven't got beds enough to look after them now?

October 17, 1961

As I pointed out before, political expediency in this particular government seems to take precedence over common sense. They put in the regional hospital in Weyburn. It should have been in Estevan, because then it would have given us enough beds to look after the people, but why would they put it in Weyburn? It is in the far northwest corner of the health region.

Mr. Thatcher: — Guess!

Mr. MacDougall: — Yes, just guess. There's only one thing I can say and that is that it was the Premier's seat. This is an expensive political gimmick . . .

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Nonsense!

Mr. MacDougall: — Well then, why was it put there? Did you ever answer that question?

The Estevan hospital by far consistently has more babies born in that hospital than Weyburn, and our stay — the hospital stay is two days less than the provincial average. Why do the doctors have to do this? Simply because they haven't got the beds to keep people the required length of time.

One more point on this medical program which I want to point out is that people who are subject to transfer from province to province under this medical health scheme will have to take out Saskatchewan government hospital insurance, whether they like it or not. I think that a medical care on a national basis with all the people of Canada involved, makes much more sense and I believe it should be made available to them, and not a compulsory system. This business of compulsion — everything we do is compulsory. You're forced into this; you're forced to do that; you're forced to pay — and I am quite certain this thing should wait until economic conditions improve.

I am also quite certain that the people in the east end of my constituency would sooner see Highway No. 18 improved and rebuilt so that at least people can travel on the road. They have the hospital in Gainsborough, and the people of that town are right on the Manitoba boundary, for those of you that don't know — the people from Cardiff and all these towns

that have to go to that hospital have what can be described as a terrible roads. I would like to see the Minister of Health take the Minister of Highways over that road and ask him if he would like to haul patients over it, because sometimes it is nearly impassable.

At a time like this I think we should take a long, hard look at costs of this insurance plan. We should bite off only what we can chew. After all, doctors in the past have cared for the sick of this province and as far as that goes, all over Canada, regardless of whether they could pay for it or not. I don't know of any doctor who would let a man die because he was sick. I dare say that the doctors write off many hundreds of dollars every year from people who cannot pay them.

Personally, I would rather see the government adopt the minority report of Doctor Barootes, Anderson, Houston and Mr. MacPherson, which urges the government to subsidize existing voluntary schemes, and to embrace all who cannot obtain coverage elsewhere. The estimated cost of this plan was somewhere around \$3.5 million. This would undoubtedly be easier to finance; the money would be easier to find and yet it would be a start. The Premier could then go to the rest of Canada, "Well, we started on it, but we didn't break the province . . ." It would not interfere with the people who are now covered by private schemes, and some of those people who might prefer to stay that way.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Haven't you adopted the policy?

Mr. MacDougall: — It would take the element of compulsion out of medical care. Compulsion indeed is very distasteful to many people. It might not be to you people, some of you think the Russian system of government is pretty good, but they are forced. If any of you fellows would like to go over there and make your home there, I am quite sure they would take you, and I am quite certain I could get up a collection here to send any of you over that want to go.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You better join the John Birch Society!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

October 17, 1961

Mr. MacDougall: — Again I want to point out that with the economic conditions as they are today, any urgency to implement the hospital care plan would seem more for the Premier's benefit than for the benefit of the people.

In closing I feel we should go to the people with a plebiscite, giving them all the facts that we have available, and the costs and the benefits, and indeed all the information that we can. Then they would give us the answer. Since the Thompson report came out, and more facts along with it, I am certain this would help the people of Saskatchewan decide whether or not they wanted compulsory state medicine.

Mr. C.B. Peterson (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take part in this debate and carry on with a sort of verbal battle, or you might say a battle of words, to try and out-do the other person. I think we should use a little rhyme and reason in our debate, and I think we could accomplish more. I think we would do something that we were elected to do — but the matter of a battle of words I don't think, is in its rightful place.

I would like, though, to set a few remarks straight that have been raised by the other side of the House. Before so doing I would like to congratulate the lady member for Regina, and also the member for Touchwood for the fine manner in which they moved and seconded the Speech from the Throne.

Here the other day the member for Melville (I think he has left his seat) made the remark that the Power building down here in Regina was costing the taxpayers some \$7 million or \$8 million. You know, it is ridiculous to think that they expect to get that across to the people of this province.

Mr. Thatcher: — It will cost more than that when they're through!

Mr. Peterson: — How stupid do you think the people of Saskatchewan are, anyway? To believe that it is going to cost the taxpayers \$7 or \$8 million?

Mr. McDonald: — It will be more than that when it's through. It will be \$10 million by the time they have it finished.

Mr. Peterson: — You might as well include all the other buildings in Saskatchewan too, then. Your house, your car and whatever you have as well. You might as well include that Coca-Cola plant down there on Victoria Avenue — you might just as well. You see, it's a stupid thing to try, or are you that dense that you can't get that into your head that this is a self-liquidating project, the same as any other public enterprise?

Then he felt sorry for himself and the people of Melville that the long-distance telephone calls would be handled from Yorkton. Well, I am glad to hear that. I wasn't aware of that — I wasn't posted on that, but I am glad to hear of it. I think it is a good thing. I'm all for progress and centralization, where it is going to be effective. To give you an idea, when we put in the rural telephone system in our community, it just about fell through, because we couldn't get an exchange in our home-town. I wanted it to go to Wadena. We were 18 miles from there, but only six miles from our home-town which was the central area there, and they said, "Why do you want it in Wadena. We want it in Kuroki." It sounded quite reasonable in a sense, but I pointed out that if we wanted to have an exchange in Kuroki it would cost us \$60 a year for each subscriber to maintain the telephone office, and also to provide for the cost of maintenance of line, and so forth.

When we got our exchange to Wadena we paid a little additional cost to get that 18 miles built into Wadena — that's true. But then we got our switching service for \$7 a year. Now we have the lowest service charge of any of the telephone systems around that area, and Wadena is serving now Fishing Lake, Hendon, Kylemore and Kuroki.

The exchange there is also handling the telephone long-distance calls from Wynyard. You see, there is a definite benefit there that this can be built up to handle the long-distance calls from several places, and I think we should be proud of our telephone system here in Saskatchewan. Regina was chosen as the centre for western Canada for distance-dialling service,

October 17, 1961

because this government had equipment set up to make a rapid change, and we can go right into it now without too much extra cost.

That is what we are doing by intelligent centralization, but he wanted it to be central in Melville because he had been elected as their representative. Well, that's all right, but it looks to me like a little bit selfish on his part.

He went on to criticize these highway programs, saying that we were spending too much money on highways, and said that we shouldn't have spent this money east of here; we should have spent the money north of Regina. Well, how often are you going to re-build a highway? Every three or four years? That's not practical. When we build a house we expect the house to last for maybe 40 or 50 years, why build one that is going to last two or three years? Like you want to build your highways — that's the way the Liberals want to build their highways, like a tent, in a little while it's old, then you throw it away. Of course, we are living in sort of a 'throw-away' age now. You buy everything in tins now and then throw them away, but you can't do that with highways.

Mr. McDonald: — A good thing to do with your speech.

Mr. Peterson: — This highway out here has been planned so that 20 years from now it still will not be out of date.

Mr. McDonald: — Whoever planned it should have . . .

Mr. Peterson: — This is the future highway. We won't have to rebuild this highway 20 years from now. It will still be usable. All these others are going to have to be re-built because of the traffic, and we're not wasting our money, as it would appear.

He also made it very, very clear that he was going to oppose the reorganization of municipal boundaries. In the last provincial election, the Liberal party especially made a very, very vigorous attempt in throwing up this 'bogyman' amongst the people of Saskatchewan. Oh, I'll tell you it's really a terrible thing.

I have here the 17 points on the CCF program that were mentioned in that political campaign, and not once in that program does it say anything about reorganization of municipal boundaries. This government has not been committed by the supporters to put that program into effect in this session, or in this term of office, and when the member for Melville said he was going to vigorously oppose this, he will have to be mighty sure that he gets elected in the next election, or he won't have a chance to oppose it.

I won't mention any more about those things that were said about this government, but I would just like to bring up one more point and that is on the amendment. I don't intend to speak on the medical plan because there are others who will want to cover that. I think we should share our debate a little, but when he speaks of the draft of planning for the farm program, it rather bothered me because I am convinced this government is doing more than the ordinary for the farmers, and it has really outdone itself for the farmers.

Mr. McDonald: — Oh, wake up!

Mr. Peterson: — I see my friend over here — we're speaking of nationalities, and I don't know whether we are related or not, but that doesn't matter. We still have one thing in common; we're both hard of hearing.

I would like to say, though, that in this amendment they mentioned that we have not considered the financial or conditions affecting the agricultural economy this year for the rural people. I would like to point out that it is very lacking in intelligent wording. What do they mean? What do you want out of this amendment? Do you just want to say you are not satisfied with the government, or do you really know what you want? I cannot see any rhyme or reason or sense to the thing at all.

Mr. McDonald: — Anything is better than nothing!

Mr. Peterson: — It's true that we did have a crop failure in the province of Saskatchewan this year — that's true. We couldn't make it rain; we couldn't do that, but I wonder how it affected the people of Saskatchewan. I believe that

October 17, 1961

the grain-grower has lost as much as \$2 hundred million because of this drought. There is that much less value in this province because of the drought. I wonder if perhaps that is what they had in mind when they mentioned this amendment, but do they mean now that we are going to cut off grants from the municipalities for schools and hospitals? Are we going to shut down the university, our highway building program, all our public works? Are we going to dispense with the hospital plan and all those things, because we have this drought and then turn around and pay the farmers \$200 million to meet the requirement of this amendment?

The member that just spoke said that we can't afford the medical plan which is costing us \$20 million. Does he expect us to put on a program ten times that much? You see how stupid it is? I cannot see any rhyme or reason for that amendment whatsoever. It is a thing that we just can't do. It is beyond provincial jurisdiction, to provide the assistance that that amendment applies to.

Here are some of the things that have actually been done by the provincial government. We did all we could to implement a practical crop insurance plan, in spite of the fact that the federal government would only contribute 25 per cent of the cost, and 50 per cent of the administration. That left practically 75 per cent of the cost to the farmers themselves actually — that is what it amounted to. Well, you can see how unworkable an insurance plan such as that is. However, it was tried out somewhat and we are going to continue to improve it if possible, but we have to have a little more help from the federal government — we've just got to — we can't do it without.

Then, early in the summer when the drought conditions were apparent the government moved quickly to deal with the problems of assistance to farmers to secure suitable fodder supplies; they did everything possible, and as a result fodder supplies were harvested to the point where actually now we have a surplus of feed in a dry year — that's true. We have more than what we will need. Steps were taken by the Minister of Agriculture, to promote additional livestock sales to the United States, averting a price slump which

could occur from the wholesale marketing of farm livestock. This has maintained and stabilized the price. Right now the price of cattle hasn't dropped out of sight as expected.

Mr. McDonald: — Don't be so ridiculous.

Mr. Peterson: — There has been some slump, that's true, but it hasn't been drastic. A couple of cents a pound isn't much off 20 cents. It isn't too bad. I know when the Liberals were in power the cattle prices were a lot lower than they are now.

Then of course they provided pumping facilities, assisted some of the areas to obtain water for dugouts that were depleted, and thus maintained the herds on those farms. There have been several farms that have been assisted in that way, and as far as I know there is no other government that has gone to that extent to assist the farmers, and they assisted in providing for pastures and so on. I have a list here that I am going to read to you.

I have a letter from the Minister of Agriculture, and I certainly want to congratulate him very, very much on the effort that he did put forth in assisting the farmers. Then of course there was the regular programs outside a dry year. We have the grazing lease, the re-grassing, clearing of lands, community pastures. It is tremendous if you go into it, just to see every possible assistance that is available in helping the farmers to help themselves.

Just to dole out the money, as this amendment suggests, is not actual assistance. I wouldn't call that proper assistance, but to help each other to help themselves is the way we feel it should be done. I am quite convinced there is no government in this Dominion that has done as much for the farmers under similar conditions as the CCF administration.

I am just going to read some of these things, and then I am through. I want to point out this: there were \$1,240,000 which was spent on this emergency program by the plant industry branch for a drought assistance policy. There was assistance to the councils and agricultural committee members for regional meetings to review fodder situations, and making surveys

October 17, 1961

to locate municipal fodder supplies.

There was assistance to moving livestock to pastures; there was assistance to moving hay machinery and equipment and truck freight and railway freight was also given. Assistance to moving fodder for five cents per ton. Then there was assistance for moving feed oats and barley, and assistance for storing in elevators and so on. There was the incentive payments on harvesting cereal crops and so on. Remember, some of these were shared equally by the federal government, that is true, but had we not taken the initiative, it would have been the same thing as would have happened when the snow-covered crops were prevalent here two years ago.

The federal government had promised to help us if we put up 50 per cent of the cost, and it cost us \$3 million. Had we not put up that \$3 million, taking the initiative, Saskatchewan wouldn't have had it; Alberta would not have gone in; neither would Manitoba — all three prairie provinces would have been out. That's what we have done by quick thinking on the part of our provincial executive, and I congratulate them for that.

I will vote for the motion, but will vote against the amendment.

Mr. David Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate those who have taken part thus far in this debate. You will also remember, and members of this House will remember, that at the close of the last session there were a number of members who were not present due to health reasons, and I want to say this today that all members on this side of the House, and I am sure all members on the other side of the House, appreciate very much that the member for Hanley (Hon. Mr. Walker) and the member from Regina (Hon. Mr. Williams) have again regained their health and are with us.

Those that have contributed to this debate — I have been amazed at some of the statements that have been made by some of the members of the government. I was particularly amazed at the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) yesterday, and also . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! If you don't mind, sir, I have had a complaint from the press gallery that they were not able to hear some of the members speaking. If the hon. members wish to have their speeches well recorded by the press I would suggest they speak up a little.

Mr. Boldt: — . . . the statement which was made by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) the other day when the Leader of the Opposition spoke, and if I am right I heard a remark from him thrown across this Assembly here, when he spoke in regard to East and West Germany, that the American dollar was the root of why these people tried to leave the East Germany border. The member for Cumberland said it was the American dollar that instigated these people to come across from the East Germany section into West Germany.

When I sit across from them I can only come to one conclusion, that in case a war should come upon us, and if we were to survive, some of the members on the other side of the House would be the first ones to reach out a hand to Mr. Khrushchev. I am amazed at some of the statements that have been made, and particularly by the member for Cumberland. Would he want to leave the impression that the Russian dollar is not playing a part in Cuba? Is it not playing a part in Poland? If it is just the American dollar, I would like to refer to a statement made by Mr. Freedman, Secretary of Agriculture in the United States, and indicate to him what the American dollar is also doing for the American people, and what the Russian dollar is doing for the Russian people.

The U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freedman, has been making a comparison of the comparative efficiency of the American and Soviet agriculture. This is what he states:

“About six million persons working on farms in the United States produced more food and fibre than 48 million people presently working in Soviet agriculture.”

Some of the members in this House might not be aware that five per cent of Soviet acreage is still under private control Mr. Freedman took note of these garden

October 17, 1961

plots, and pointed out that in 1959 they produced five per cent of the acreage produced; 82 per cent of the Russian eggs; 65 per cent of its potatoes; 50 per cent of its green vegetables; 49 per cent of its milk, and 46 per cent of its meat. I cannot see why the farmers of this province cannot realize that this government eventually has in mind totally socialism.

Today this House is assembled here to discuss medical health — socializing the doctors. It won't be long before they will be socializing the druggists. You can rest assured that this government has in mind that at some future date all farmers will also be socialized. We will not be the only ones that will be left in the open.

There have been numerous head-lines in the last six months across the country and in this province. One in particular that strikes me — about six months ago the federal Minister of Agriculture went the length and breadth of this country, telling the farmers, "Boys, you're raising too much wheat. You'd better plant some trees." I don't know how many took him at his word, but six months later he said, "Boys, uproot those trees; seed every acre into wheat. I'll need it to fulfill my commitments." We farmers sometimes take advice from the Minister of Agriculture, but I don't know whether we should adhere to the two Ministers of Agriculture — the federal and provincial ministers. That is one of the headlines that amazes me.

Now we have a new party created in this country, and soon in this province. The Premier would like to have us believe that all is well with the farmer. I have also been amazed at the number of meetings and conventions that he has attended. He has been in Toronto, Chicago, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Calgary and Niagara Falls, and all I read about is that he has been to labour unions. Has any farm organization invited the Premier of this province to speak to one of their conventions or delegates? Not one.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that statement is not correct. He had better talk about something he knows something about, not something he doesn't know anything about.

Mr. Boldt: — At least I'm not aware of it; it hasn't been reported in the paper. I should be very much surprised if he would be asked to speak to the farm organizations. I am confident that they don't want him over there. The leader of the new party would like to have the country believe that all is well with the farmer, but I can tell you that it isn't.

On July 22nd, the Star-Phoenix reported that 400 Mennonites were leaving the Warman district. They are all farmers, or practically all farmers. If everything was well and rosy with the farmers in Saskatchewan, I cannot see why these people should leave the country. It states here that approximately 86 families of old colony Mennonites from the Warman district will be preparing immediately for emigration in August to the Peace River country.

I am also surprised that the Attorney General has not been visiting this area to find out why these people are leaving the country. Perhaps the majority of the people will come from his constituency. I can assure this House that things are more favourable in B.C. for these people than they are here in Saskatchewan. These people are not leaving because of schools, church; they are leaving because it is too expensive for the farmers to settle their young people back on to the land. The Mennonite heritage is farming; they have made a good job of it.

I was glad to see the attitude that this community will take in Fort St. John, B.C. The influx of the new settler is expected to be a major boost to the economy of the northern wheat and oil towns, and this is amazing, too. The Agricultural Department will assist the settlers with technical information, and will make a land-clearing loan of \$2,000 repayable in 20 years, available to each farmer. Has this provincial government made an attempt to keep these people here?

I also understand these people will be paying from 50 cents to \$5 per acre for virgin land. The Saskatchewan farmer is not given the opportunity that other provinces are making available to them. If I were not a Mennonite I would say a great deal more about this movement, but what I will say — these people

October 17, 1961

have earned a proud reputation in this country as well as in the United States. It is most unfortunate that this government is not aware of it. Had they known the history of the Mennonite settlements in Ontario, southern Manitoba, here in Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia and the United States, I would have hoped that every effort would have been made to keep these people in the province as tillers of the soil. But this government has done practically nothing in the way of assisting the would-be farmer.

I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that this government is out of touch with the farmers of this province. I am quite sure too that this government is out of touch with the labour people. We have very seldom in the past heard of labour unions criticizing the government, but on September 25th, and I am quoting from the 'Star-Phoenix', it states here:

“A lively debate on provincial government unemployment policy sparks CCF meeting here.

A resolution on the matter of unemployment at first worded to openly criticize the provincial government handling of the situation, and amended to softer tones, sparked lively discussions Friday night at the annual Saskatchewan CCF constituency convention held in the Co-op hall.”

I think the resolution is worth noting. It states:

“ . . . which was eventually carried in its amended state by a majority vote of approximately 100 delegates attending and was to be presented to the annual provincial convention in Regina November 1 to 4. It called for government action to alleviate the present unemployment situation, and to prevent an even worse situation arising in the coming winter.

The original preamble to the resolution stated that the matter of unemployment

had been recognized as much more than just a seasonal problem that can be overcome by such adequate programs as winter-works projects.”

After this meeting had taken place, the Minister of Social Welfare appeared a little late and got in on the discussion, too.

“After much discussion from the floor, Sandy Nicholson, M.L.A. for Saskatoon, Minister of Social Welfare and latecomer of the meeting, dealing with each point in turn, reminded the gathering that they should back up their recommendations with suggestions on just how the government was going to raise the money for these projects. He warned them they should be prepared to do this, when called upon.”

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that the government has lost touch with the farmer and with the labourer, and they should not be too sure about themselves when they want to bring in legislation, that they have the support of the majority of the people of Saskatchewan. Many things have taken place since the last election, and I would remind them that when we came to the House last year, I believe the government felt a decided defeat by the people of Saskatchewan, especially the rural areas, when the municipalities practically voted 100 per cent against a change in local government.

1961-62 will be a long, hard year for the majority of farmers in Saskatchewan. Some of these hardships can be traced right down to the Minister of Agriculture. Since early last fall maps were distributed and indicated that the grasshopper infestation would be very severe. Why was there not enough dieldrin to go around? Within a week, and in some places within a few days, dieldrin was not available. Farmers had to wait until the municipalities could bring it from the warehouse. In our area, farmers lost complete fields because of the lack of dieldrin. Who is responsible for this loss? Nobody but the Minister of Agriculture.

October 17, 1961

Then after the grasshoppers came, the drought and the two combined in many areas took the total crop. Finally the minister threw up his hands and told the farmers all that was left to do was to pray. For what? For dieldrin? For rain? Or for cooler weather? Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us believe in prayer; but certainly not as a last resort. I think the minister should have asked for wisdom and guidance from above to cope with the farm situation, and should continue to do so, for it is very evident that this department is not looking after the welfare of the farmer.

There will be many problems facing the farmer before next spring; feed oats and seed oats are now selling at a premium. Next spring it will be next to impossible to buy. Is the government doing something about it? I haven't heard of it. What about the hoppers for next year? Indications are that they will be a lot worse in 1961. Will the government assist the farmer in controlling the hoppers? He will be unable to afford the poison.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . same as John Diefenbaker?

Mr. Boldt: — What is the benefit of the farmer if he controls his hoppers on his field, when thousands of acres of marginal land receive no attention at all? If you just travel through this country there is enough acreage around coming in from Saskatoon to Regina to pollute this whole country with hoppers, and no poison is spread on these areas. Who is responsible for these marginal lands? I am hoping that the government will see fit to pay for the dieldrin that will have to be applied by the farmers next season.

Can you imagine farmers spending \$18 or \$19 for a pail of dieldrin when he hasn't got the money nor the credit? When the hopper situation and the drought came . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? Will the hon. member tell the House how much an acre it costs the farmer for dieldrin?

Mr. Boldt: — That is a question that would have to be answered by each individual farmer, because . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, I will answer that for you because you don't know and you don't want anybody to know.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Some farmers have sprayed their fields three or four times and it is not only a matter of buying the dieldrin. A lot of farmers haven't even got a sprayer. If they have to hire a sprayer, it would cost them up to \$2 an acre.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I was addressing my question to the hon. member, not to the rest.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered his question correctly, because we have had that experience in our area. I am a farmer, and perhaps maybe a better farmer than he is. I know what I am talking about, but I doubt very much whether he does.

When the drought and the hoppers came and they prevailed, the minister said, "Farmers, get out in the fields and cut down your green fields for fodder." I still think the farmers will keep this in mind that it is not too wise to listen to the advice of the Minister of Agriculture. I have farmers in my area who thought this was good advice, and they went into their fields and cut down their best green fields for feed. But then they looked over the other fields, after they had cut the first field and they decided they would let it stand. You know, these poorer fields yielded up to 17 and 18 bushels an acre. There was a terrific loss by some farmers in the area.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn some of my remarks to the Minister of Social Welfare. I am sorry that he is not in his seat today. We on this side of the House criticized his department and committee

October 17, 1961

most severely last spring. All he had to say was that if you find a case where social aid is abused, it is the duty of the individual to report the family. I certainly do not agree with him on this at all. You know, when we went to school and tattled on some of the school children, sometimes we were severely, punished for doing so. I think the same case should be made out of this. We on this side of the House say that social aid has become a big scandal in the province, and it is up to the minister and his department to correct it. In other words, when a robbery is made we report it to the police. We don't go and find the culprit.

I have in my hand here a copy of U.S. News and World Report. The contents of it, "The Growing Scandal in Relief in the United States". I think it would be most proper for the minister to read the contents on page 84, and I can assure the minister that the same conditions exist right here in Saskatchewan. Some of you will remember that Senator Goldwater criticized very strongly the New York State Department of Social Aid administration. The reaction by the public was very favourable to his recommendations and it is also reported by U.S. News and World Report that, due to his stand on social aid benefits, he is today the runner-up for the Republican nomination.

I want to repeat again as I said last spring that in most instances, social aid is absolutely necessary and a good job is being done by the officials, but there is a bug somewhere where social benefits are being dished out wholesale by the government of this province, and we on this side of the House want the minister to do a clean-up job in his department. We are not satisfied with the stand he has taken in the last session. If he wants information, he can get it through following the newspapers, social welfare officials, last summer the census takes and the councils.

The taxpayers are fed up with reading newspaper articles such as "Man Fined for Impaired Driving". "Out of Work for Four Years". How was he able to own a car? This appeared in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix. I hope the Minister took note of it.

It would also appear to me that the employment offices are falling far short of doing a good job. As far as the services rendered by them to the farmer they could chuck these offices out the window, and the same holds true to many business firms, by-passing this agency for their requirements. Unemployment insurance and social aid today are the biggest scandal in the province, and something will have to be done in the immediate future, or it will wreck the economy of this province and this country.

The other day I read in ‘The Leader-Post, October 12, 1961 the council at Weyburn discusses aid abuses, and I quote:

“Weyburn’s Department of Social Welfare tries to make it as rough as possible for aid recipients who frequent the beer parlours, and it was disclosed here Tuesday night at the regular weekly meeting of the city council.”

It goes on to say that one alderman

“ . . . wondered if some social aid people could not be put to work for the aid they are receiving, and Mr. Findlay explained that this was not possible; that the people put to work would have to be paid for their services.”

I think the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) yesterday pointed out the feeling of the people in his area, and also the feeling of the people in my area, that if you pay them \$200 a month, they certainly could do some services for it, and that’s what we on this side of the House want.

Premier Douglas: — We agree. We told St. Laurent that.

Mr. Boldt: — Yes, you pass it on to the federal government. Mr. Speaker, the people of this province would be very disappointed if this session had no mention of local government. It is very interesting to note the policy of the government with regard to local government. A few speakers have spoke on it briefly. I would like to go into it in a

October 17, 1961

little more detail, to explain to you what the policy is. Last winter, at the Urban Municipal Association convention banquet held in Regina, I heard the Premier of this province say (and I speak from memory and stand to be corrected) that the report “of the Local Government Continuing Committee is now in the hands of the government. I suggest to you to read it over — read it over twice. After a year or two we will get together for consultation. We never intend to push any form of government down your throat.” I agree with that. I heard him say this. I was at the banquet.

Is the government adhering to this principle? Today they are busy setting up boundaries; school administrations will be set up within these boundaries; the health regions too will be set up along these boundaries, taking in five or six county boundaries. Local municipal government will be within these boundaries. It has been claimed that two-thirds of the R.M.'s will be affected by these changes. The remaining municipalities affected by the change of boundaries could have chunks of other municipalities added on to them without their approval. This change of boundary and school administration will be done without a vote. Is this change of boundaries, cutting up municipalities, taking away from some; adding on to others, is this not a change in local government? Some municipalities will have up to six townships added to them, and some will be cut to two-thirds of the original size, without a vote being taken.

Oh yes, we will be given an opportunity to vote on the modified or full county but only after confusion and chaos have been created. Does the altering of the school unit boundaries mean that this is the government's first step in preparing the way for the county system? I am sure this is what they have in mind. Why go to all the expense in creating school boundaries and local municipal boundaries, when it is reasonable to believe that all plebiscites will go against the larger municipal units?

I have been asked here in Regina by some of the municipal men that they have heard there is great interest in the county in the Rosthern area. I would have hoped that the vote by the municipalities in the Rosthern area which was overwhelmingly against the county system, would have been a good indication that they want nothing of it. But these socialists don't understand a no vote.

A few weeks after the close of the last session, the President of the CCF party in the Rosthern constituency called a meeting of the R.M.'s in the constituency of Rosthern, on reorganizations, at which the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs was present. There again they received no for an answer. I don't know whether the government has made a deal with the President of the CCF organization in the Rosthern constituency or not, but it appears to me that he knows more about government policy than we on this side of the House.

A few days after this particular meeting, he wrote a letter to the editor of the Rosthern Valley News, and I am glad to see that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is in his seat. I would like to read from this letter, and I would like to challenge the Minister as to whether there has been an under-the-table deal made with the proposed county 51. This gentleman runs around the constituency and tells them, "Well, you should form county 51 and put it up as a pilot system. This government is going to pump all the money into this area; we'll have our roads, bridges and schools built as a pilot system; certainly the government wouldn't let us down. They would have to do this, so that the other areas would see this thing is good." So here he writes this, and this happened almost immediately after the close of the last session. He wrote this letter after the meeting with the R.M.'s — just before seeding. It says this:

"If it were merely that we were simply thinking of pooling the resources of the municipalities concerned in reorganization, I would be opposed to it. However, I believe that such matters as the share of gasoline tax and income tax and education tax were to prove to the credit of the reorganization of municipalities, perhaps even poor Warman R.M. would be contributing its share."

This is what amazed me. He said this:

"The school set-up has now been reorganized in most of the centres of population and it would be a simple

October 17, 1961

matter to carry this step one further to the county, or modified county, with little loss of economy while tapping a better source of revenue in the above mentioned taxes.”

Have we heard this in the House? This is the President of the CCF organization in the Rosthern constituency. Has the government — have we any legislation, or heard from the government members that the municipalities would be given some share of the gas tax, income tax and education tax? The President of the CCF in Rosthern seems to know all about it.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Would the hon. member permit a question. My question is, is that signed by this gentleman as President of the CCF, or reeve of the Warman municipality?

Mr. Boldt: — It was signed by neither of the two. It was signed by Mr. G.G. Guenther.

So, Mr. Speaker, we in Rosthern are concerned about these boundary set-ups. The schools in most of the centres have consolidated. The Department of Education went into this area and told the people that if you consolidate, the larger unit cannot touch you. So five or six communities have consolidated — Duck Lake, Rosthern, Hague, Osler, Dalmeny — and with the setting up of these new boundaries, with the Department of Education take in these four remaining school superintendency into the school unit system or not? That is what is on our minds today.

If they would change the Act so that no vote would be taken in the area, what would happen to the consolidated areas? Will they also have to be taken in? I cannot imagine the superintendency of Rosthern becoming a unit and leaving out these large centres. Those are the questions that are on our minds today, and I think they should be answered in this House, because meetings were held on the 11th and 12th in this area, setting up the final boundaries. The people are very concerned as to what will happen to this school administration, and what will happen to local government. The vote, in the end — after all this has been set up — a larger unit perhaps set in

with the Rosthern area — what good is a vote on the modified or full county after 50 per cent of what the people voted against has been put in without a vote?

Mr. Speaker, I want to support the amendment, but I will not support the motion.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate today, I first wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder. I see I need only speak three or four words and I drive four or five of them out of the Chamber. I would like to say to the mover that she did a very excellent job of moving the Address-in-Reply, in her usual high level manner. I can assure you if I can reach 50 per cent of the high level of the debate that she started off with, I will be doing very well here today, because there aren't many of the speakers who have followed her that have led off on as high a plain in the debate as she did.

I must also congratulate the seconder, the member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). He dealt with the Throne Speech debate and particularly, the tax-sharing agreement. He did an excellent job; he went into the history of the tax-sharing agreement and gave a summary of the tax-sharing agreement, and how it affected the provinces over the past quarter of a century, as to what we had before we actually had a tax-sharing agreement; how in 1937 the Rowell-Sirois Commission pointed out that we were living in a society of the jungle as far as taxes were concerned, and that something should be done about it. He also pointed out how several years later the green book agreement proposal came down, and what took place from that time up until the present.

I have been a little disappointed, in listening to the speakers opposite, on the discussions which have taken place on the tax-sharing agreement, but I will have a little more to say on that a bit later. I wish just to congratulate the seconder for the good job he did.

October 17, 1961

I should like at this time, too, Mr. Speaker, to extend my congratulations to the Premier for the excellent job he has done these past 17 years during his term of office as Premier of this province.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — It has been a pleasure for me to work with him for 16 out of these 17 past years. I have always found the Premier to be a man of honesty and integrity. It is true that some people may not have agreed with what he has said at times, or what he has done, but at least you cannot challenge his honesty and his integrity. He has never been two-faced, double-dealing or dealing under-the-table. He has always been above board.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — I am sure when he goes back into the federal arena again as the leader of the New Democratic Party, that he will do a sincere, honest job for Canada as a whole, the same as he has done for Saskatchewan during the past 17 years.

To the Premier I say, I wish you well and may you have the best of luck in response.

Now, comments have been made about the Ottawa convention. I was at the Ottawa convention, and contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition said, my expenses were not paid by labour delegates. They were not paid by organized labour . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — I didn't say they were.

Mr. Dewhurst: — You didn't say my particular expenses were, you said all the delegates' expenses were paid by labour organizations.

Mr. Thatcher: — I said union delegates had their expenses paid. I didn't suggest you were a trade union delegate.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Dewhurst: — The Ottawa convention was a huge success. It was one of the greatest conventions this nation of ours has ever seen at any time. It was the greatest of all conventions; over 1800 registered delegates there, delegates from Vancouver Island to Newfoundland. Every province was represented there by delegates. There were delegations, it is true, from labour organizations and from the CCF, and New Party clubs, and other interested people. It was a huge success, and the sincerity and the integrity that ran through that convention was something, Mr. Speaker, which one would have to be there to feel, in order to believe.

When they talk about it being dominated by the labour organizations, that statement is not true. They only wish it was. If they could only find that it was dominated by labour, how they would wring their hands in glee, because they know it isn't true and they're trying to make the people believe that it is. But there were a lot of people at that convention. It was covered by TV, the press and radio, and those reporters that were there by and large did a very good job reporting the convention.

Mr. Thatcher: — The union paid for most of the TV, too.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Dewhurst: — So all that some of our friends in the Opposition can do now, will not change the report that came direct from the floor of the convention, because the people who were at that convention realize what the score was.

When it comes to delegate bodies, the largest individual delegate body that was there, were from the CCF. The next largest group of delegates represented labour. But there were a number of farmers there. One delegate rose one day, and he said it would be interesting to know how many farmers were at this convention, and would the farmers please stand up. The farmers stood up and there were over 400 or 500 people at the convention that were farmers.

Mr. Thatcher: — Not according to the official report.

October 17, 1961

Mr. Dewhurst: — When the farm resolution came before that convention, the evening before, with the farmers meeting in the salon in the Chateau Laurier to draw up what they thought would be a resolution on behalf of agriculture, we engaged the largest salon there was in the Chateau Laurier, and it wasn't half large enough to hold the farmers that were present. We had to get an adjoining salon, and then we filled the corridors and the aisle besides that.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers were well represented there. "One wonders how big that crowd would have been had the trade unions not paid the expenses down there for the delegates." That is what Mr. Thatcher said.

Mr. Thatcher: — For their delegates.

Mr. Dewhurst: — For 'the' delegates. You can quibble and squirm all you like, but it doesn't help.

Mr. Thatcher: — For 'their' delegates, I said.

Mr. Dewhurst: — The Leader of the Opposition starts off by asking what the government was doing about a pulp mill in this province. Mr. Speaker, after following his actions for the past year and a half or so, one can only assume that he is only interested in a pulp mill or a petro-chemical so that he can try and tear it apart as he tried to do with the steel mill for the past year or so. He is not interested in industry in this province. He is just interested to try and find a whipping boy to try and mislead the people, to make the people think that industry is scarce. If anybody was a friend of industry, which he pretends to be, he would not go on the hustings and in this Legislature and other places, and attack industry as he does.

First it was the cement plant which was shipped by some of the Liberal members. How cement could never be made in this province; industry wouldn't come in; the cement wouldn't work; why it wasn't possible to have cement made here. But the cement plant went ahead in spite of them, and became a success.

Mr. Thatcher: — After it was sold to private enterprise, it did.

Mr. Dewhurst: — The cement plant always belonged to private enterprise. I don't know why the Leader of the Opposition doesn't wake up and read a little bit. He doesn't know the difference between private enterprise and government enterprise.

Mr. McDonald: — It's the most expensive cement on the North American continent, right here.

Mr. Dewhurst: — You may think so, but it's cheaper than the one we had before.

Mr. McDonald: — Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Dewhurst: — No, sit down. You can make your speech.

Mr. McDonald: — You're scared of the question.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — I will challenge you to accept it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McDonald: — You're scared of it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should take his chair.

Mr. McDonald: — You're scared of it, too.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can challenge it if he likes, but he is not prepared to take his seat yet.

They attacked the cement plant and did all they could to prevent the cement plant from coming into this province. Then they turned to criticize the steel mill for the past year or so, and the Leader of the Opposition is still trying to prove that the steel mill is an enterprise . . .

October 17, 1961

Mr. Thatcher: — I'm trying to get some facts on it, that's all. Why it's losing \$200 a month, even today.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! These interjections are altogether disorderly, and if the hon. members have something to say, they may do so when they have the opportunity to take the floor.

Mr. McDonald: — That applies to both sides of the House.

Mr. Dewhurst: — He mentioned that the new party was giving no support to the farmers. Well, the facts just bear this out — it is true that this CCF organization has joined the new party. When he talks about the opposition representing the farmer, he should count the number of seats in this legislature which is considerably urban — we have 37 on this side to 18 on that side. Some of those include smaller cities on this side, as they do on that side. We have only nine members on this side who are strictly urban members; the rest are rural as well as urban members. So we are not worried about the support from the farmers, because the farmers realize that the CCF have been, and still are, the farmers' friend.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — What a friend!

Mr. Dewhurst: — The Leader of the Opposition talks about how the labour — how it has hurt the farmers. He has mentioned when labour gets a decent price, how the farmer has to pay the bill.

Mr. Thatcher: — I have never said anything like that at all.

Mr. Dewhurst: — And the labour organization, getting increased pay for their service, it means that the farmer's prices must go up and up for what they have to buy. That could be correct under our capitalistic system which they support.

Mr. Thatcher: — When did I say that?

Mr. Dewhurst: — The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the price of labour, while it bears some proportion to what the farmer pays for his services, it doesn't bear the major portion of what he pays. Back in the 1930's when you could get a hired man or a hired girl for \$5 a month, and the government would pay the \$5 — if you could keep them all winter they would give you an extra \$5, if you did keep them — when labour was that cheap, if cheap labour was the answer to the agricultural problem, then the farmer should have been well off in the 1930's, because we all know that labour didn't get the money. Labour didn't get it, nor did the farmer get it.

I would like my friends to do a little soul-searching, and find out what happened to our economy for the 1930's. Had they done the things that a people's government should have done back in the 1930's, both provincial and federal; had they been really interested in the people as they pretend they are, there would have been no need for the people themselves, the farmers, the labourers and other classes to organize the farmer-labour party back in the 1930's, leading into the CCF today, and now today we have the New Democratic Party.

Those are the reasons — because they have failed to do the things they should have done — that the people themselves have had to take action.

The Leader of the Opposition challenged the Premier and the government to resign because we had no mandate on this side of the House to govern on behalf of labour or the New Democratic Party, and therefore he should resign. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, if he had set an example in previous actions, he would have had room to talk, but his example when he crossed the floor in the House of Commons was to flaunt the wishes and will of the people who support him. He was no longer supporting the people who put him in Ottawa, for three times he stayed there with the people of Moose Jaw-Lake Centre, long enough that he qualified for the federal pensions, so if he lost out afterwards, he still qualified. As soon as he got elected the third time, across the floor he went. After looking around, and doing a little bit of hunting around he joined the Liberal party, and that is where he is today.

October 17, 1961

After the Ottawa convention, the Star-Phoenix was talking about our convention, and they mentioned this convention promised jobs for all. They said how ridiculous it was. I want to quote a few words from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, August 5, 1961:

“How far Mr. Douglas is prepared to go in pursuit of the Canadian prime ministership is seen in his party’s promises for jobs for all Canadians. This promise, of course, cannot be achieved, and is a base toying with the hopes of thousands now jobless, and others who will never work again in their life-time.”

Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, that is the attitude of one of the Liberal presses, that hundreds now out of a job will never work again in their life-time. That is the kind of security and prosperity and future they have to hold out for the labourers.

What have the Liberals been talking about — what are they doing about the farmer? They bring in a little pamphlet here which says, “Join with Farmer John”. Who is Farmer John? Well, farmer John was born on a farm in the Yorkton constituency. Farmer John farms today with three of his sons in the Kamsack district. Farmer John was a councillor of Cote R.M. for 12 years. Farmer John was Reeve of Cote R.M. for eight years. Farmer John is chairman of Kamsack Union Hospital Board. Farmer John is chairman of the Yorkton-Melville Health Region. Farmer John is a director of the Anti-T.B. League of Saskatchewan. Farmer John is, and has been Mayor of Kamsack for the past five years. Farmer John can devote all his time to winning the election. Farmer John has won over a dozen elections, and yet, Mr. Speaker, when Farmer John put his name before the Liberal nominating convention in Yorkton, the Liberals turned down Farmer John.

Mr. Thatcher: — They took Farmer . . .

Mr. Gallagher: — They took three farmers!

Mr. Dewhurst: — So it remains to be seen that they are now the farmers' friend. You talk about three farmers. We know who the three farmers were, and we know who took the nomination.

The member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) in his great oration (if one could be so bold as to call it that), says that the Bill was placed on our desk by the Minister of Public Health, when no agreement at all had been reached with those who supply the services, was the greatest hoax that was ever brought into the House. Well, if that is correct I wonder what kind of a hoax it was when they brought down the free cancer legislation? What kind of a hoax it was when they brought down that health bill which he so glibly talked about? They brought down lots of legislation, but never made any provisions to do anything about it, and didn't intend to. What kind of a hoax was it when they promised health insurance 42 years ago? Those are the things, Mr. Speaker, which one cannot help but look twice at what they are doing.

The member for Melville also said the farmers should go back and read some of the old statements which were tabled in this legislature, and then they would know a lot more about past governments. I agree with him, and there is one here I would recommend to him and some of his colleagues that he read, and that is the Bryant report of 1930. If they would read that report they would find out some of the things about the previous governments and previous legislators. That, I think, would make good reading for him so I will recommend it.

The member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) (I'm sorry he isn't in his seat) but I think he summed up his own speech very well, with the one word when he sounded much like the neighbor's billy-goat when he hollered out 'baa'. I think that summed up his own speech pretty well.

The member for Saltcoats a year and a half ago was reputed to be a brave, worthy successor according to the man who had sat in that seat before (Mr. Loptson). I remember the former member for Saltcoats saying that he had a very worthy successor picked out for Saltcoats. A man who would be very worthy. Well, I wonder, Mr. Speaker. The member for Saltcoats was

October 17, 1961

once a CCF supporter, it is rumoured. That could be. He may have been a supporter at one time, but we are not pining over his loss at this time. But the former member for Saltcoats said he had a very worthy successor, and then the present member came in with a chip on his shoulder — he seems to be pretty sore about something.

We all know that the records of our legislature show that the former member for Saltcoats made a lot of money in years gone by, by selling hay to the government in drought years. I wonder if the present member — could it be that he is peeved because he didn't have that opportunity today?

Opposition Member: — Pretty small!

Mr. Snedker: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I resent the complaints by the hon. member against my predecessor.

Mr. Speaker: — I think in good parliamentary procedure I do believe that the argument should be of policies in the past, and I think as much as possible we should endeavour not to be too personal.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, he says he resents the criticism of his predecessor, yet the records of this House speak for themselves. The former member for Saltcoats, and he never denied it, made a lot of money out of selling hay to previous governments of this province, and I repeat the statement — the records of the House verify it.

Mr. Snedker: — Where is Mr. Fines? Where is the hay today?

Mr. Danielson: — That is a false statement and you know it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Does the hon. member care to make a correction. If so, you may do so with the consent of the member speaking. Otherwise . . .

Mr. Danielson: — I want to point out that he is telling a story that is not fact, and he knows it is not a fact.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Dewhurst: — The hon. member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) in his speech this morning said that everyone gets only what they pay for. Well, I guess he should know. According to Maclean's magazine, the hierarchy of the Liberal party paid \$50,000 to get their present man for leader, and he should know — they get what they pay for. I wonder if that sale of \$50,000 was justified.

The member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman), while speaking the other day mentioned that we should have a parity price for the first thousand bushels of grain sold from each farm. Well, we on this side of the House do not object to that. We have always said that the farmers should have a parity price, not only for the first thousand bushels, but for all his grain. Why should he only have a parity for the initial unit of his production? The records of the House bear it out, Mr. Speaker, that we have always stood for parity.

On April 9, 1957, a resolution was moved in this Legislature by the member for Gravelbourg, seconded by the member for Pelly, asking that \$2.10 per bushel for wheat be paid for the first one thousand bushels of wheat that went for human consumption in Canada. The member for Rosthern, (Mr. Elias), moved, seconded by Mr. Weber, an amendment asking for a parity price on all the wheat that was consumed in Canada. We agreed with that. The former member for Bengough (Mr. Allan Brown) and myself later on brought in a sub-amendment, asking that the balance of the grain be sold through whatever channels were available, through the Agricultural Prices Support Act, and guarantee to farmers a price that would bear a close relationship to farmers' costs. On the recorded vote, Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 10th, every member of the opposition, including the three Social Crediters, voted against parity price for farmers — not only for the sub-amendment which Mr. Brown and myself had suggested, but for any part of it — they voted against the resolution in its entirety.

I wonder why it is when they have a chance to vote to ask for parity prices, they turn it down and now they come back giving lip-service to the farmers again.

October 17, 1961

Some of the things this government has done for the farmers since they took office back in 1944 was — one of the first things was the cancellation of the seed grain debt. Seed grain and relief debt which dated as far back as 1917, and which amounted to millions of dollars. They took millions of dollars of debt from the shoulders of the farmer and the municipalities of this province.

Another thing was the equalization grants to the R.M.'s. The R.M.'s were given equalization grants to help the have-not municipalities. Our grid road policy was also a policy which helped the farmers of this province, and has saved the farmers of this province tremendous sums of money, in order to provide transportation in the municipalities.

As has been mentioned earlier, we have removed the public revenue tax — a tax that was placed on the farmers of this province along with other property owners, back in 1917 and had remained there until this government removed it. Rural electrification is another thing that we did for the farmers of this province. The farmers of this province are enjoying the better standards of living, due to the policy followed by this government — especially with respect to rural electrification.

Today, with the natural gas being available to our larger cities and intervening points, many of the farmers are going into these towns, and buying oil-burners in good condition at a very reasonable price, and installing them in their farm-homes. Mr. Speaker, it would not be possible for a farmer to use an oil-burner if it wasn't that he has the electrification, because you must have the power to operate the electrical controls of an oil-burner. So the farmer has made good use of his investment of the \$500 in rural electrification. They have not only lights in their house; they are able to use it in the out-buildings, the barns, their hen-houses and are also able to install more modern fixtures in their house.

The family farm improvement plan which is going on today is another reason why they had to have power before they were able to have sewer and water in their farm homes. The first thing had to be done first, and this government proceeded in that manner.

Higher grants for education which, as one of my colleagues said here the other day, has greatly relieved the burden of the farmer in this province.

Also, another thing which relieved the burden of the farmers is when the agreement was made with the municipalities on social aid, that the province, in co-operation with the federal government, we now assume over 90 per cent of the responsibility for social aid. In cases where there are no municipal residence, or municipal qualifications — then the municipality is relieved of that case altogether.

The crop under the snow which happened a couple of years ago, the amount of money that was paid out by this government to farmers with crops under the snow was very much appreciated by the farmers of this province. The opposition can talk as they like, but the farmers realize what kind of a deal they would have had if they happened not to have had this government — they realize they would have been far worse off.

The ag rep service, the veterinary districts, they have all helped the farmers of this province. Another thing whereby we helped the farmers, which the opposition, who were present at that time and everyone voted against, was the Farm Security Act. They didn't want the government of this province to give security to the farmer on his farm home.

Mr. McDonald: — You didn't give him anything.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Now, the tax-sharing agreement, which I touched on earlier, is a thing which vitally affects each and every one of the members of this legislature. For anyone to get up in this House, or anywhere else and try by innuendo, or this House, or anywhere else and try by innuendo, or other means, to try and say it is the fault of this provincial government, or any other provincial government, for asking Ottawa for a fair and just deal over a tax-sharing arrangement — that is the reason why the present Ottawa government, to my way of thinking, sabotaging the tax-sharing agreement — for those people to make those statements; they know it is not correct. They know the people of Saskatchewan or Quebec or Newfoundland or New Brunswick or any other province, are still citizens of Canada. We have a right to expect consideration from the government of

October 17, 1961

Canada. The government at Ottawa is not elected by Canada as a whole; to be just the government of one or two provinces.

When the Premier of Saskatchewan, along with the Premiers of other provinces met with the federal government to discuss this tax-sharing agreement, it is pure hypocrisy for any member of this legislature to get up and say that it was the Premier's statement that sabotaged that conference, because the Premier of Quebec, the Premier of Newfoundland and the Premier of New Brunswick were just as voluble in their request, asking that proper care and treatment be given to their provinces. These were joint arrangement agreements — these various tax fields, and when they were turned over to the federal government, all the provinces had the right to expect that they should get in return, a fair share back. It should be a two-way deal; not a one-way deal.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons why this session was called was for the medical care bill, proposals for which are before us. I think this is a bill which is long overdue and a bill which we have on this side of the House been interested in for many years but once again the first things had to be done first. It was no use bringing in a medical care bill back in 1944-45 in the early years of the life of this government, before you had set up the proper number of hospital beds, and other facilities to take care of patients when they went to hospitals. These things have been done and now we feel it is time to take another step forward, and bring in a medical care program. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, we are doing things far faster than the opposition, who promised a medical care program 42 years ago, and they are still in the stage of considering it. They still don't know whether they should go ahead with it, or whether we should have a plebiscite.

Some of the things that we have done in the past to pave the groundwork for a medical care program, we started off in 1944 with free cancer treatment. We made sufficient arrangements whereby cancer treatment could be free. This has saved many hundreds of thousands of dollars for the people of this province. We have made mental treatment free in this province. We also have given health care for the aged; that is the blue card for our old-age citizens, and we gave also the blue card to mothers on mothers' allowances

and their dependents. We brought in a hospitalization program to take care of the hospital part of the sickness of the people of this province. Also for our senior citizens we erected the homes for senior citizens, these geriatric homes, and gave assistance to our senior citizens throughout this province through these housing projects.

So we have been doing some of the things which should be done to relieve the burden and suffering of the people and put them in a position where they can at least look after themselves. We have helped those less fortunate than ourselves. That is the proposal behind the medical care program, that society as a whole should help those in most unfortunate circumstances, by each and every one of us working together — that is the only way we will make it possible that anyone, regardless of where they live, should have the right and access to proper medical care and treatment. Sure, it is true that the doctors may not turn anyone down, but I know personally a lot of people who need special care and attention by specialists.

They may have at the present time a municipal doctor set-up; the local municipality paying for their medical attention within the municipality, but does not pay when they leave the confines of that municipality. They are not in a position to be able to spend money on specialist care. Some of them know that if they do, they have to take the food off the table or the clothes off the backs of their children in order to pay for the medical care which they need. So a medical care program will be a great assistance to the citizens of this province.

There has been a lot of discussion as to whether there should be a utilization fee charged, or whether there should not be. The people of my part of the province who I have raised this point with, feel that at this time they would not be opposed to a utilization fee. They realize that a lot of people are in need of medical service and medical attention, but they also realize that there could be a lot of abuse, a lot of unnecessary calling on doctors and they feel if the plan charged them one or two dollars, or whatever the case may be, for the utilization fee, that it would at least from the start, help to control an over-utilization of doctor services and facilities on trivial things which are not necessary.

October 17, 1961

After two or three years of time they feel that if it shows no abuse, it could be possible, as time goes on, that they could reduce utilization fees, or abandon them altogether.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, these are the fields which I assume from perusing the Bill that will be worked out by the commission in conjunction with all concerned.

I agreed with the lady member for Regina when she said the doctors should have several choices of offering their services, whether it is a fee-for-service, salary or partial salary and partial fee-for-service. I think that a wide range of proposals should be given to the medical profession of this province, and I am not in the least worried that the medical profession will leave the province, boycott eh province or refuse to support the people of this province in this plan.

This plan as proposed does not regiment the medical profession. All it does is guarantee to them that, regardless of a person's financial ability, they should have medical care and their bills will be paid.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot more I would like to say on this at this time, but I think I have spoken long enough, and what I have to say can be left for a later day.

I think I shall end my remarks by saying that I am wholeheartedly behind the proposals of this government on this medical care program. The people of my constituency who have discussed it with me over the past few months, endorse these proposals as something that should be done, and I think that we should march together, blaze new trails. I feel quite confident that within a few years the rest of the people of Canada will demand from the other provincial governments that something be done as they did with hospitalization.

To sit back and say we should not do it at this time, well, the time will never come unless we are prepared to go ahead and give leadership. I say the time has come now; that this is a step which should be taken.

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

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate, I would like to take the opportunity of complimenting all those who have participated, especially the members on this side, because I believe that they have certainly given some valuable contributions in the debate.

In view of the fact that the time is fast running out, Mr. Speaker, I have just received word a moment ago that the brick plant in Estevan has closed down, and all the staff have been given their notice to that effect. Now, everybody knows that if the government had been using the bricks to build the Power building, or other buildings, it would certainly have been possible to have kept the plant going for at least another year. Just last year, Mr. Speaker, a \$185,000 office building was built for the plant. Why? Is that a typical example of the present government's planning? Attention should be brought to the Premier and others, to a particular debate that was held in Mossbank some years ago. Another one up, another one down. I don't know how many more will be coming down before it is all over.

Premier Douglas: — That is a long way from down.

Mr. Coderre: — They are really going down fast. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if it would be possible to call it 12:30, with the consent of the House.

Premier Douglas: — If the hon. member prefers to call it 12:30 — it would help our appetite if he proceeded with his speech, but if he prefers to call it 12:30, that is all right.

Mr. Coderre: — I wish to call it 12:30.

The Assembly recessed at 12:20 o'clock p.m.

October 17, 1961

The Assembly resumed at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, when I left before lunch, I didn't want to go much further as I was fearful it might disturb some of the hon. ministers and I didn't want to disturb their lunches.

I noticed when I brought in this bit of news that the reaction from some of the ministers was somewhat of a joke. I don't think they even expected it.

I believe at this point, Mr. Speaker, that we should just review briefly what happened to this particular corporation. In 1945 the government of Saskatchewan decided to purchase the brick plant in Estevan. The asking price for it was in the neighbourhood of \$30,000. I haven't got the exact figures, but fairly close to that. Of course the government, you know, really concerned with the purse strings of the province, made an offer to the people concerned, and offered them roughly \$150,000 — five times the amount of the actual value of the property. One of the significant things to note at that particular time was that the offer was on a take it or leave it basis. You take it or else we are going to take it over under The Expropriations Act that they had at that time. One of the conditions, of course, was that \$50,000 of this amount should be used to invest into Saskatchewan development loans, funds, bonds, or something to that effect.

Let us review the operations of it. According to reports tabled in the legislature in 1958 under the summary of results of operations of the crown corporations, 1945-48, we note that we have an accumulated deficit at that date of \$40,493.00. Now, to that probably could be added the deficits of 1949 and 1950. You will note that in that year, Mr. Speaker, there was an amount of what they call an adjustment of \$120,000 and this was more or less to cover more accumulated deficits that they have had, so it brought it down to show the figure of \$40,400.00 rather than probably \$160,000.

Now any business operations, Mr. Speaker, have to pay interest on the money that they borrow. As far back as 1945, when they went into the business they had borrowed from the government, advances to the end of that period, according to their summary,

of \$239,000 and from time to time, year in and year out throughout the record of the corporation, the government had poured more money into it, which, when it came to 1960, we found that we had an accumulated deficit of . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Six hundred thousand — I'll give you the figure.

Mr. Coderre: — Well, \$600,000 . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Accumulated surplus of \$71,000.

Mr. Coderre: — We find that we had advanced to the corporation about \$600,000. Now, as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that any amount of money which is borrowed, somebody has to pay the interest. In all their reports there is no provision for the interest paid on the money borrowed, so that if we take into consideration the true assessment of the corporation that was operating, we would find that there had been an accumulated interest which it should have paid, on the basis of \$600,000, which at one time was as high as \$901,000 advanced, that the accumulated interest on the advances would amount to roughly \$376,000. The fact that it has been operating at a deficit you could actually compound that amount. But we will be lenient in assessing the whole figure. Now, if we take into consideration the actual value of the property, based on their advances, there is another \$600,000 that will appear as a loss somewhere. I think, taking these figures, it is quite obvious that the total loss of this corporation from its inception until now will be in the neighbourhood of \$1,136,000.

Oh, they can have some giggles, they can manipulate figures to have different meaning, but the facts are there right in their own little yellow peril. One of the most significant things that come to mind, Mr. Speaker, is that they knew they were in difficulties. They knew they were having some trouble but they figured they should build themselves a little monument over there, so sometime last year they decided to build an office building which was valued at \$165,000. They opened it in May this year, Mr. Speaker. A new office building for a plant that was really flourishing.

October 17, 1961

Now, if my figures are wrong . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making such misstatements over there, I wonder if he would like to know the truth. That wasn't an office the \$165,000 was for. The office was built the year before that.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Is the hon. member willing to accept a correction at this time?

Mr. Coderre: — I don't need to take his correction. The figures that we have available . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I know you don't . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Otherwise the opportunity will be given at the close of the speech for any corrections of this kind.

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House for approximately five or six years now, and for the five years that we have tried to receive information regarding the Crown Corporations, we have often been told that it was not of public interest. The closest figure we have is \$165,000 for the office and warehouse which they built for that plant.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I am the minister in charge of that corporation, and he was never given that information that the office was \$165,000.

Mr. Coderre: — I said, Mr. Speaker, that the only information available that I have, the last report that we have, is one that was tabled in this House, and there was nothing mentioned in it at that time. The only information which we have available — the closest information, for office building and warehouse is roughly \$165,000. However, Mr. Speaker, if the minister wants to correct me after he can do so sometime this afternoon.

It is noted at this particular point that the ministers have been conspicuous by their absence on the floor of the House by not getting up to say anything. If they have something, why don't they get up and speak like the rest of us? The Minister of

Agriculture is one of them, and many others, Mr. Speaker.

The only thing that was noted was that the official opening took place in May, and they had quite a fanfare about it. They invited the aldermen of the city, almost all of them. There is one of them that I sometimes wonder who he might be. The local MLA, whenever there is any public function such as that, usually should be invited, but of course the government wouldn't give him that opportunity. Another socialist promise was broken, anyhow.

Again, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the prediction that was made at a certain debate in Mossbank. You know the Premier's Waterloo; you know another one up and another one down. We find today, Mr. Speaker, that the only corporations which we have left standing are the public utilities, most of which had been established by a previous Liberal administration.

Some people, Mr. Speaker, regard private enterprise as the predatory tiger to be shot. Others look at it as a cow that they can milk. I believe that not enough people look at it as a horse who is pulling a sturdy wagon. You know this statement was made by Sir Winston Churchill, a greater leader of the world in times of need. It is too back the members opposite don't pay more attention to that. Just the opposite view was taken by the Premier of this province in 1948, when he addressed the Regina people's forum on January 10th. This is what he says:

"Our capitalistic system is through. The time has come to move into new waters, to build ourselves a new society.

I am just wondering who he wanted to build a new society for. Part of this is true, as our Premier is now moving into new waters, probably because of the serene and calm waters of Saskatchewan have been fermented to a nice little boil, he wants to move out before his goose is cooked too much.

His leadership, Mr. Speaker, may have brought some very good legislation, but he overall picture of the future for the province is bleak, particularly

October 17, 1961

for the people within this province. An example of it is, on several occasions when we have had conferences for the federal-provincial tax rental agreements. The Premier on several occasions went down there and had nothing but criticism for the plan. It was a plan that was established on equalization where the have provinces would pass some of it on to the have-not provinces. But the constant criticism that has been levied at the administrations of the day and even today, has probably been instrumental to the Tories to scuttle this tax rental agreement.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan will feel nothing but serious repercussions from the event, especially we in Saskatchewan. It is indeed sad to have to deal with such a situation at present, especially when the economic growth of this province actually is regressed. I know that we will probably have an opportunity to deal with these problems a little more thoroughly when the bills are brought in. I am sure we are very fortunate that there is a loop-hole in it, then at least there will be a floor to the minimum amount of money we will be able to receive.

I would like to say a few words on the medical health of this province and its people, Mr. Speaker. All its people who have pioneered and asked government to bring in legislation. We in Saskatchewan led all of America in social legislation, even before the socialists had come to power in this province. Saskatchewan is in a remarkable province. Nowhere is this characteristic shown more clearly than is recorded by the individual organizations — various governments and the medical profession, to develop the best possible care for patients.

We can see this record in our anti-tuberculosis program, on our cancer program, and the tremendous growth in health insurance programs in the province. Today over 70 per cent of the patients coming to doctors offices have some form of coverage. No other area in the North American continent has attained this high level. We are considered and have been considered a model in that respect. Over a period of twelve years the private non-profit medical plans of this province such as Group Medical Services, M.S.I., and many others have grown to an enrolment of a little over a quarter million people.

These plans, Mr. Speaker, provide medical care for about ten cents per day and less than 25 cents per day for a family of four or more people. Now, despite the growth of these voluntary plans, there remains gaps in medical coverage available to certain individuals. I personally am happy to see that these gaps are gradually being closed. These are the groups: First, the people over 65 who expect a good deal more illness as time goes on, particularly these individuals are not a good insurance risk. Also involved are individuals who had serious illness prior to the formation of these plans, and they again are a poor insurance risk, and their rates would have to be high. Finally there is the groups of unfortunates, with our unemployment — insurance for their families would cost around 24 cents a day, but they have taken no insurance, because they are unable to afford it; when they became unemployed they had to drop these contracts.

At this time I would like to make the following observations. It is my personal observation, but I am of the firm opinion that it is the responsibility of the people of Saskatchewan to guarantee medical insurability to every man, woman and child in this province. Certainly every conceivable method to carry out these objectives should be explored by the government. The voting public, Mr. Speaker, should have the opportunity of accepting or rejecting any plan, by plebiscite. This applies to any plans which any government might put forward.

At this time I would like the privilege of presenting to you a plan which I think might be useful. As I said a moment ago, it is the responsibility of the people of Saskatchewan to guarantee the medical insurability of every man. As yet there are gaps in the plan. I suggest the government underwrite the medical insurance people for the people over 65, and people who are uninsurable because of previous chronic illness, and guarantee to the voluntary prepaid plan that they will absorb the losses incurred for accepting these people, these people who would normally pay less than 10 cents a day. This leaves one group of people to be dealt with. This is a group of people who cannot afford to pay part of the present cost of premiums for reason of being indigent or otherwise. The other one is the case of a person having a plan and becoming unemployed. This is of grave concern.

October 17, 1961

I believe that the government should, at the moment that these persons pick up their unemployment cheque, have them come to a government office and make arrangements for continuing to carry the plan until such time as they become employed again. This I believe, is surely reasonable and fair. For a person whose income is so low that he cannot afford to pay any part of the premium, I think that the government should be prepared to pay the amount necessary to make up the difference, on the basis of individual cases. The decision as to who is entitled to receive this assistance should be left in the hands of local government.

Of course this government is trying to scuttle our local governments, but bitter and long experience has shown to all of us that local authorities acting at the municipal level can be more efficient and more economical in handling the affairs of the people than any other senior government. The full application of this plan as I have outlined it, would guarantee individual coverage to all. It would keep control of medical services in non-political hands. It would be clean, which is a very important thing. It would also have the advantage of being extremely economical, compared to the \$20 or \$30 million that it is estimated the plan will cost. A plan such as I have outlined would cost in the neighbourhood of \$4 to \$9 million. Let's give a good average of about \$6 million to come out of the public treasury.

I would like to bring forth some other aspects of the situation. Saskatchewan, as I said, is a remarkable province. It is not because we have the present administration, but the people who make up the province. It is not only for our advances in the medical field, but also for our record in the development of many of our important medical programs. All these programs have always had the constant co-operation of both the medical profession, the people and the government in power. That includes your administration for a change. We have to give you a pat on the back sometimes. The medical profession, having worked closely with Conservative, Liberal and even socialist governments have developed the Anti-Tuberculosis program, which has been a model throughout the world. It was established by a previous Liberal administration. The medical profession has developed a cancer program, which was established when a Liberal administration was in power. Only with the complete co-operation of the medical profession

was it possible for the present CCF administration to have had success with the hospitalization plan. More will have to be said on this when the Bill comes into the House and the costs are brought in.

We of the opposition have gathered from far and near for this special fall session, at which I personally wanted to deal with matters that are of the utmost urgent importance to the people of my constituency and of Saskatchewan as a whole. In 1944 when the CCF were elected in this province, they took it on themselves immediately to have a fall session to deal with the agricultural problems that were presented at that time. We have the problems again today, and Mr. Speaker, your advisers have failed to include that in the motion.

Let's take the question of water. Lack of water in this province today has created a tremendous and serious problem. Surely the Minister of Agriculture has been in this province long enough to realize there are days of drought and years of scarcity of water, and that it is a threat to agriculture generally, and in this particular case to our cattle populations in some respects. Many of our farmers with ten, twenty and thirty head of cattle have had to dispose of the small herds. Some of them have just kept a few on hand. The Minister may get up and deny that, because they have plenty of feed and water in that part of the country. Don't do like Uncle John when he came out west and just stayed in the good areas. Go all over the province and see what happens everywhere. Others with larger herds have probably reduced their herds considerably.

We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that the agricultural economy of the province has been stabilized by the cattle in the country. I would have supposed that the government would have realized that and taken positive steps to safeguard this stabilization of our agricultural economy. There has been no substantial government provisions for assistance in this matter, either in 1961 or 1959. Surely, when they were elected in 1944 after the disastrous thirties, they must have realized that the economy of this province is oftentimes controlled and governed by the disastrous, re-occurring droughts we have.

October 17, 1961

Some more positive steps could have been taken. Here we are now, Mr. Speaker, in the grips of a very serious drought. Almost all our dugouts are dry. Feed is at a minimum and is probably only sufficient to carry us through a short winter. Insofar as rain is concerned, perhaps the minister and the cabinet have different thoughts. They probably wish to use the methods which were used by the original settlers of this province many years ago, our Indian population. Probably the minister and his tribe wanted to get into a little Indian rain dance to try and get us some rain, in sufficient quantities to assure us of something better next spring. I can see the minister standing on the hill, looking westward, looking at the dark clouds rolling by.

On the local scene that is immediately in the locality of my home town, I note that the sodium sulphate plant is also in difficulties. They are dredging the Chaplin creek to have some water over there, but they can drain the lake from Old Wives' Lake. Surely the Minister of Agriculture could probably control that to some degree. I understand he is the minister in charge of water rights. I believe that the first right to water should be for human consumption, and then for our agricultural people. This lake is quickly being lowered, and the additional drain on the lake with the tremendous drought we have had this year is creating a tremendous concern for the people surrounding the lake. I am somewhat surprised to see the member for Bengough had not taken a stand on that, because the southern part of that lake is within his constituency.

I am sure the farmers in that area are concerned about the lowering of the lake. Let's get the water in those parts. Let's try and get some water in those dugouts from the reserves that you have. Talk is quite cheap, you know — you are the people who could do this or that. Governments, Mr. Speaker, are elected to guide and assist the people when they need help. Today the farmers of Saskatchewan need help and they are not getting it from the government. Talk is cheap.

During the spring of 1961 and even during the fall of 1960, all officers of the Department of Agriculture were giving advance warnings about the disastrous dangers of grasshoppers and cutworms and

what have you. The minister got up in 1961 and he said, 'We have prepared a substantial supply of dieldrin and insecticides to control this'. Only the government knew to what extent it could be developed. They should have planned and been prepared to cope with all these situations which have arisen. Socialist planning has failed again.

During the spring operations, many of our farmers were starting to spray for hoppers, starting to spray for worms, so at once the chemicals dwindled out and there weren't any left. Normal spraying operations require about one ounce per acre, or below that. I am just using that for a rough figure. Cutworms require four to six ounces of spray for a good kill. Fluids in these quantities were just not available anywhere. Farmers were looking at their crops, and sometimes travelled from one hundred to two hundred miles to try and get some of this poison and very often to no avail. They would come back home with insufficient quantities. In utter despair and desperation, some of these farmers, with the little that they had — probably with insufficient guidance from the government — used what they had with the result that they had a very poor kill, or no kill at all.

I have been on several farms during that particular time of season, Mr. Speaker, and talked to many farmers who said, "Well, we'll use what we've got." Twenty-four, forty-eight, seventy-two hours later the land was black, completely eaten by worms, resulting in the loss of the crop, the loss of good time, gas and money, and no feed. Probably in some of those cases they might have been able to go to work and cut some of it for feed.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, we could pick up the newspaper today and look at headings like that: "Hay Bank Opens", "Three Hundred Tons Bought" — and so on and so forth. What has happened to our hay banks? Since 1956 we've constantly asked the government what has happened to the hay banks. The irony of it is, Mr. Speaker — what I cannot understand is why they established these hay banks then and they didn't do it in times of plenty. They didn't establish hay banks in 1958 and 1959. I'll read this one, Mr. Speaker. The headline, (Weyburn):

October 17, 1961

“Over one hundred farm trucks of all average size converged on Halbrite Monday and loaded and dispatched some much-needed supplies of hay, provincial hay, . . .”

Now, the hay was ten years old. This appeared in ‘The Leader-Post’ October 28th, 1959:

“The hay was ten years old and had been stored in excellent condition. Farmers really appreciated the opportunity to supplement their meagre supply. The bank was opened by the government due to large demands for, and caused by the widespread damage to feed and fodder supplies by the recent heavy rains and unseasonal snow.”

We haven’t got rain, Mr. Speaker. We haven’t got snow. We’ve got drought. Where are our banks? What has happened to them? Has the government been picking at them? You may laugh, Mr. Minister. Many of our farmers in this province would like to see these same types of headlines with a 1961 dateline instead of 1959.

Mr. Thatcher: — Socialist planning!

Mr. Coderre: — You’ve been talking about rotating feed banks and everything else, but what have you done? What have you done to see that a feed bank was established in the province?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You wouldn’t accept them.

Mr. Coderre: — We’ won’t accept it. The farmers are probably accepting them but they can’t find them. What concerns me greatly, Mr. Speaker, is that with no appreciable rainfall, it is now so darn dry that I doubt like the devil if there is going to be any growth whatever in the spring thaw, if we have any snow.

You know the Minister of Agriculture comes from an area that is called ‘the land of plenty’ this year. They have been blessed somehow and they have a lot of feed and they have had a lot of rain, but somehow or other the minister seems to have forgotten to look

beyond the horizon. I've got some; everybody should have some. He has trusted that his party had divided the spoils of everyone. He figured he had it so everybody else had it. His colleagues have not helped him either. After all, what can we expect? They were more concerned with the founding convention at Ottawa and other types of conventions all over the country. They weren't concerned with the plight of the farmer. They've been shelved. The farmers of this province have been shelved by this administration that has professed to be the friend of the farmer.

We all know that with a depressed agricultural economy, the whole economy suffers. Our wage-earners suffer; there is unemployment. The situation is bad enough at the moment without permitting the conditions to worsen, particularly through government neglect. Sometimes I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture is going to get up, particularly here, Mr. Speaker, and tell us what he has in mind after the demands have been put in by the opposition.

Mr. Thatcher: — No program.

Mr. Coderre: — Members of the government haven't asked them for one thing for agriculture, and everybody else knows that we are in a dire position and we need some assistance from somewhere. Positive action must be taken not negative action, and we will see what he has to say. He will probably let all the backbenchers speak, and he won't say anything.

Then we come to other problems — political patronage. I wish the minister in charge of the corporations would be around and listen to something sometimes. Political patronage is being practised now by the Power Corporation. Well, it's more glaring to the public. There are many examples of this all across the province. If you happen to be a good friend of the government, if you happen to live on a farm, we find that sometimes you can get the power in your yard for about \$180 or \$280, or in that vicinity. If you are not a good friend, you'll have to pay the full farm price of \$560. I know of several cases like that, Mr. Speaker. I don't expect him to give his reasons. I suspect that there is nothing else but political motives in these moves. Who is making them I don't know. We say 'humanity first' — political connections first.

October 17, 1961

Other instances come to my attention. This is one the Minister of Social Welfare should probably take heed of. Last fall the district operators of particular parts of the country came into a farm-yard while the man of the house was away, and disconnected the transformer and took it away, leaving the mother and five children without power. Now, there is probably a case of neglect in that particular circumstance. The husband in this particular instance and probably not been assuming his responsibility as head of the family, and as a father. He had failed to pay his light bill when he had the money, failed to pay his grocery bill and finally they lost their power. They may have been justified in doing so, but sometimes a little bit of humanity could go along way in that respect.

I've had customers come into my shop, Mr. Speaker, where I've had something on the books for quite a while, but when I find that something may be of tremendous need and necessity for the well-being, I will soften up. But, in this particular case the political affiliation was not too good. The man used to bend the elbow occasionally and used to make quite a bit of noise around the country. He didn't like what the socialists stood for. So they came around and took the power away. What concerns me most, Mr. Speaker, is that they came there on a cold, bleak day in November and cut off their power — lights, radio. The mother and children being punished for the actions of another. Some of the members opposite will say, "Why didn't they go to the Department of Social Welfare — why didn't they get social aid?"

According to the investigations of the department there was sufficient revenue from the farm; they didn't need any social aid. What had been was wasted away by the head of the family. Sure, he didn't assume his responsibilities, but where was our welfare department in this case, who so glibly announce from time to time, 'the humanity first government' — penalizing a mother and her children for those actions. You should be ashamed of yourselves.

I should like to briefly discuss the power building in downtown Regina. The question that I ask immediately is, how much is the building going to cost? The first figures mentioned for this building, Mr. Speaker, were around the \$4 million mark. The

amount was revised because more detailed plans called for thirteen stories instead of the original twelve. Some of the reasons (probably a penthouse for the minister) — I don't know — some of the reasons given were that in a very short while the building would be overcrowded, as soon as it was completed.

I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that the real reason was for some socialist self-glorification. They wanted to have a socialist first. Statements have been made on a couple of occasions that they would be the first to build the highest building in Saskatchewan. That was the reason — a socialist first. In making that decision, statements were made that they doubted there was another building in Canada that was as beautiful or as functional. It is a shame though, that the future generation is not here to see the wonderful things that you are doing with their money.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — Now, with regard to the financing of it. At the time it was indicated that the building could have been financed under two different methods. The first is that the Power Corporation could raise the money and erect the building themselves, or that a private company could build it and lease it as an agreed price, with an arrangement that would give the ownership to the corporation at some future date.

This latter method was discarded, possibly because the people who would have had the money to build it, didn't want to take a change on the socialists — they might move out a couple of years later and say, "We want to have our own building". I don't know. But I think the private people probably wouldn't build a building with all the frills and little fancy do-dads, you know — mosaics from Japan, and that sort of thing, or possibly because of what had appeared in the Regina Manifesto several years ago. I quote here from the Manifesto:

"The CCF proposes that in future no public financing shall be permitted which facilitates the perpetuation of parasitic interest receiving plans.

October 17, 1961

“That capital shall be provided through the medium of national investment board and free from perpetual interest charges.”

Where are you getting the money? From your shyster friends across the line?

Mr. Thatcher: — Coupon clippers.

Mr. Coderre: — I am rather disturbed from the continuous borrowings of the Power Corporation from their shyster friends. It is somewhat contrary to their Regina Manifesto. This government has borrowed so much money, Mr. Speaker, that I doubt if the next generation or the next one will ever be free from this so-called perpetual interest charges. It has been mentioned before in this House time and again, of the overwhelming debt and of the interest that we have to pay. These accumulated drawings — the interest on all these is greater than the total expenditure of the previous administration, for any particular year. However, let's see what the costs really are.

According to the Leader-Post of March 16, 1961, in a release given by the minister himself, the cost of the land was going to be \$425,000. Then it came to the part for excavation — a pile foundation and a fence which amounted to \$193,000 plus possibly other unannounced expenditures. Then to another report from the Leader-Post, August 24th, 1961:

“A general contract for construction to Commonwealth construction company of Calgary was for \$6,022,000.”

Now this brings a total amount known and unknown to very nearly the \$7 million mark.

Mr. Thatcher: — Still no furniture, either, Russ.

Mr. Coderre: — Now when they started to build it — and another thing, what about the furnishings? This will cost another million and a half dollars, and that has been said on several occasions. We were told during the spring session of 1961, Mr. Speaker, that the total cost of the building, including furniture, would be near the \$6 million. I venture to

to say that before this building is ready for occupancy, the total cost will be much closer to the \$10 million, as was previously estimated.

In 1960 when the first indication was given that a power building was to be built, the cost was estimated to be \$4 million, with another million and a half for furnishings. This would bring the cost of the building to around \$5½ or \$6 million. Now, the actual contracts to date indicate it is almost \$7 million, Mr. Speaker. There has been an increase of approximately \$1½ million a year. At this rate of \$1½ million a year increase, before the occupancy takes place in 1963, and if they are held up slightly, 1964, the costs will be in excess of \$10 million, because they are constantly going up in price. They have never been able to estimate the cost of anything.

I might suggest, Mr. Minister, that you had better speed up the program so that we can be sure of getting it for below \$10 million rather than in excess of it.

Mr. Thatcher: — The interest will make it 50 per cent greater.

Mr. Coderre: — When you take the interest charges into consideration, it will be much higher. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation building that is being built will not earn its annual costs because if you have estimated the earning on that basis, and if you've estimated the cost of building it, you'll be so far below that you will be running in the hole with that building. Your heat, light, depreciation, etc., plus your interest charges which will put an additional cost of roughly \$5 million.

Because of this building, Mr. Speaker, towns and villages in this province are deprived of necessary commodities. If business rather than political considerations were to be the factors in deciding when towns and villages were to receive natural gas, I am sure they would have a good gas pay load and it would increase the revenues to the corporation. It would increase it substantially, and then they could probably go ahead with their white elephants.

October 17, 1961

Such towns, Mr. Speaker, and I speak on behalf of my constituency — such towns as Gravelbourg, Vanguard, Lafleche, that have excellent gas pay loads, are being left out of the distribution system, from what I suspect is purely and only political considerations. Candidates have been going around, after they have been defeated, saying, “Oh, they’ll never get it as long as they have that man there.” I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if there were to be a provincial election this fall or next spring, we would have gas for the winter. Towns such as Gravelbourg, with its institutions, hospitals, senior citizens’ homes, colleges, certainly need gas. The saving in the cost of heating alone would be tremendous. This would also assist in lowering the costs to the consumer, which is what we are concerned with. Gas is within actually twelve miles of Gravelbourg.

Because of these few reasons outlined; lack of government attention in the problems that are facing us, and flagrant use of political patronage in many things, I believe it is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I will support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I was rather amazed to hear the news given to us by the hon. member for Gravelbourg, that the brick plant at Estevan had been closed down. It probably wasn’t all loss, because it seemed to give the hon. members on the other side of the House a great deal of pleasure. I have watched them for many days, this session and previously, and I never saw them look happier than when the member announced that the brick plant was closed down. This is nothing new. Any trouble that occurs in regard to any crown corporation is greeted with the greatest of glee by the hon. members opposite. I have often claimed that the Liberal party is not interested in Saskatchewan first, but only interested in the Liberal party. They haven’t changed a bit in all the years that I have known them. Then he had a long story about the history of the brick plant, most of which was completely wrong. It was only years after the brick plant was purchased that some of the hon. members, with their imaginations working overtime, came up with the story that it could have been bought for \$25,000 or \$30,000. It is easy for people who have those kind of imaginations,

to dream up something like that after the time.

Then he went on to talk about an office building, and said it was \$165,000. I tried to correct him, but the evidence is quite clear that the hon. member is not interested in the facts, but only in some kind of a story which he can tell to the people of this House and get publicity through the province. The \$165,000 to which he was referring, I think must refer to the extension of the kiln, the extension of the plant, and the putting in of some new drying equipment and other new equipment in the plant, which took place last winter, the cost of which was in that neighbourhood. The office building that he was talking about at that time was actually built more than a year before, and speaking from memory, the cost of the office building was in the neighbourhood of \$30,000 or \$40,000. If he had wanted to know what the cost of the building was, he could have got the information.

I am awfully sorry to have to make my hon. friends opposite feel sad again, when they are in such a happy mood over this plant closing down, because I have to tell them that it is not closed. It is operating today and will be operating tomorrow and the next day, and on into the future. I don't know, but it may be necessary to have a shut-down period, and the people working in the plant at Estevan, so as not to take them by surprise, have been informed that there is a possibility that there may be a shut-down. But the plant is not closing. If it shuts down it will be because there is a good inventory of bricks on hand and that it is not necessary to keep the brick plant going to supply the market. But notice has not been given to the employees of any lay-off and the plant is still operating.

Hon. member: — You certainly have. You phone Estevan.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I have been talking to the plant superintendent, Mr. Speaker, and I happen to know . . .

An Hon. Member: — You get your information from the . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I don't know where he gets his information, but he certainly got it wrong this time.

October 17, 1961

Premier Douglas: — Try the Liberal executive — maybe they know more about it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The trouble with the Liberal executive as the Premier suggests, as a source of information, is that they give you information according to their wishes and their hopes, rather than the facts.

The hon. member also said that practically the only corporations which are still standing are public utilities, and they were practically all started by the Liberal government. Would the hon. member stop speaking a little too soon. I didn't get these papers sorted out, but I'll be able to get them for him, and there are eleven of them still operating besides Saskatchewan Government Telephones and Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Now, to my knowledge the very late and very much unlamented Liberal government didn't start any of these other corporations. Included in them is Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. As a matter of fact, the Liberal party did everything they could to stop the setting up of that corporation, and the Saskatchewan Guaranty and Fidelity Company, the sodium sulphate plant, which certainly cannot be classed as a public utility. It is a business corporation together with clay products.

Saskatchewan Fish Marketing, and Saskatchewan Government Trading finished their job and were taken over by successful co-operatives in the north. Saskatchewan Timber Board, Saskatchewan Government Airways, and Saskatchewan Fur Marketing are still successfully operating. But the Liberal party cannot claim credit for starting any of these corporations. The ones that they did start, particularly the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, the Power Commission as it was called in those days, while the Liberals were operating it, had an accumulated deficit. It was not serving any farm people of any consequence at all. It had not gone to very many of the smaller towns and villages in the province of Saskatchewan. It was neither giving service nor was it making money to pay its way either. That is the history of their efforts in crown corporations.

The hon. member also, in talking about the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, mentioned that some farms were able to get power for \$180; others had to pay \$500 or more, or the regular price. He says: 'I know of several cases over the province'. After the kind of fairy tales which the hon. member tells, unless he can produce some further evidence than his word, we will have to take this as a fairy tale, too. Unless he can produce the cases which exist, and I would suggest that in all the stuff that he presents to us, that he present a little supporting evidence at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, all of the speeches which I have listened to during this session have demonstrated a pretty complete lack of responsibility on the part of the members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — That is your opinion.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — This is the opinion, too, of a great many people in the province of Saskatchewan, and has been their opinion for over 17 years. All you need to do is look at the record of what government has been elected in this province, to support that statement. That isn't the kind of . . .

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . a dream that was presented to us by the member for Gravelbourg. This is one that is supported by some historical facts.

Mr. Speaker, there was a good deal said about government expenditure and size of expenditure by some of the members opposite — I believe the Leader of the Opposition had something to say about it. I would point out that this is something that is taking place all over the country, not just in Saskatchewan, but all over Canada. There has been a great increase in government revenues and government expenditures. I don't know whether my hon. friends are opposed to this or not, but the fact of the matter is that over a period of time, people have found that there are more and more services which they can get through governments, and pay for them in their taxes, which either they cannot get in any other way, or they cannot get so effectively

October 17, 1961

in any other way.

When we take the whole picture in Canada, going back over a long term of history, pretty near back to Confederation, we find that the per capita expenditure of all governments in Canada, in 1874 was \$8.40 per capita. By 1926 this had grown to \$92.50 per capita, and by 1960 it had grown to \$589 per capita. This is the total expenditure of all governments, federal, provincial and local governments in Canada. This increase has been an increase of 70 times what was spent in 1874. Now this has not been because governments over the years have deliberately thrown money away. There may be in any government some waste, as there is in any private business too, but this trend has been established because there has been a constant demand from the people of the country for governments to give better services. It is because of that demand that we have such things in Saskatchewan as our provincial hospitalization plan. Our party saw that demand; saw that it was correct, and we put it into effect. It is for this same reason that we are going to see in Saskatchewan and all across Canada in the not too distant future, the implementation of medical care programs.

The question which I would like to have answered is, do my hon. friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, believe in this trend, believe it has been a good thing for governments to give additional services as they have been requested, or would they like to go back to the situation we were in in 1874?

A good deal has been said in this debate about the conditions in Saskatchewan — about the drought conditions which we have and which we certainly all regret. We also have, of course, a recession or a depression — whatever you like to call it, particularly in relation to the farmer — or you may want to call it, Mr. Speaker, the farm cost-price squeeze. This is not new. We had this when there was a Liberal government in Ottawa, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition no doubt lambasted the Liberal government in Ottawa in the past for this very situation.

Farmers have never had a fair and equitable share of national income. The closest they came to it was in that period of about 1943 to 1952. Even then the farmers did not get their fair share of the national income. If the farmers had been

receiving their fair share of the national income they would be in a much better position today, to stand a year's crop failure, than they are at the present time. If they were getting their fair share of the national income they would also have the ability to pay taxes comparable to other groups of people in Canada, so that their local governments could give them comparable service.

The prime question is not a question of taxes, because the local government taxes, I believe, are spent by local governments pretty efficiently and pretty effectively, and that the farmer probably gets a lot better value for the dollar he pays in local taxes than for the dollar he puts in to farm machinery. There has not been nearly the inflation in taxes that there has been in farm machinery. But when our economy determines that there must be a group of people who are underpaid for the work they do there is bound to be trouble in regard to those people, in their community, being able to supply themselves with the local services. When we have this drought, this depression or recession, whatever you like to call it, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that most Saskatchewan people are glad that they have not got a Liberal government on top of all their other problems.

Many of them are old enough to remember the situation when they had this before, and my hon. friends don't want to jump to any conclusions that they are going to have a Liberal government in Saskatchewan very soon.

Mr. McDonald: — Call an election!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You know, Mr. Speaker, old books are great things. I have here the Journals and Speeches of the Saskatchewan Legislature for the Session of 1938, and the hon. Mr. Davis, who was then Attorney General in Saskatchewan, said in 1938, that is a long time ago — isn't it . . .

Some Hon. Members: — I thought you were still a Tory then!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Davis said: "So far as the CCF party in Canada is concerned, it is all washed up — a thing of the past."

October 17, 1961

Mr. McDonald: — It is today.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, now of course my hon. friends are saying the same thing today as the hon. Tommy Davis said, speaking right from one of these seats in 1938, twenty-three years ago. So just don't jump to conclusions that there is going to be a change in that respect.

Coming back again for a minute to this question of taxes, I would like to point out that before this government took office there was almost negligible help for municipalities and for local governments here in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — You know better than that, Brock.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I know that about the only time you could get a grant in a municipality was the year that an election was going to be held, and I can open up the records and show you that that is a fact. That in 1938 a whole group of municipalities got grants that year — sure, some of them were pretty small; some of them were only \$100. In 1939 when there was no election, no grants. Now in 1939 the province of Saskatchewan was better off than it was in 1938, just after the 1937 crop year.

Mr. McDonald: — How many didn't get any this year?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is the way it was handled. There were quite a lot of them who didn't get any grant at all. But there were numbers of them who got grants from \$100 to \$500, and this was supposed to fix things up for the election.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, taking the expenditure for the year we took office, and comparing it to the expenditure now in regard to help for rural municipalities, they are getting over twenty times as much as they were getting back in 1944. The member for Cannington doesn't like that story, but that is a fact. That is what has actually happened, and in education, grants for education are over ten times as much.

The Leader of the Opposition was speaking the other day and he said, “Why, the government has even got these land assessors out, increasing the assessments on land and subsequently raising the taxes.’ Doesn’t he understand what the land assessment is?”

Mr. Thatcher: — I do, and so do the farmers.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That it is the base for taxation, and that if there is going to be equity it must be kept up to date. I want to tell him of one case. I know of a quarter-section went up from \$1400 to \$2200. The taxes on that quarter-section were up between 65 and 70 per cent in that year. But when the land was last assessed, many years ago, there was 25 acres broken on this quarter-section. Now there are 140. Shouldn’t it be re-assessed? Shouldn’t those men be out there reassessing that land, or should they be letting that land owner get away with very low taxes. I don’t know whether they think he should get away with that or not, or should equity be introduced.

When I tell them that was my quarter-section of land I am sure that they will agree that the assessment should have been raised. As a matter of fact, I was getting away with murder on taxes until the last two or three years, with 140 acres broken and the assessment \$1,400. But my colleague here didn’t get his men around to assessing it until just last year, and now they have caught up with me. When the Leader of the Opposition uses that kind of stuff, to try and muddle the thing up and completely mislead the people, he is stooping to a pretty low level on this question.

Mr. Thatcher: — It was some of your friends in your riding that told me that. Some of your friends in your riding.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Sure, the people in the local improvement district, that is where this quarter-section of land I have been talking about is, — it has been re-assessed. Mine has come up,

October 17, 1961

and other people who ten years ago, when it was assessed had 15 or 20 acres broken on a quarter section, now they have 100. Shouldn't it be reassessed?

Mr. Thatcher: — That isn't always the case.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is always the case. From year to year they get around and re-assess and bring these assessments up to date. There has been a good deal of talk here in this House about the Saskatchewan Power Corporation office building. And there has been a good deal of talk out in the country about it. My hon. friends go out in the country and say, 'Oh, about \$7 million or \$8 million'. Of course, the cost is going to be about \$6½ million, but they say \$7 million or \$8 million, and the president of the Liberal Association at Prince Albert — I heard him say over the air, \$13 million. He believes in really giving good measure.

Mr. Thatcher: — He was counting all the interest you are going to pay before you are finished.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Thirteen million dollars was going to be the cost of the building. I have no idea what he was counting. I have no idea what my friends over there count. I don't know how they count to arrive at the answers which they get. The purpose of course, of talking about this head office building of the Power corporation is to try to impress on a man with a section of land, or a business man in a little town, what a tremendous amount of money to pay for a head office. It is awful. The hon. member for Moosomin, I think, says . . .

Some Hon. Member: — Propaganda!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — This corporation has 260,000 customers scattered all over the province. It has 66,000 miles of pole lines. I'll bet you my hon. friends never tell the people in Saskatchewan some of those facts that indicate the size of the corporation. The fact is that if for one year you put one-third cents per kilowatt hour on all the electricity sold by the Power Corporation, and five

cents per thousand cubic feet on all the natural gas sold by the corporation in one year — that would pay for the building.

Mr. McDonald: — Is that the way you are going to do it?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is not the way it is going to be done, but over a twenty-year period, if you put 1/60th of a cent per kilowatt hour on the electric bill and ¼ of one cent on a thousand feet of gas, you would pay for it in twenty years. But there will be no increase in either the price of electricity or gas on account of this building. I am only using these figures to illustrate that, though this is a big building and will be a fine building of which my hon. friends opposite can be proud . . .

Mr. McDonald: — We'll open it!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They can be proud — we'll have you there at the opening. Now, look at this in another way. This head office building is going to cost about 1/7th of one year's average business of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, taking that average over the next five years of business — 1/7th of a year's business. This is not an undue amount for any business or any enterprise to pay for a head office.

Of course, my hon. friends would like the staff of the Power Corporation to continue to be scattered around in sixteen buildings in the city of Regina and paying rent of \$300 or \$400 thousand a year.

Mention has been made of the resources of Saskatchewan, and Saskatchewan has been described by members opposite, in this debate, as a treasure house of resources. I agree. This is a wonderful, beautiful world, and Saskatchewan is a fine part of it. We have been blessed with lots of good resources and farmland, of course is one of the most important of all, but this whole resource of farmland has been under the great disadvantage of producing goods at less than the actual cost of production, and that is what we are doing with this resource. That, of course, is recognized by all members — that this relation, in regard to farm products and farm prices, and the exports in the world markets is a federal question. We've had that with us for a long time. We have great water

October 17, 1961

resources in the country, and though the Prairie Farm Assistance Act has done quite a bit in regard to conservation of water resources, a Liberal government in this province never did anything in regard to conservation of water resources. Never anything until a CCF government was elected — well, they didn't have enough in the agricultural budget, Mr. Speaker. Three hundred thousand dollars to \$500,000 or \$600,000 was all they had in that budget . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . with all the money you've got today.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Minister of Agriculture has been carrying on a great many water conservation projects; assistance to dugouts and dams . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — That is with federal assistance.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and water control, irrigation and drainage projects to the extent of many millions of dollars over these past years. Now there is being carried on a survey of ground water sources, and ground water supplies. Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friends in the Liberal party are so sure that these are good things, the people were here in Saskatchewan when they were in office; the water was in the ground — why didn't they do something about it? They didn't believe in doing things like that. They didn't believe in doing any work to find out the basic information in regard to our resources. I can hear the hon. member for Cannington shaking his head . . .

Mr. McDonald: — We'll never hear yours, Brock!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, you'll never hear mine. Probably because I don't shake it.

When we turn to our forests, the same thing is true. I said the former government never went after any basic information with regard to our resources, and if there was one place where they knew nothing about it, and where it was relatively easy to find out, it is forest resources. We got in and we began to take . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — They were producing four times as much lumber when they left office as you are today. Four times as much.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We began to take a forest inventory . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . and sent out all the sawmills . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . of what was left, and the forest inventory exposed the fact that our spruce saw timber was becoming very scarce, and we either had to carry on at the rate established by the former government and have it all disappear in a few years, or cut it down to a sustained yield basis. We gradually cut it down to a sustained yield basis.

There is a big story to tell if my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition wants to hear it, about forest resources. The Liberal governments in Canada, when they controlled these resources, sold huge tracts from Prince Albert to Big River at a matter of a cent or two an acre, of the forests that belonged to the people of Saskatchewan. Down in the Hudson Bay area the same thing was done. This is all on the record, but they don't want to know these facts.

Mr. Thatcher: — Today they sit . . .

Mr. Danielson: — What did you get when you sold the land?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Give the hon. member an opportunity to make his speech.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Trees not only rotted in those days, but there was the poorest kind of equipment in regard to fire prevention and control, which has been improved, and even in a very bad year like this, the losses of forests though they were great, were certainly far from what we might have expected them to be. I know many areas in Saskatchewan where timber was logged, good timberland, but poor farmland and nothing was done to maintain it as a timber area, following the cutting of

October 17, 1961

the timber the fires did the rest of the job. And my hon. friends opposite and the Liberal party generally are the last people that ever should have a word to say in regard to the conservation and management of our renewable resources.

Little was ever done about improving and making use of our recreational resources in Saskatchewan, at our lakes and resorts across the south and also opening up the north to make them accessible.

Then I come to the question of minerals, and in this certainly nothing was done of any consequence by the provincial government in the way of getting basic information — basic mineral or geological maps of the province. We have been having survey parties out, getting aerial surveys done and we are now gathering information which is produced, incidentally, by the companies in their work of exploration in this land.

Saskatchewan occupies fourth place in Canada with regard to the total value of mineral resources produced. Only Ontario, Quebec and Alberta are ahead of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan has held that position for a number of years. We had no oil wells in 1944 in production, but the oil was here, Mr. Speaker. The good Lord didn't put it here after 1944. Now we have almost five thousand wells capable of producing oil or gas and every year since we began oil production in the province of Saskatchewan, there has been an increase in that production. There aren't many areas where you can say that.

The revenue from oil and gas to the province in ten years has been \$106 million. That isn't peanuts either. The hon. member from Notukeu-Willowbunch said, "Who developed it?" Who did he want to develop it?" I thought he would be happy to know that the oil companies were here developing. I am frustrated, Mr. Speaker. I just can't make my hon. friends happy. I tell them we have oil companies here to develop the land and that we have got \$106 million revenue in 10 years, and he grumbles about it.

Mr. Thatcher: — American dollars!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I think they are ungrateful.

Mr. Thatcher: — Coupon clippers from the States.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The total revenue from minerals in the province of Saskatchewan to the government in seventeen years was \$152 million. You can look back into the records and again I say all these minerals were here, but the revenues were mighty small. Three or four hundred thousand dollars a year at the most, before that time. Roads in the north, in the mineral country — we never got any assistance for these roads from a Liberal government at Ottawa, with two exceptions. One where they had to have a road to the Eldorado mine — we assisted them, and the other case, over at Black Lake, where they did put in a few thousand dollars. We have and we have, to give credit to the present government at Ottawa that they did adopt this roads to resources program, which has enabled Saskatchewan to make some progress in the north.

Saskatchewan, of course, has great reserves in potash, and two potash mines are in the process of getting into production — one already produced, but on account of difficulties with the Blairmore formation had to be shut down for a time. This potash industry is going to be one of the really big industries in Saskatchewan, and I think it will be by far the biggest mining industry which we will have, in the course of years, and maybe one of the fairly large mining industries in all Canada. This is something to which we can look forward with a good deal of satisfaction.

Our sodium sulphate, mineral salts are also a very valuable industry, and in one particular case is bringing a very good revenue to the province of Saskatchewan. I will deal more with that when we come to our session of the legislature in the winter, and have the reports for the year-end.

I want to thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition for quoting my speech of March 2nd, 1944, where I said that under the Liberal system there was no prospect but a continuing burden of debt on the people of Saskatchewan. I said that a CCF government can liquidate that debt. That we have done. The net debt (I wish my hon. friend would listen closely), the net debt is down from approximately \$170 million to, I believe at or less than \$20 million at the present time — pretty near wiped out.

October 17, 1961

Mr. Thatcher: — The interest charges . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The interest on the net debt has also gone down from 16 per cent of the total budget of the province of Saskatchewan, which the year before we took over was paid in interest on the net debt by the treasury department. Now one per cent of our budget pays the interest on our net debt.

Mr. Thatcher: — Socialistic arithmetic!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. Leader of the Opposition, of course, always quotes the gross debt and he is perfectly free to quote the gross debt if he wants to. But I wish he would tell the whole story, because it is just as much a falsehood, you know, to tell a part of the truth, very often as it is to tell something that is absolutely wrong. He quotes the gross debt as about \$500 million, and it is in that neighbourhood. That is right. But what has it been incurred for? The great part of it had been incurred for the development of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones, the two crown corporations for which he had sympathy.

In fact, there is no reason why he should not like these corporations because they were established by a Liberal government and they have been supported by the CCF government. So when he was a Liberal he was with it, and when he was a CCF'er he was with this idea, too. So he should like these corporations. But I don't know whether he does nor not because he grumbles so much about this gross debt.

Mr. Thatcher: — But as a former Tory you should have more sense than to read a balance sheet the way you're doing it. I know your socialist training wouldn't help you . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I don't like being accused of being a former Tory, and if I thought it would make me any better in the eyes of the people of Saskatchewan I would say I was a former Liberal, but it is really not my choice —

one is as bad as the other. They are both tarred with the same brush.

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . which is more than your fellows can do.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It is only the case of the flip of a coin or something like that that my hon. friend isn't a Tory at this time. There is no difference between them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, coming back to this gross debt of \$500 million. It has been created in the creation of the assets of the Power Corporation. These assets of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones could undoubtedly be sold for much more than the debt owing against them. They are undoubtedly worth a lot more. If we wanted to put them up for sale, we would have no trouble getting the money out of them and a good deal more. They are good systems and many power companies would be very glad to have them. But you may rest assured we will not sell them. That is one of the problems, is that people in Saskatchewan are a little bit afraid that a Liberal government might sell them, especially since the present Leader of the Opposition has been in office. When he complains about having no privately-owned gas utility in Saskatchewan, and I suppose that would apply to power too, I would like to know just what he intends to do if he were the government. I'll put it that way — if he were the government — because he never will be.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, then, what do you want to know for?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The people of Saskatchewan, I think, are entitled to know, from the Leader of the Opposition, where he stands and furthermore, it is going to become very uncomfortable sitting on that fence too long. He is sitting on that fence — he slides over to one side a little bit, and then a little bit to the other but he never gets off it. I think he better get off it. He said in his speech, 'A Liberal government, when elected, will root out socialism.' Those are the words he used in his speech; I read it here. What does he mean? Is he going to turn over the insurance office to private business? That is surely socialism. Isn't that

October 17, 1961

a socialist enterprise? I think so. The Power Corporation is certainly a socialist enterprise.

Mr. Thatcher: — The Liberals started it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes, and I give the Liberals credit, when they get in a jam they will adopt a little bit of socialism, but it is a socialist enterprise and is he going to turn it over to private business — with gas — the telephones — is he going to sell that to the Bell Telephone Company? This is what he said, and this is what I mean, that he should come clean and be fair with the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Thatcher: — I will accept the minister's invitation.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . when elected we'll root out . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Do you have a question to ask?

Mr. Thatcher: — I was just going to answer some of these questions.

Mr. Speaker: — . . . otherwise I think you should take your seat.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Then what would he do with the sodium sulphate plant which last year made over \$300 thousand in profit? That is definitely socialism. I suppose there would be some friends around to get that one, too.

Mr. Danielson: — Definitely drying up . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Then we come to some other things that are definitely socialism. My hon. friend from Arm River, for whom I have the greatest respect, says the sodium sulphate business is drying up. Well, it's going to be all right for quite a while yet, I think, so don't worry yourself about it.

Mr. Thatcher: — Why are you buying Ingebright Lake then?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Another bit of socialism which we have in Saskatchewan is a provincial hospitalization plan. It was socialism when it was introduced; now it has gone all across Canada. The member for Humboldt says, ‘Oh, no — not that’. No, they wouldn’t throw that out. Of course not. But they will do everything they can to stop any extension of that plan, and you don’t have to take my word for it. You can go back into history and find out something about the Liberal party and this kind of thing. These are the Journals for the Session of 1943. Dr. Kiteley, the Liberal member for Torch River moved, seconded by Mr. Baker, Liberal member for Moose Jaw:

“That in the opinion of this Assembly, the government of Saskatchewan should, to the fullest possible extent, co-operate with the government of Canada in developing and putting into operation a national plan of health insurance.

A debate arising in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Howe, seconded by Mr. Benson (Mr. Howe used to be the member for Kelvington and Mr. Benson used to be the member for Last Mountain) that the following words be added to the motion:

‘To provide complete health services to all residents in Canada irrespective of their ability to pay.’

The debate continuing it was on the motion of Mr. Demers, Liberal member for Shellbrook, adjourned.”

That was on March 15th, 1943. On March 23rd —

“The debate continuing by consent of the Assembly, the said motion and amendment thereto were withdrawn.”

By leave of the Assembly, on motion of Mr. Kiteley, seconded by Mr. Howe,

October 17, 1961

‘ordered that the subject matter of the said withdrawn motion and amendment thereto, be referred to the Select Special Committee on Social Welfare, etc., for consideration and report.’”

There was at the time this Select Special Committee on Social Welfare and other problems. But that committee didn’t report at the Session of 1943, so we go to the 1944 Journals, and we find:

“Mr. Patterson, seconded by Mr. Uhrich, moved that a Select Special Committee be appointed to study (and then a whole lot of things) social security and health services, and so on.”

It was a follow-up of the committee of the previous session, and it endeavoured to present its report at that session. On that committee was my hon. friend from Arm River, and I was on the committee. We are the only two survivors, Mr. Speaker, of that committee. The report of that committee is Sessional Paper 82, tabled in the House on March 30th, 1944. Because the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) finished before I thought he would, I didn’t have time to look that up. But I know that even though a Liberal member in the House moved in favour of health insurance all across Canada, they found the way of doing nothing about it. That is right. We go back to 1936 . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — They put an Act on . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They put an Act on the Statute Books and did nothing about it. Let’s go back to 1936. On March 4th, Mr. Stork moved, seconded by Mr. Kemper:

“That in the opinion of this Assembly, the government should submit to the Assembly a proposal whereby state-aided hospitalization and medical services would be further extended in Saskatchewan. The debate was adjourned by the hon. Mr. Uhrich.”

Then on page 78 of the Journals we find the next time this is discussed:

“In amendment thereto it was moved by the hon. Mr. Uhrich, seconded by Mr. Demers that the words ‘as soon as the finances of the province will permit’ be inserted after the word ‘should’.”

Mr. Snedker: — . . . funds are available.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — In 1934 the hon. Dr. Uhrich stated to the meeting of the Association of Rural Municipalities that state medicine was the only thing. There was no question that at that time there was a great need for state medicine, but nothing was done about it, and my hon. friends opposite, in regard to medical care are using exactly the same excuse today. They say, ‘Oh, times are tough, let’s not do it now’. Of course none of them have told us, and this I suppose is their real problem, whether they are in favour of a medical care plan in Saskatchewan, or not. This is really troubling them, and they want to pass the buck back to the people of Saskatchewan. These people, Mr. Speaker, want to be elected as members of the legislature, with the privileges and the honour that goes with it, but without any of the responsibility of having to make up their own minds and made decisions.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — But they will have a chance to stand up and be counted on this very question.

Mr. Speaker, I was also very interested in some of the other remarks that were made. I was downtown at a luncheon at noon today, at a meeting of the Ceramics Association, western section, which were holding their annual meeting here. I got this thing. This is quite a thing, isn’t it — published by the city of Regina, and in here it says:

“The city of Regina is stretching out to accommodate the growth and population of industry. Eight hundred acres of choice land has been acquired and serviced

October 17, 1961

by the city to meet the needs of new and expanding industries.”

Listen to this one:

“The steel and concrete contours of Regina’s industrial sky-line trace the progress and diversification of the city’s economic development. Multi-million dollar industries established at Regina since the war include a basic steel industry, cement mills, steel pipe plant, steel fabricators, paper box and paint manufacturing, industrial gas plant, and other important secondary industries.”

I am sure that my hon. friends never saw this before, so I was very much interested in bringing a copy out here and reading some of the things from it.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Sure.

Mr. McDonald: — Who did you say prepared this report?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The city of Regina.

Mr. McDonald: — I wonder if he knows that the individual that prepared it used to be one of his employees.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes, that’s right. We have a lot of good people who have worked for us.

Mr. Thatcher: — You must have brain-washed them first.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . so good that they were stolen from us by the people of Regina. Well, it doesn’t say he prepared it, but direct your inquiries there. That is where to go. But we have had a lot of good people working for us that have been stolen by other people.

Then in this folder they put some selected growth indicators and they show that in 1951 the population of Regina was 71,000 and in 1960, 108,000 — actually 110,000 or 112,000 in 1961. The labour force increased from over 31,000 to 46,000 in the same period of time. This value of manufacturing from \$61 million to \$121 million. It is interesting to note that, in spite of all the gloom which we hear talked about by the hon. members opposite, there is still something going on in the province of Saskatchewan.

I was greatly amused by the hon. member for Melville when he got his metaphors mixed and he said, 'There is only one elephant that I know of, for a period of sixteen years in this province that has danced among the chickens and then, he says, he has now flown the coop.' I didn't know elephants flew, but apparently the member for Melville has that kind of elephant. He maybe has pink ones, too, I don't know. What I want to say about this is, the hon. members opposite don't really need to worry themselves about what happens to our Premier. He will be able to look after himself. He has looked after himself here in all the battles and throughout Saskatchewan in all the frays that have taken place over the past 17 years.

One of the things that really puzzles me is the great deal of attention and concern that is being given to the New Democratic Party. I read that extract from 1938, when the hon. Tommy Davis said that the CCF was done and all washed up. So it seems to me that we have made at least a complete round and my friends are now hoping to get the same story across. I don't think they'll be able to do so. If they were half as sure as they say they are, that this New Democratic Party could not be organized between these groups that are getting together, they wouldn't be worrying about it at all. The trouble is they don't believe what they say. They believe that it is possible for the working people of Canada, including the white-collar workers and the factory workers, industrial workers and the farmers to all get together. They really know that they have a common cause and what makes the opposition scared is that this may happen, and that is going to be pretty bad for the Liberal party, when it does happen.

October 17, 1961

There are many other things, Mr. Speaker, that I could mention but I think I should let somebody else have a go at it now. There is just one thing I would like to mention in reference to what the member for Rosthern said. I think he said very strongly that social aid was a scandal in Saskatchewan. This is a terrible reflection on the local governments which administer this social aid. I am surprised and amazed to hear that kind of a statement made. I know there are problems in regard to social aid. I know there are people here and there who won't work and do not intend to work, and they are getting social aid. I know that, and my hon. friends know it. Some of these people, I suppose, we will have as long as we are human beings. But I certainly wouldn't say it is a scandal and I would say that in the main the municipalities are doing a pretty fair job of what is a pretty difficult thing — the administration of social aid.

Mr. Speaker, there is no motion that we will not have a chance in this session to discuss agricultural or any other problems. These things have been getting attention, far more attention than what was given in the past, when we had a Liberal government.

I will vote against the amendment and I will vote for the motion.

Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I wish to associate myself with the previous speakers who complimented you on your return from your attendance at the Commonwealth Conference in London this past summer, and to welcome you back. I am sure, Sir, that I speak for all the members of the House when I say that we appreciate the fact that this legislative body was so well and worthily represented at this year's Commonwealth Conference.

Secondly, I would like to add my congratulations to those already made by previous speakers in this debate, to the mover and seconder of the motion. I also extend my congratulations to all those who have taken part in the debate thus far, on their respective contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I was both surprised and disappointed at the lack of contents in the Speech from the Throne. While it refers to two very important items, the termination of the tax-sharing agreement, and a medical services plan, it completely ignores the urgency of the current situation in agriculture. Due to the drought and near crop failure in a major portion of this province, the problems that are created are both acute and urgent. The conditions are even more extensive in scope than in the worst year of the drought of the 1930's. As a consequence, farm people, small business and professional men, local governments, and in fact all our citizens, both urban and rural, are faced today with circumstances and problems that require and fully justify extraordinary and immediate assistance from the senior governments.

If we have not at the moment, and I believe we have, a crisis in respect to education in this province, then it is my opinion such conditions will develop in the very near future. We need, in this province, provision and substantial provision for additional accommodation for the aged and the infirm, those who require institutional care and attention. This is not urgent, Mr. Speaker. This urgency will substantially increase rather than diminish in the months and years that lie ahead.

I believe the same urgent need for additional accommodation for those unfortunate people who are mentally ill is very evident in Saskatchewan at

October 17, 1961

this time. Despite anything already mentioned in this House to the contrary, surely no member of this House will fail to agree that the current situations and problems which are confronting the people of Saskatchewan, some of which I have just mentioned, are not serious enough to warrant the consideration of this Assembly at this particular time, at this session. Surely no member in this legislature can justify the stand whereby debates and discussions of such vital problems should be delayed until the next session, months hence. Surely the urgency of these problems are worthy of mention in the Speech from the Throne — the motion on which we are now debating.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I must repeat my keen disappointment in finding no mention made of these grave problems and situations that everyone in Saskatchewan should be concerned about at this time, and which the majority of people are faced with.

I am going to talk a little bit about my own constituency, and the conditions that exist there. Current economic conditions throughout the constituency I have the honour to represent in this legislature, are serious to say the least. Problems arising out of the near crop failure and the severe water shortage are most urgent. These problems are beyond the capacity of the individual and local governments to cope with. Assistance is needed, and without delay, and will be required for a period of several months at the very least. In my opinion, we haven't felt the full impact of the situation yet, and certainly it will exist until we harvest another crop. If the conditions of the past year continue to prevail during the coming year, 1962, then I am sure everyone will agree that dire consequences will result. I hesitate to consider the conditions as they would be under such circumstances, and I hope and pray that Divine Providence will, during the coming year, make provision that will cancel out such tragic prospects for the people of the province.

In the Pelly constituency, we have few if any large grain farmers, in the sense that the term applies to farmers in other parts of the province. Partly as a result of having small mixed farms in that area, there is no surplus of grain to be disposed of by the farmers to tide him over during this critical period. This condition of large stocks of grain may

prevail in certain areas of the province, but I think they are few and far between too. Many farmers in the Pelly constituency, and I believe in other parts of Saskatchewan, next spring will require assistance in the way of seed grain, and many of these farmers in my constituency and elsewhere, in addition will require financial assistance in order to be able to sow a crop next spring, in the way of fuel, oil, machinery repairs and such. Many of them will also require living expense assistance.

All this is beyond the ability of the local governments to provide. Assistance is not confined to the farm population or rural population alone. Our small merchants in the small villages and towns, the operators of the service centres of various kinds in these small villages and towns are in a very precarious condition. This condition they find themselves in is due to the present economic state of the farm population to a very great degree. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, these conditions will deteriorate in the months ahead, and this will result in unemployment of many people, formerly and under normal conditions employed by these small town and village establishments.

It is not only the cities and large centres who are faced with a serious unemployment problem. The small villages and towns and even the rural areas are likewise affected, and again I say this may become more serious as the weeks go by. It is most urgent, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, that plans and policies be immediately brought forward and put into effect by our government. Programs and policies that will assure the farmer, the worker, local governments, yes even the small business operators throughout this province, affected by these abnormal conditions and circumstances, that they are assured their essential needs during the months that lie ahead will be adequately met.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that this assurance and this assistance are needed now and not months hence. The scarcity of fodder for cattle was a very serious problem too, in mid-July of this year, in my part of the province. But I am pleased to be able to say that to my knowledge most farmers by special effort and hard work were able

October 17, 1961

to scrape up a fair quantity of feed. Much of this feed is far from first quality and the supply is not abundant, but enough if we do not experience a very severe and long winter, to see the farmers' livestock through. Such limited fodder supplies, I imagine will have to be augmented by grain, during the winter feeding season, and this is a commodity that in my area feed grains were not in great supply either, due to the near failure of crops this year.

There is one matter that gives me concern, and that is that many of our farm people who raise stock have drastically reduced the size of their herds. Now this was partly brought about due to the lack of fodder and feed, and also the shortage of water, but one reason for some of the disposal made of cattle was that these farm people were compelled in order to carry on their harvesting operations and their normal farm land work of this fall. Having to dispose of some of their cattle — some of which they would have benefited by greatly, if they could have kept them is, in the future, going to reduce substantially some of the individual farmer's income. This will apply for several years. I don't think anybody will doubt that the disposal of certain livestock in all parts of the province this year will have an undesirable effect on the future economy of the province.

Now I want to express my appreciation for any and all assistance that was rendered to our farm people in connection with the fodder shortage by the provincial government this year. But I am of the opinion there should have been provision made sometime ago on the basis of a long-term policy. This situation is not something new in Saskatchewan, and that would have averted the panic experienced by so many people during this past summer and fall. I hope the Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues will at the first opportunity take appropriate measures, which will insure no repetition of the sad experience of the past summer and fall season.

In this regard I would like to say a few words to the Minister of Agriculture. I am going to offer him a suggestion, because as most members of this House know, I live very close to the province of Manitoba. They had very similar or identical situations in connection with shortage of fodder and drought conditions in the province this year. The

surprising thing to me is this. I don't often like to give credit to political opponents or people who are in public life in other political parties, but I must say that in the province of Manitoba they have a Minister of Agriculture, the hon. Mr. Hutton, who immediately these conditions were realized in his province, went up and down the length and breadth personally, of the province of Manitoba, and the provisions and the policies that were carried out and expedited to take care of the situation in the province of Manitoba has no comparison to what was done in this province, so far as I could see.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — Now, Mr. Hutton is a very young man in politics. As you know, he has only been a minister of the crown a relatively short time. I believe he is a very able man. I would certainly suggest, in view of the circumstances that exist and have existed in this province — the lack of agricultural policy, and such like, that our Minister of Agriculture journey down to the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba and learn some of the leadership, some of the policy-forming ability and some of the techniques of Mr. Hutton.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would not want to make any reference . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I just want to inform him that they accepted our . . .

Mr. Barrie: — . . . accepted your plan, according to the statement of the Minister of Agriculture. If the province of Manitoba accepted the Saskatchewan plan — well, it worked quite differently in Manitoba than it did in Saskatchewan, because there is not a farmer or stock raiser in the province of Manitoba that hasn't an adequate supply of feed for his cattle, whether they are large herds or small herds — it is of no concern as to whether the winter will be two or three weeks longer, or two or three weeks shorter, because Mr. Hutton tied up every bit of fodder within the boundary of his own province until he was assured that the requirements of the people of his province were met.

October 17, 1961

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member tell the House how he tied up this fodder, and what authority he had?

Mrs. Batten: — He told you to go to Winnipeg.

Mr. Barrie: — I can't give him all the details, but he can get all the details if he will go as I suggested, down to the city of Winnipeg. One of the things they did do — the province of Manitoba — is they went out and where they found large supplies of hay and fodder available, the province of Manitoba bought it, or made commitments whereby they would take over the entire amount. They went to the municipal councils in the province of Manitoba, and they said to them, 'Make a survey and we will help you make a survey of your particular municipality and tell us how much feed you will require.'

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Did the hon. member say that the Manitoba government bought fodder?

Mr. Barrie: — They made commitments to buy it where it was necessary.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They never bought one tone of fodder, and they haven't a single policy that we didn't have.

Mrs. Batten: — You can make your own speech after.

Mr. Barrie: — Mr. Speaker, I would hate to make any statement that would reflect on the veracity of the Minister of Agriculture, but I am quite certain that financial commitments were made by the Minister of Agriculture for the province of Manitoba, in connection with acquiring and securing an abundant supply of fodder for the people of that province last year. If he will only do, Mr. Speaker, as I have suggested and it was repeated two or three times, if he will go down to the city of Winnipeg, and discuss the matter with Mr. Hutton, as I have suggested, I will only be too glad to be corrected at the next session, if I am spared to appear here — to have him correct me in my statement that the Manitoba government made certain by making financial commitments to take over this feed. This is well-known throughout the area in which I live, and well-known throughout the

area of Swan River Valley, and the Shell River Valley around Russell and Roblin, and these places just across the boundary in Manitoba.

I want to now continue, Mr. Speaker, with the most pressing problem at the moment in my constituency, and that is like many other areas in this province — the lack of water. This problem is serious to say the least, and most unusual. A water supply is not only the problem of the farmers, but equally as much a problem for most of the village and town councils and urban residents in my constituency. I think the same thing applies not too far out of the boundaries of my constituency, in the largest town in the constituency of the Minister of Natural Resources, the town of Canora. They have had extreme difficulties in connection with water in that particular urban centre. The constituency of Pelly and the surrounding area is one in Saskatchewan which could in the past be considered the most unlikely to ever experience a lack of adequate water supply. It is a section of this province through which two large rivers normally flow, along with numerous creeks, lakes, large sloughs and marsh areas.

But I want to inform the members of this House, some of them may be already aware of this, some of them may not, but during the past summer, never known before in the history of these districts, due to lack of snowfall last winter and the absence of rainfall during this past spring and summer, the Assiniboine River and the Swan River, another fairly good-sized river, have now flowed since mid-July, and in many cases, completely dry. Most of the creeks in our area haven't even run this season. Some of our smaller lakes have completely dried up, and sloughs and marshes have disappeared. Many of the swells which in the past have supplied sufficient water for individual farms or for urban dwellers have gone completely dry. Others provide only a very small fraction of the volume that they formerly supplied, either on the farm or in connection with an urban dwelling.

This is nearly to the point of what I would call a disaster, and it is facing not only the farm people, but also the residents in my constituency of the two largest towns, Kamsack and the town of Norquay. These people have to face the prospect that unless something different is found or done that in a matter of days, let alone weeks or months, they are going to be

October 17, 1961

faced with the prospect that they will have not water supply as soon as we get the first heavy frost. The town of Kamsack at the present time, which is a town of well over three thousand people, is drawing their supply of water for all purposes for that town from two large pools that are about eight inches deep in the bed of the Assiniboine River. This is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker. The town of Norquay, who depend on two large dug-outs, are in the position where they are hauling water a distance of five or six miles for domestic purposes, at the present time. It isn't for lack of trying to do something about it because both the councils of the town of Kamsack and Norquay, during the past summer and this fall have spent substantial sums of money in drilling wells, and I am sorry to say, without result. They, of course, have a limited ability to finance such exploration that is necessary, engineering and actual drilling operation. They must have some assistance from the senior governments, and I think the rural population is entitled to, and must have some assistance soon to carry on a program that is hoped will result in locating adequate water supplies for both domestic and sanitary purposes in our urban areas, as well as in the rural areas.

I am pleased to know that the federal government, recognizing this emergency and necessity for assistance, has within the past few days, announced a plan and policy of assistance to be shared by the provincial government and others affected. Whether or not this plan will go far enough, or provide all the necessary financial assistance is yet to be determined. But I hope our provincial government will cooperate to the utmost and that there will be no unnecessary delay because as I have said, that in connection with the other problems faced by many of our rural people, this assistance is needed now, not weeks and months hence, if you are going to avoid a real disaster.

Now, it must be apparent, Mr. Speaker, to most people, except those who like the ostrich, choose to keep their heads in the sand so they can't see, that we have a crisis or a near-crisis on hand in this province in connection with education. This is a serious matter, in my opinion — a very serious matter and requires in order to solve it, the immediate attention of this government. The basic reason for this

undesirable situation, I believe, is financial. Local governments, in levying property taxes have not only reached the limit, but in my opinion exceeded the limit of the ability of the property owners to pay. That have increased these taxes on property in an endeavour to try and hold the line, or meet the additional extra costs of municipal services and educational costs, which have been steadily and progressively increasing. There is only one source of revenue to our local government bodies who are charged with the responsibility of administering our educational system, and that is the taxes they levy on the property owners within the area that they have jurisdiction.

In addition to that, of course, is the money they received from our provincial government in the way of grants. These municipal men, school unit board members, particularly the rural municipal men in a very honest endeavour to try and meet these rising costs, have diverted much of the levy that they formerly used for municipal services towards the cost of education. In many instances this has been done to the detriment of municipal services, which have been reduced to a minimum in many municipalities.

The only solution that I can see is that possibly there might be certain economies instituted throughout the system of education in the province, and apart from what that might be able to do then it is a matter that the provincial government will have to bear a greater share of the costs of education.

This condition has not developed suddenly. This hasn't come up like the drought and the water shortage, and one thing and another within a matter of months or weeks. Members on this side of the House, during the time that I have had the privilege and honour of serving in this legislature, have over the years warned the present government of the seriousness of this problem. They have consistently, session in and session out, advocated a complete reassessment of the financial structure of our education system. These warnings and suggestions have gone unheeded. Today we find a state of grave concern confronting all the people of Saskatchewan. I am certain that no member of this House will disagree when I say that the proper and adequate education of the children of our time is of the utmost importance. It is a most essential and necessary service, and education is one of, if not

October 17, 1961

the main responsibility of this government. The education of the children and young people in this province is most important. Again I say that this is an urgent problem which demands attention now, and it is worthy of discussion and consideration of this House at this session.

There is an urgent need, as I have already mentioned very briefly for added facilities to provide for our aged and infirm. Long waiting lists of applicants out of necessity are seeking admission to our geriatric centres, which are entirely inadequate to fill the need and demand in this province for such care. This poses another problem because many of our local general hospitals in the province have been obliged to care for these elderly people, creating a problem and creating congestion of the facilities of these local hospitals. I am sure that the accommodation in our mental hospitals and institutions is taxed to the limit and results in serious over-crowding. Under such conditions, even with the most competent staffs and personnel, I am sure that proper care, supervision and services cannot be rendered the patient.

The government has requested and insisted, I believe, that our hospitals hold the line and pare expenditures on services so as to avoid any increase in cost. This policy has created problems for those responsible for administering our hospital services, and will no doubt result in lower standards of service, if it is prolonged. I assume that the principal reason, if not the whole reason for the hold the line policy of the government with regard to hospital assistance, is lack of finances to provide for any increase in an already large commitment.

Premier Douglas: — It's no such thing.

Mr. Barrie: — Mr. Speaker, in the light of these existing circumstances affected the aged and the infirm requiring institutional care, and the mentally ill, and the curtailed assistance to our general hospitals, I cannot but question the wisdom of embarking on a medical care plan until these urgent and deserving needs have been provided for. A medical care plan will involve the expenditure of millions of dollars, and if the government is unable to finance other essential services in connection with public health and welfare of our citizens, then it would follow, and I believe this is true that they would have extreme

difficulties in financing any proposed plan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that I agree there is merit in a medical care plan. I am quite in favour of it if that plan is favourably accepted by all the people affected. I am not talking about plebiscites or anything of that kind. I am referring to the general public, who are not only going to be the beneficiaries of the plan, but they also must provide the costs of whatever services are rendered under the plan, either by fees or taxes, or a combination of both. The other people with whom I am concerned are the professional personnel, who will render the skilled services to the beneficiaries of the plan. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this observation, that without the fullest co-operation of both these groups, you can have the most desirable plan that can be evolved, but it is doomed to failure from the start if you lack the co-operation of these two groups.

Even though I agree to the principles of a medical care plan, in order that I would be in a position to decide as to the acceptance or rejection of any proposed plan, I require certain specific data. I believe, with the contact that I have had with the public of this province, in my own constituency and outside, that today this is the information (that I am going to mention in a moment or so) that the ordinary people in the villages and towns and cities want. The information they want in connection with the plank and the items of information that I feel must and should be supplied are as follows: (a) who will administer the plan? We have that answered now in the report that was released just a few days ago. (b) We want to know what services are to be provided; and (c) There should be a fairly accurate estimate of the overall cost of the plan, and the last (4) The source from which the money is to be obtained to finance and pay for the plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, lacking such information I cannot imagine any member of this House coming to a firm decision, and I certainly don't think they should be expected to do so.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

October 17, 1961

Mr. Barrie: — In my opinion a medical care plan is too important a matter, with too far reaching affects, to be rushed forward to a hasty conclusion without ample opportunity to consider and scrutinize every aspect of any proposals that may be made.

Mr. Speaker, this is my personal stand, which I consider reasonable and proper. Hence I view with extreme alarm the apparent urgency on the part of the Premier and the government to enact their proposed legislation at this particular session. We can continue the session, get the complete information that I have suggested, and probably other particulars that other people would want; then I have no criticism to offer. But in spite of anything that has been said, or anything that may be said to the contrary, I cannot do otherwise than judge that such action is a case of extreme political expediency, without due regard and respect for the consequences it may inflict on the province of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan in the future. It appears to me to be a means to provide the Premier, as leader of the New Democratic Party, with political propaganda for the forthcoming general federal election.

I was heartened, Mr. Speaker, by the criticism of, and the opposition to a means test, expressed in this debate both by the Premier and the lady member for Regina. They were both concerned about the stigma arising out of the enquiry into an individual's personal affairs, required to assess the qualifications of a person under a means or needs test. I quite agree with them, and I only hope that they will be successful in converting their colleagues, particularly the Minister of Social Welfare, to their way of thinking.

Then there may be some hope, Mr. Speaker, for some slight relaxation in regard to the means or needs test, now so vigorously applied and enforced by this government and its employees respecting applicants and recipients of mothers' allowances, old age assistance, and supplemental allowance. I am certain that the future application of the means or needs test by this government and its employees, will be closely followed not only by those directly affected, but by the public generally.

I hope that those responsible will be consistent with the attitudes and sentiments expressed by these two government speakers in this debate. I sincerely hope that we will see or learn that some little measure of relaxation in the enforcements will be the result.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur that the ending of the existing tax-sharing and rental agreements between this province and the federal government, by the federal government is an act of retrogression. This particular action will have other serious and far-reaching effects on the economy and people of Saskatchewan in the future. It is noteworthy to have the Premier acknowledge the merit of these agreements and the equalization features contained in them, particularly so when he quite conscientiously, I believe, acknowledged that they were proposed originally and instituted by a Liberal federal government.

The Liberal governments of Mackenzie King and St. Laurent appreciated the need of assistance provided by these agreements to the less fortunate members of our national federation. Saskatchewan being one of the poorer members has benefited very substantially during most of the last two decades. These arrangements certainly ease the tax load to be borne by our citizens, and provided large sums of money annually for expenditure by our provincial government with no specific strings attached. In other words, they could be considered to a degree as unconditional grants.

In addition to this, of course, vast sums of money have also been provided the provincial government over the years by the federal governments, both Liberal and Conservative, for assistance in fields of health, agriculture, resources to mention a few. The Premier and this government apparently placed the full responsibility for this backward step in federal provincial fiscal arrangements upon the federal government of the Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Mr. Diefenbaker. To a degree, but only to a degree is this correct. Anyone following the pattern of attitude that this government used during its entire term of office must have been impressed with the consistent lack of appreciation and acknowledgment by them of the very substantial assistance received from the federal governments, whether Liberal or Conservative. The attitude ever present was 'not enough' — 'too little' — they were never satisfied, and made greater and greater demands,

October 17, 1961

some to the point of being ridiculous.

Even governments appreciate an expression of gratitude on occasion, and become resentful of ever-increasing demands. There comes a time when such behaviour breeds contempt for, and resentment towards those responsible for such conduct. This socialist government, in my opinion, pursuing their consistent attitude of ingratitude and sometimes unreasonable and impractical demands and requests, precipitated the unfortunate situation we and several other of our sister provinces find ourselves in today.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — This socialist government must share the responsibility for the termination of these agreements and the consequent eventual loss of revenue to, not only this province, but many of our other poorer provinces in Canada, who have been materially affected by this most desirable form of agreement.

During this debate, members of the opposition were as usual chastised for alleged absurdities in regard to policies of taxation and government expenditure. Well, the speakers opposite too often judge others by the measure of themselves.

Government speakers inside the outside this House have repeatedly poured scorn on the opposition, claiming we advocated lowering of taxation, and at the same time proposing additional services. If these charges were factual then I would readily agree, that such proposals are not only absurd but unreasonable and ridiculous. But the statement attributed to us in this regard is grossly incorrect. We advocate no such procedure, and during the debates in this House I have never heard a Liberal speaker advocate the interpretation given by members on the government side. We do say that we favour reduction of certain taxes, but we do say that at the same time that while those taxes are reduced we will continue to furnish the people of Saskatchewan with full and complete maintenance of essential services, which is expected of any government. I am going to tell you how we propose to do this. We propose to do this by the elimination of waste and extravagance, so obvious in the present government in Saskatchewan. We would divert the luxury and unwarranted spending on non-essentials and unnecessary government services to the essential services required

of a provincial government, within reason. We are convinced that what we have and what we will continue to advocate in this connection can be accomplished without any difficulty and by the means that I have suggested. We suggest no magic formula, just sound, prudent administration, shorn of all the fancy frills, the luxuries this government indulges in so freely.

Of course I can readily understand, Mr. Speaker, it is most difficult for those opposite to comprehend such policies. They have too long travelled on an entirely different road. The critical situation that I have dealt with of near crop failure in my constituency, which I consider during the winter and spring months will progressively worsen, affects all the residents of the constituency, including the native citizens, the Indian population. The fall casual labour, ordinarily available to them, has been practically non-existent this year due to the state of agriculture on land adjoining these Indian reservations. The share of crop that the Treaty Indian usually receives each year for the leased land on the reservation, was extremely small, if anything, in most cases this particularly season.

The federal government under the Department of Indian Affairs, has and will continue to provide these people with certain rations and the limited aid in connection with the purchase of clothing. But these particular grants and rations and assistance they get is very limited, and anything that could be done by our provincial government, or any other government to supplement the food allowance these native people will have during the coming winter, would render a real service to them, particularly to the aged and the young on the reservations.

Due to fire hazard conditions prevailing up until a few weeks ago, the normal early moose and deer season in the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve was suspended this year. Until recent years, Mr. Speaker, moose was one of the principle sources of food and clothing for these people. A native Indian, upon killing a moose or deer, and I am quite certain the member for Athabasca, and probably the member for Cumberland will bear he out in this — a native Indian upon killing a game animal utilizes every part of the animal, including the entrails, hair, hide, and even the hoofs — there is no waste.

October 17, 1961

Lying adjacent to the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve in my constituency are three fairly large Indian reservations — Cote, Keesekoose and Keyes. The Duck Mountain Reserve, or what today forms the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve, was for hundreds of years back possibly, was part of the hunting and trapping grounds of these native people. If this government is interested in the welfare of these people as they so often professes, then I suggest to the Minister of Natural Resources, (I am sorry he had to leave the chamber, but I hope that some of his colleagues will bring this message to him) that he favourably consider extending permission to the Indians on the reservations I have mentioned, to hunt moose in the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve for even a limited period, commencing at a very early date, and if there needs to be restrictions as to the number of animals to be taken during this limited season, then I am sure his Department and the employees of the Department of Natural Resources, game branch, will receive the fullest co-operation from the Indians, with regard to any restrictions that the minister or this government wish to make in connection with this limited season.

If the minister and his department advise the chiefs of these bands, and the band councils, then I am sure that he will find that the native Indians will not indulge further than he is as Mr. Speaker, that this suggestion will be favourably considered and that we can anticipate a statement from the minister, regarding this matter, very soon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the serious problems confronting the citizens of this province which are so apparent, and which have been ignored by the government in the Speech from the Throne, I will not support the motion but I will support the amendment.

Premier Douglas: — Before the hon. member commences, since he is just starting, it may break into his speech, I would like to raise a question break into his speech, I would like to raise a question of the business of the House, if I might have permission. The Clerk has drawn to my attention that there are some motions for returns, and it is helpful from the standpoint of printing if they can be dealt with either just before we recess for dinner, or just after the recess.

Since the member is just starting to speak, he might prefer to leave his remarks until after the dinner hour, and we might deal with the motion now, or we can deal with them at 7:30, if it is the wish of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the House to do this now?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Assembly recessed at 5:30 o'clock p.m.

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

Mr. H. Ray Dahlman (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Assembly will tolerate just another effort in taking part in this verbal debate on the Speech from the Throne. I have come to the conclusion there are a lot of unhappy people in this Assembly, especially on the other side. It seems to me no matter what we do over here doesn't please them, and if we accomplish something good they won't recognize it. I often think of the time when the CCF was just in its infancy and we had to tolerate the opposition in government then. I can appreciate the position they are in. They do their very best, in my humble opinion, to dig in their heels and try to slow down the social vehicle with every ounce of energy they have.

It seems to me that in the medical care plan that is being proposed, and is actually being legislated at this present time, that those who give lip service to medical care service ought to be willing to launch one. Surely to goodness there is not one human being that ever did anything perfect, except perhaps one. If we're going to do anything good, we're going to have to start some place, and this, in my opinion, is where thoughtful, conscientious legislators ought to give their best to this Bill. Be happy that it seems to me they are opposing it by every means possible — a deterring action. So I say they must be a very unhappy lot. We on this side of the House rejoice that at this time we are able to complete, or bring into legislation the Act to complete our medical care program in this province.

October 17, 1961

I also wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply, not only because they did a very good job of it, a very able job of presenting it. I think they rendered this Assembly a great service, because they did bring out a most important point of the program, so that it will be much easier for us to debate it here and to discuss it. I am sure there are very few people who have had more interest and more concern for the medical care plan than has the mover of the reply to the Speech from the Throne. I think she did an excellent job.

I also wish to congratulate the member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). I didn't know that he had it in him to make such an exhaustive study of so complex a thing as federal-provincial tax relationship. He did a marvellous job. I think he must have made an intensive research in order to prepare that address, and that, in my opinion, expedites the process of processing this legislation.

Referring again to the medical care plan, I am only going to deal with it in general, in the philosophy of the thing. I think it is just as ridiculous today to resist socialized medicine as it would be to suggest that we put education back on private tutoring. I think the time has come when we realize that countries less fortunate in the way of wealth have had socialized or state medicine for a good many years. In this country I feel it is a national disgrace that we have to follow in their footsteps. I think you will find there is a response to socialized or state medicine all over Canada. Canadians are waiting for us again to give them leadership, and these are people of all political faiths.

I am sure that members of the Liberal party all over Canada will be disappointed if members of the opposition here do not vote in favour of this plan. I think they would be letting down their national leader if they did so, because it is fortunate for us, at least, that within just the past few weeks he made a statement here in Regina to the effect that certainly they had a medical care program in their platform — just a few weeks ago.

Just referring a little bit to the philosophy of socialized medicine, I had the opportunity in 1954 of travelling through the little country of Denmark — a little country of just over 4 million people. They

are in a position there, where they had to utilize every natural resource to give everybody a fair chance at a standard of living. They have done this through co-operative development, and also social legislation.

Sitting on a sight-seeing bus, taking a tour through the city of Copenhagen, the young lady who was conducting the tour, a nice blonde lady (which made it even more pleasant) — one of those dazzling blondes with those blue eyes, and she spoke in English because everyone on the bus could apparently understand English. So, travelling through the city on a tour, we came past the university campus and pointing out with great pride, she indicated the medical college where Danish doctors were trained. She said that every student who has the ability and the desire to go into medicine becomes a guest of the government. They are paid in total; all expenses, living expenses and otherwise, during the time of their training, and of course they become victims of Cupid, she said. They marry and if they do, and wish to establish a home, that is also taken into consideration.

So, being from Saskatchewan and having a similar philosophy, I suggested to her, “Isn’t that quite costly?” “It all depends upon how you look at it”, she said. “In Denmark we believe that health is a national responsibility; therefore it is also a national responsibility to provide the doctors to give medical services.” That is the philosophy they have in that little country, and they are making a wonderful job out of living.

It is a funny thing, this word ‘socialism’ — how it does corrupt people’s minds — those who wish to use it in a misleading way. I look at it this way. I feel it would be a national responsibility to provide the doctors to serve our medical needs. I think it is a privilege for those who have the opportunity to become doctors, and receive their certificates. I also believe that when they have received their certificates they then have assumed an obligation to their fellow-man. It seems to me out of gratitude, if for no other reason, that having the privilege to be a certified doctor, that they in turn should feel a moral responsibility of serving the needs of their fellow-man.

I think in the same regard that we should also provide hospitals and the facilities in which doctors can practise, and to give medicine and medical

October 17, 1961

care in the most efficient and effective manner. To put it short, I think that socialized medicine should be the stature of an adult people.

There have been a lot of arguments, pro and con, about where the doctor fits in. You know, in my foolishness I could even go along with part of the plan which my hon. friend from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) has recommended. I am one of these persons who enjoy my personal freedom and personal liberty, and it is too bad that in bringing about socialized medicine there should be that aspect to it, that our good doctors should feel that perhaps they are losing some of their freedom. I think that is something that will change; it has changed in other countries, where state or socialized medicine is being practiced. When you work with it, you adjust it and you begin to love it, because under socialized medicine you feel part of the community. You feel that you are taking your rightful part in administering medical services to the common good.

I think the dignity of the profession must be maintained. I think we have to launch this program with as much freedom to the individual and to the doctors as possible. We are not launching a perfect program, certainly not. All we are doing is starting to develop one. Those countries that now have socialized medicine, the doctors are working into this scheme and are learning to regard it as a very good way of administering medical care and a health program for their own citizens.

Much has been said about agriculture. As a matter of fact, the amendment is an attempt by the opposition to bring in something at this time that is out of place. I regard their concern for the disaster that has taken place this year across this province, and across western Canada. We all have. I don't think there is any constituency in the province that is worse hit than Bengough. I have a lot of sympathy for those people, and I am glad that we have such a thing as social aid which is being paid by the federal and provincial governments, thus allowing the municipalities of the cost of social aid. I am happy that we have that plan in existence, because I am sure that we are going to have to use it. But what I cannot understand is this, that Liberal and Conservative governments at Ottawa do not want to assume much responsibility for the plight of the farmers.

Is there any other segment of society that has had to bear the increased cost of production in the same way as the prairie grain farmer? He is the one individual that is expected to be a superman. Everybody else has gotten bigger — everybody else demanded higher prices, and they got it. The theory that getting bigger and more efficient should cut the cost of your production, therefore you should be able to produce more cheaply, should apply to big business, industry and manufacturing. Only the farmer can do it alone, they insist.

A year ago it cost the farmers of the three western provinces — the three prairie provinces — \$140 million to buy Canadian, because of tariff protection of the goods that he had to buy. In other words, could he have bought those same goods for the prices that prevail in the countries where he sold his grain; that is the saving that he could have created for himself. In other words, Canadian industry was protected to that extent. Actually the Canadian farmer today is the only one that is producing grain without price support or subsidy. He is actually in competition with the treasuries of practically every other exporting nation that is an exporter of wheat. We hear the outcry, especially of some of the Liberals and Conservatives — why, we cannot afford to subsidize grain the same way they do in the United States.

If the Canadian government and the Canadian people as a whole cannot subsidize the Canadian grain producer, how can he do it all by himself, but that is what he is expected to do. I can have sympathy for the farmers, but I don't have any sympathy for those people who sat in the federal government and did nothing about it, when we had a delegation of over 1,100 farmers and business men, and others from western Canada go down and plead with the federal government.

There is no use of saying that the Conservatives are to blame for this. Oh no, the former Liberal government is also to blame. They had also after the war an Act — the Agricultural Prices Stabilization Act, which had at its disposal \$200 million with which they could subsidize agricultural products, but for the 12 could subsidize agricultural products, but for the 12 years they had it in effect, they could have supported agriculture to the tune of \$2,400 million if they wished to use it all. They spent a measly \$12 million during that time. The Conservatives come along and they were going to make a big show of it, and they were going to

October 17, 1961

increase the size of the fund, and probably make less use of it.

I have sympathy for the farmers, but I don't think those who have been in power in Ottawa had too much sympathy for the farmer. That is the unforgivable thing. If I were a Liberal or a Conservative I would be very, very cautious of what I said about the treatment of farmers, being that they had the opportunity and didn't do anything about it.

Oh yes, crown corporations — like one of the members here said, I don't like to chase this thing around the mill again, but you know, I think we have to say a little bit about it. It's a funny thing — those who protest so hard against crown corporations in this province — it's a funny thing that they take such sadistic delight in the failure of some of them, especially those who are wanting to develop industry here.

(Short recording failure)

Can't you just imagine the Leader of the Opposition standing at the border of Manitoba and waving his hands, "We're free now; come on, boys", bring in your industry." You know, they might be able to do that — ask them to come, but only because we have crown corporations in this province. Wouldn't it have been a nice thing to ask industry to come in here with no power? Because we have crown corporations in this province, we have helped private industry more than anything else. If it had not been for the Power Corporation and the rural electrification, there would not be any TV sets, bath-tubs, refrigerators, deepfreezes, and water systems on the farms — very, very little. There might have been the odd individual who might have had a plant.

Springing from that, of course, you also have the development and distribution of natural gas. There were industries set up to make pipes for the gas distribution; there were wire companies set up; companies set up to build transformers. This whole thing would not have been possible without the crown corporations such as the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I think we have to go along with that. I don't think that anybody in this province has very much to say about industry not coming into this province, because of this government. I think we have done more to set the

climate to induce industry here than any other province. There is no industrial development across the line in the prairie areas of the United States, either, because it is a strictly prairie agricultural region, and there is nothing to induce industrialization.

If industry were to be set up here, it would be only due to process of raw material at the source of where it is being mined. We are looking forward to that. But this thing of always hollering about this government because it is social democratic, that it would keep industry out, is wrong.

The other day the Leader of the Opposition took great delight in telling us what a wonderful job they were doing with free enterprise over in Germany — about the tremendous economic progress — the economy at a high level, and that there was actually a shortage of labour. In the little Scandinavian country of Sweden, the economy continues at a very high level, but labour shortage may hamper industry. About the time the Leader of the Opposition was going to take his European tour last spring, I suggested he should have time, but I think he made a mistake, because in all sincerity I think he would have been justified in going there just to straighten out his own thinking.

This paper here — it's no socialist rag, it's the 'Financial Post' — this is the second issue they have on Sweden, and I am sure nobody in this Assembly, especially the opposition, are going to argue over the fact that it is probably the most reliable source of financial information in this country.

“It is in the realm of manufactured goods that Canadian exporters meets the real challenge. Sweden has the highest per capita income of Europe, and has enjoyed full employment and prosperity for many years. Local manufacturer caters to a very high standard of taste and performance requirements. Imported goods face stiff competition, but for Canadian exporters, there are interesting possibilities in a wide field, including communications, equipment and other electronic apparatus; pulp and paper machinery; logging apparatus, textile and certain consumer goods.

October 17, 1961

“Worthy of note is that Sweden, a country of only 7.5 million people, have been able without capital assistance from foreign countries, to develop, design, produce and sell all manufactured products, including two makes of motor cars and two lines of trucks, into export.”

Just a brief comparison, then. We are proud of what we have accomplished in Canada, and I am sure that we will all agree that we enjoy a high standard of living here. However, just to give you again a few comparative statistics — here is a comparison of population: Canada was 18 million; Sweden, 7.5 million. The total exports in 1960, per capita: \$341 in Sweden; \$300 in Canada. The total imports per capita, \$382 in Sweden; \$305 in Canada from which I would conclude they have just as strong economic activity over there as we have here.

Mr. Thatcher: — They have not had a war for 150 years, remember.

Mr. Dahlman: — Yes, I was coming to that. You have a small point there. However, there were two other small Scandinavian countries — Norway and Denmark, which were occupied during the war, and these statistics compare. In Sweden, \$74 per capita is spent on defence, while in Canada \$98 per capita is spent.

Mr. Thatcher: — That’s a big point.

Mr. Dahlman: — Actually, during the war their economic activities were contained just the same as anyone else — taxation, a percentage of general national produce in Sweden, 27.7 and 21.4. I will just bring this up, because that sounds just a little bit better, but of course taking into regard that the social services which are provided in Sweden, we wouldn’t even think of — I’m sure the hon. members opposite would hold up their hands in holy terror if we ever suggested doing things here that they are doing there. In industrial production, Sweden is gaining percentage-wise over Canada. Using 1944 as a starting point, in 1961 production has increased in Sweden by 24 per cent, and in Canada by 21 per cent. If our own CCF here in Canada had to apply our program over there, we would do very little different.

This term 'socialism' — I notice the members opposite use it very, very often — every chance they get, it's socialism, socialism. It's a bad word, you see. It is designed to terrify people and give themselves a shock treatment. They frighten so easily.

In my opinion socialism is the development of the brotherhood of man in a social way. It is the medium of directing man's ingenuity and purpose to the common good. It is the medium, or kind of society where fear of want and the lust for gain become instinct motives. It is a society where man ceases to be predatory in his habits.

Mr. Thatcher: — Like Clarence!

Mr. Dahlman: — Socialistic ideas come into their own as people grasp the possibility of mutuality and co-operation and set seriously about, developing a system which is not based on strife and competition, but on co-operation. It is where individuals strive to become part of an answer, rather than part of a problem.

It could be that I am wasting my time here, but anyway, when we think of socialism and its development in this province — the other day, driving down the road I began worrying about this thing, socialism. There were so many people scaring me I thought perhaps I could be wrong, so I thought, well, what have we got here in the way of socialism. I looked at the road I was driving down. It was a publicly owned road on which I was driving. I drove past a school. Here was another bit of socialism. If you keep driving you'll see a hospital, telephone lines and power lines, and you'll see more socialism. It's a funny thing, but they uphold certain things as being very dear to them. Even in this province we haven't gone as socialistic as some countries that are supposed to be strictly free enterprise nations. You know, we could do with a bit more socialism here.

In the United States, the federal government engages in building state highways. They also contribute funds to education down there. They have learned a few things about socialism, too, and people are supposed to be afraid of socialism. One of these days they're going to have to use more socialism.

It seems to me that any time the people opposite are in disagreement about something, it has to be socialism. How many times have they appointed a finger across

here, and accused us of being communists? That shows their mentality. We on this side of the House here came in with an ideal that we are going to make this a better society for the common man. Is that wrong? Is that philosophy wrong? They can laugh about that — I'm going to give them a pat on the back. Not these people, but their federal government. Senior citizen's pensions; family allowances — now we have hospital services from the federal government. This is all good legislation, but friends, it is all socialistic in nature. You know, they unbend once in a while when they see the need — when they are pushed enough; when they get pushed — M.J. Coldwell fought them tooth and nail.

I am a little long-winded anyway, but I suppose the other people have subjected this legislature to much in the same manner, but I want to take one gentleman to task, and I do it not because I want an argument but because I feel I would be remiss in my duties and responsibilities, as a member of the United Church, if I didn't say something about it. I think the impression was intended, I believe, that a certain document in the 'Observer', where some of the United Church clergy had attended the New Democratic Party founding convention. I did not quite understand what he was getting at, but it seemed to me that he was trying to insinuate that somehow or other the New Democratic Party was trying to use this article for political propaganda. That is the thing I object to.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . the church, not the organ.

Mr. Dahlman: — Or the church, it doesn't make any difference. I want to read just a bit out of the 'Observer' of August, 1961. These people here are suggesting certain things that maybe the New Democratic Party here was using this organ and the church to further its cause. Here is what the observation is, from the 'Observer':

“The Social Credit Party last month chose Robert Thompson to be the new national leader, and while the Observer naturally supports no political party, we do think our readers would be pleased to know that Bob Thompson is a man whose life has been motivated by Christian faith and the desire to serve others.”

“Long before he got involved in politics, or reinvolved, as a young man in Alberta he took the Social Credit platform, he was a friend of the Observer, and its editor.

We first met him at a little church near Markverville, Alberta, when back from college for the summer he spoke at a young people’s service on our student mission field. His family, Norwegian in background, was Lutheran, but many of them attended the local United Church. Later he volunteered to go to Africa as a missionary for the Sudan interior mission.

A few years ago, bad weather sent the plane we were on en route into Northern Rhodesia into Addis Ababa. A young Ethiopian, knowing we were from Canada asked, “Do you know Dr. Thompson?” We didn’t, and refrained from adding that Canada is a big place. He was so enthusiastic about the Canadian missionary we went out of our way to visit the Sudan mission, and looked up this esteemed Canadian. Naturally, we were delighted to discover he was an old friend. For years he worked with lepers in Ethiopia, and persuaded his younger brother to go to Ethiopia and help in agricultural work.

Personal family conditions made it necessary for him to return to Canada. A few months ago he came to our office to investigate United Church co-operation in a plan to get the scripture recorded in some of the Canadian Indian dialects, by Gospel Recordings, Inc., a sort of Bible Society on records, for people who cannot read.

Speaking of politics, numerous correspondence criticized us for reporting the Liberal and Conservative leadership convention a few years ago, when we said then when another party had a leadership convention a few years ago, when we said then when another party had a leadership convention, we would cover it, so next issue we hope to report on the Rev. Tommy Douglas, or whomever the New Party chooses to lead them.”

October 17, 1961

I want to vindicate the 'Observer'. I am sure the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) feels sorry now that he made a reference of this kind. I am going to read now . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I am going to say to my hon. friend that I never said that — that I consider where the mentality of the person that that statement just came from.

Mr. Dahlman: — It is not going to deter me from reading some more. I think it is a good document. Religion and politics have always been mixed by earnest Canadians, especially on the frontiers in bad times. The new parties of the thirties had preachers as founders and leaders. Now the New Democratic Party has enlisted the support of a substantial number of ministers. One political commentator says that Canadians, especially western Canadians, love an evangelist at election time. He says that is how Mr. Diefenbaker has swept the country. They should enjoy the next election campaign with a Baptist Prime Minister and a Baptist Douglas going to it — an ex-missionary, Robert Thompson preaching for the Social Credit.

“Liberals may be confronted by the memory that Mr. Pearson's father was a Methodist preacher. If they were preaching for a pulpit call, Mr. Douglas would get it. The New Party was the best political convention we have covered . . . “

The hon. member read that part of it.

“ . . . a number of delegates paid their own way as delegates, and demanded that they hold 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 a Liberal or Conservative convention.”

Let's read a bit of the editorial:

“Some of the ministers attending the founding convention of the New Democratic Party last month had misgivings about their activity as Christian ministers in a political party, and certainly some of them will be criticized by their friends, the church members, who believe that a man ordained to the Word and Sacrament should concentrate on preaching the Word, administering the Sacrament, teaching and counselling the people, and leave professional politics alone.

No one should deny a Minister his right and duty to assume full responsibilities of citizenship. This includes political action.”

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Wait until he continues before you clap.

Mr. Dahlman: — “Nor does anyone in this relatively enlightened age deny a minister’s right and duty to discuss political matters as he teaches and preaches to this people. All things which come between a people and their God — hunger, unemployment, Sunday work, race discrimination, or governments that fail to do their duty, are his field.

The churches’ task among others is to “wage war on evil and work to establish right relations among men.”

We are grateful for the great contribution of some ministers who have entered politics. We hope, too, that ministers who are enthusiastic for the New Party will make a worthy contribution, and that their actions will be judged with Christian grace, and that they will remember it is, after all, just another political party, not an institution created by God to save Canada.”

October 17, 1961

Mr. Gardiner: — I agree with the statement just read. Those are my views.

Mr. Dahlman: — There are many churches taking a direct interest in social and economic affairs these days. For example, I wish to read from an article in ‘The Leader-Post’:

‘Social Doctrine Education Urged by Catholic Meeting

The ninth annual Catholic social life conference ended Sunday night with resolutions ranging from a call for government initiation of employment projects to a need for education in social doctrines.

The three-day conference sought initiation of projects by federal and provincial governments in areas where unemployment is having “detrimental physical and spiritual effects.” It also sought assistance for “family farms” by means of legislation providing effective control of prices and markets.

The 500 delegates urged a large-scale immigration program to exploit Canada’s agricultural potential and the provision of subsidies, if necessary, to farm families to preserve the family farm — “the cornerstone of the Christian social order.”

The necessity for Roman Catholic educational institutions at all levels to develop courses in social doctrines of the church and the establishment in Catholic colleges of industrial relations departments was also stressed.

The resolutions were presented at a dinner attended by nearly 1,000 persons who ended the conference.

Among the 11 archbishops and bishops from various Canadian dioceses at the dinner was Archbishop G.B. Flahiff of Winnipeg, who in his summary of the conference, said:

“We should start at the earliest possible moment to instill in children” notions of the dignity of man and labor.

“Suggestions by Pope John XXIII ranging from increased home markets through immigration to active support of co-operatives as means of helping the Canadian farmer were discussed Sunday at the ninth annual Catholic social life conference.

The big question in Canada, said F.E. Von Pills of Saskatoon, is “who will own the land and who will do the work. Will it be free, independent farmers, or will it be collectives run either by big corporations or perhaps even the state?”

The Saskatchewan Farmers’ Union public relations officer and executive director of the Roman Catholic diocese of Saskatoon’s rural life movement told 500 delegates the present economic position of the farmer “is precarious”.

Suggestions for dispelling these problems also included balanced prices and costs for farmers, organized marketing and professional associations and political movements.

Mr. Von Pills reiterated Pope John’s view that agriculture is a depressed sector of the economy. He presented statistics showing a trend towards fewer and larger farms, a smaller share for farming of the gross national product, lower farm net income and higher farm costs. He described the call for a sharp reduction in the number of farmers a “myth of the economic man.”

Mr. Speaker: — I must say while we do have extracts read, illustrating certain things in your address, if the article is very long it is just as well not to read the whole article.

October 17, 1961

Mr. Dahlman: — There is just one other thing I wish to deal with just shortly, and that is labour. I don't know how the members opposite ever expect to attract the labour vote. Who is Canadian labour? Today I think about three out of every four people born and raised on the farm have to go outside the agricultural industry to make a living. So they are going into the labour force, and into the other segments of our society. It is a strange thing, but it so happens in Canada today, it might be the only country in the world where this is true — that roughly half the labour force in Canada today came either directly or indirectly from the farms, and that is the group that the people opposite are so afraid are going to take over and do something bad. I think that is an insult to the integrity of our Canadian public.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

You know those things that they believe, that the labour party in Canada are some sort of Reds. In any election that has taken place anywhere in Canada, the Communist party candidates have never drawn over 4 per cent of the vote. What are they afraid of? They're afraid of their fellow Canadians. I would be happy indeed if labour had taken political action a long time ago. That is where they made their mistake, in North America. I think that is where labour, perhaps, in the United States, has become a bit one-sided, because they didn't have any political responsibility. As organizations, they were politically benign. Elsewhere in England and Europe, labour has been active in politics, and once you involve them in politics, then they are going to have to answer for their actions to their people.

That's a good place to have labour, or anybody else — in a place where they have to be responsible to the electors. I think it is high time that labour has taken a position in politics in this country. I have no fear. Insinuation has been made that labour dominated the convention down at Ottawa. They did not dominate the convention at all. It was only the last day that we discussed agriculture. I don't think labour's program came up for discussion.

What I like about the new party and the convention, and the formation of the new party was that we were getting groups of people in this country that were so sick and tired of the old parties that they are willing to take one step forward. They are willing to take one step forward; they are ready to walk in and take responsibility for the economic welfare of this country. They are now becoming full-fledged responsible citizens in a political way.

Yes, it is true enough that at the convention maybe we had those that were perhaps a little bit to the left and those a little bit to the right. You could entrust the responsibility of government with either group, and they would probably come up with the same sort of a program, and the same result which would have been the middle way, which is where the CCF now stands. We have the same philosophy; we have the same things in common; the same things to fight for. In my opinion it is time, as the Premier has often said, that in this country it is time we had a choice, and this time we will have a choice.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Dahlman: — In closing I just could not leave this unsaid, either, and I think that all of us here were left a little bit numb last Friday evening, after the Premier had given his farewell address to this Assembly, after 17 years of holding that office. But one member took advantage to get a bit tough with him — it was entirely uncalled for. It was a loathsome display of social misbehaviour.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Dahlman: — I think he bragged about the fact that he had no fear of going back to his electors in his own constituency, but I think he ought to be ashamed of himself to go back there. I don't think that this legislature appreciated that very much on my side of the House, to tell the truth. I am going to do a bit more reading, and it is a very good document; one that I think everyone will appreciate, including the member from Melville, and this article is about our Premier.

Mr. Danielson: — Who wrote it?

October 17, 1961

Mr. Dahlman: — This was written by Jack Scott, Vancouver Sun columnist.

“This man Douglas is, well, how will I put it — he’s a good deed in a naughty world. He’s a little corner of sanity in a big asylum. He’s a breath of clean prairie air in a stifling climate of payola and chicanery and double-talk and pretense, global and local.

Forget politics. Here’s a man who wanted to do something for the improvement of the human race. He chose the method that seemed best to him. Quarrel with it if you will; he was motivated entirely by an ideal. No one ever slipped an envelope of bills under a table to help him get elected in return for special privileges.”

Mr. MacDougall: — The leader of the CCF . . . in B.C.

Mr. Dahlman: — He had no support from a powerful press or a powerful organization, or a powerful pact . . . He had, in fact, nothing but the incredible and a naïve (so they said) notion that he could do something to help his fellow-man; to give him a little dignity and pride; to make life a little less precarious in the jungle of dog-eat-dog society that is laughingly referred to as ‘free enterprise’.

He was and is a dreamer and a humanitarian, incorruptible, genuine and intellectually honest.

I might as well go all the way and tell you that he made me feel proud to be a Canadian.”

I am going to close just with that little statement, but I want to pay personal tribute to the Premier. He has been accused now of running away, he’s running away, but to a larger field. Destiny has called him to play a bigger role in the political life of this country. The people opposite may be happy to see him

go, because he has been a bulwark of defence for social progress in this province; he has never deviated or ever hedged. He stood and took it. He has had to take a lot that wasn't justified, and that he didn't earn.

In the new field he was called because we needed him there. There is a bigger field in the federal field. We have to, in our own way, in this province, lead the way, give leadership to the Dominion and in this new party; I am sure that everyone across Canada, the newspapers have given this Premier more good publicity than any individual has had for a good many years. Something new has been added to the political scene, as far as the Dominion is concerned.

Oh yes, we may not win the next election. Regardless of whether we do or not, we are going to be an influence on Canadian thinking. In that way we will accomplish our ends, even if it takes just a little more time, but this country, in my opinion — here we have some of the greatest people in the world. I am proud to be a Canadian. I am proud that we have the privilege of living in Canada. We have a wonderful country and we should make the most out of it. It would be a national disgrace for us, if we did not as a nation, give world leadership, and that is where we are going to take our interest from now on — the broader scene. We wish our Premier the best of luck, and I wish to assure him that the people on this side of the House, and all those who represent the CCF in this province, and the labour movement, that we are going to do our very best to see that his efforts are not in vain.

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I believe it is my duty, as well as the duty of my colleagues, to take advantage of the time allocated to them, to take part in this, one of the most important debates that has ever been held in this legislature.

To me this Speech from the Throne is certainly a defeatist document. It is devoid of hope; it is devoid of faith and it is devoid of charity. Throughout the course of my remarks I want to illustrate to you why I think it meets those statements.

October 17, 1961

While it is fresh in my mind, before I go into my address, I want to just briefly remark on some of the statements by the last speaker, insofar as they referred to the Premier, to his bidding of adieu the other afternoon when he spoke, and some of the comments which have arisen from them. I am speaking from my own personal opinion. Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure to know the Premier of this province for some good few years, and I don't think the Premier as long as he has been in public life, ever asked for any quarter, and never gave any in return. I think those of us who are engaged in public life recognize that fact.

To me the significant part of his farewell remarks the other afternoon were this, that I think they were given in good faith. If there were any interpretations taken from the remarks of the member for Melville, he stood steadfast in the statement he made, and I believe he believes in them in all sincerity. The last speaker went to great lengths to eulogize the Premier of this province a few minutes ago, but he cannot get off that easy, in my opinion. I remember year after year when people on this side of the House got up and presented constructive criticism; got up and tried to put their points of view across, if he couldn't defeat the point of view they tried to put across in the interest of the people of the province, on too many occasions, Mr. Speaker, he tried to destroy them personally.

That, I do not condone, and I think the person on this side of the House who bore the brunt of the attack over those years is, to my notion, the most respected man in the House — our senior member, the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson).

I think the other man in this province who stood second in bearing the brunt of the attack was the father of the member who made those statements. Now I say, as long as we are in public life we are entitled to our opinions. If we can back up the statements we make, then we should accept responsibilities for them. As I say, I don't think the Premier ever asked for any quarter, and he never gave any in return. So some of the remarks which have been interpreted from what was here a few days ago, I think is just so much eye-wash to play on the sympathies of the public.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to some of the speeches on the other side of the House, and the one of the member who just sat down, especially, I could in no place during the course of his remarks, find anything whatsoever in it of a constructive nature. Then I thought of the remarks made by the member for Kelsey this afternoon, the Minister of Mineral Resources, when he intimated to us that sometimes old books, old documents were to be treasured.

So I think I can sum up my opinion of some of the statements and speeches which have been made across the way, by the statements made by one of their former presidents in this province, and I refer of course, to Carlyle King. I imagine after he, having to listen to many of the same type of arguments, the same type of speeches, it put him in the position where he had to write these words. The member who spoke just now used the 'Financial Post'. I am going to use his own party organ, and I refer to the 'Commonwealth' of July 27, 1955. This sums up, I think, some of the subject matter in the speeches we have heard:

“Sometimes when I look at the total body of resolutions sent in from constituency conventions, or listen to the discussion of those conventions, I wonder if our CCF members are interested in anything beyond the parish pump or the local beer parlour.”

Then, in the Speech from the Throne:

“Where is your constructive matter; where is your subject matter; where have you outlined anything that would help the people of this province?”

Here again, is what he has to say:

“Who nowadays is either much disturbed or much aroused by a socialist program, and where can you find the socialist party that has had a fresh idea within the last 10 years.”

Mr. Speaker, those statements were made in 1952, and we have now another nine years since that time. These are not my thoughts; these are the words written by their own past provincial president, and if he has left the party since then he must have left it out of dire frustration and utter disgust.

October 17, 1961

I was very interested in the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources this afternoon. I have always respected his ability, not only when he was house leader of the opposition in this province, before the advent of our present Premier, but during his term here, and I have a high regard for him inside and outside this House. I would imagine it must be a disappointment to him after having stayed with the party, being a senior member all these years, to find himself in a position now where, when the leadership changes hands he will not have the opportunity in his last days as a CCF member, to have the honour of leading that party.

I would think, and I would imagine after the leadership convention in Saskatoon some two weeks hence, when they appoint an undertaker for the party, that he will once again be very disappointed that he hasn't had the privilege of leading the party that he helped form several years ago.

What were some of the things that he said this afternoon? I intend to deal with a few of these in the course of my remarks. One of his statements is this: "One of the things that puzzles me is the concern given by the opposition to the new party." That is what the member for Kelsey said this afternoon. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am a farmer representing a rural seat in this province; a constituency whose people derive their livelihood from agriculture in the main. I think that not only myself, but my people are very concerned with this so-called 'new party'. I believe that they have just reason for this concern, because they know who has been trying to form the party; they know of the actions of some of those promoters of the party, and they know of results in all parts of the country from some of these gentlemen.

I think the thing that concerns them most is the fact that it is no longer an agrarian movement. The people across the way pride themselves, and have done over the years, because of the fact they said their party had started from a grass-root movement and from an agrarian movement in these western provinces. Today we find that is no longer so. We know that those who are taking the initiative in setting up this new party are mostly labour union leaders. That, I think, is born out from press statements that have been made in the past, and I would refer to a statement of none other than David Lewin, who is one of the organizers

of this party; he told a meeting in Winnipeg, a meeting of the Manitoba CCF party, that the new movement was first called by the labour unions, but the CCF is taking the lead in this development.

So, Mr. Speaker, we share the concern of the people of rural Saskatchewan because we know the agrarian section of this movement is being by-passed in favour of the labor union leaders.

I think that we have further proof of that by the actions which we have seen in this province, and actions we have seen in this House. I think of none other than some of those by our own Premier. It is quite apparent to us that to further his own interests, and to further the aspirations of the party which he has now decided to leave, will be done so at the expense of the farmer. We have only to look back, as has been mentioned a few times, at the grain-handler's strike at the west coast. At that time he had taken the part of the labour unions, and the part of those who had gone on strike at the expense of the farmers of this province and the expense of the farmers of western Canada.

There were vast differences in the level of living conditions of the two parties concerned, and I want to bring those out later on in my remarks. But the significant part of the whole thing was this, that the Premier at the time, or shortly before that, had been the Minister of Co-operation of this province, and being the Minister of Co-operation, represented some of the largest grain-handling concerns not only in the world, but in western Canada. Being not only the Minister of Co-operation, but also the Premier, and a Premier of a strictly agricultural province, we would naturally think that his sympathies would have laid with the farmer. But what do we find? We find that when the chips were down, he left the farmers and went on the side of the labour union bosses.

I am going to quote some of the conditions and some of the statements made by 'The Western Producer' the official organ of the farmers concerned. But to give you a background on the strike, I will quote from 'The Leader-Post', November 14, 1960:

October 17, 1961

“The demands on the strike of grain handlers at Vancouver are not against this Corporation, but aimed directly at the farmer, most of whom make considerably less than the members of the Union, A.G. Baker, general manager of The Alberta Wheat Pool said here.

Mr. Baker gave figures of current earnings showing that minimum annual earnings in the Pool’s Vancouver terminals was over \$4,900 and the average for all members of the union employed by the Pool was over \$5,100 in the year ending September 30, 1960.”

I go on from there to what is said in ‘The Western Producer’:

“ . . . to suggest that his suffering is incidental, and that after all the strike against the companies does nothing to repair the damage and hurt to the farmers, even now they are feeling as a result of the west coast walk-out.

The strike demonstration took place at a time when we hear many pious declarations from labour leaders concerning their regard for the farmer, but the strike graciously authorized by the union’s head office in Cincinnati was called, and the farmers have suffered.”

Then I want to compare that with conditions on the farms in the homes of some of those farmers who are affected by that strike. I think we can best illustrate that by a set of figures. In 1958, the net income of farm operations amounted to a total of \$224 million. This is in the province of Saskatchewan, or an average of about \$2,200 per farm unit. On this basis, assuming 4.1 persons per farm family, there would be an average per capita income of \$546, stemming from farm operations, or about \$1.50 per person per day.

So it has been said by the editor of “The Western Producer’, in spite of all the pious declarations of the labour leaders and the Premier himself, when the chips were down, when the rural people of this province needed protection, he abdicated and

went on the side of the larger union.

Another illustration of that I think could be pointed out by the attitude taken by the present Minister of Co-operation in this House. Prior to his becoming the successor of the Premier as Minister of Co-operatives, when he was vice president of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, on different occasions he would come into this House presenting briefs on behalf of Saskatchewan Farmers' Union. He not only presented these to the government, but he also presented the briefs to the opposition. In that brief, as I remember, when he came to see us, one of the items they were asking for at that time was the cancellation of the gas tax for farm trucks. The other one was the abolition of the mineral tax. Then last session, Mr. Speaker, when opposition members introduced those two motions in the House, what was his stand at that time? In both cases he voted against the Liberal resolutions. But here, when he was representing the farmers of the province, these are the things he wanted enacted by this legislature. When he became a cabinet minister, associated with his socialistic colleagues, he forsook the farmers and went on the side of the labour unions of this province.

The words of the Premier have still not been forgotten in the instance of that west coast strike. When he was asked by farmer organizations why he had taken that stand, he said, "The grain companies have exploited the farmers in the past and it is possible they may be exploiting the workers now." Here he was, the Minister of Co-operation, supposedly looking after the interests of the largest co-operatives of the world, and accusing them of exploiting these few people who are getting over \$5,000 a year, in comparison with farm wages and the farm net income in this province of about \$1.50 per day per capita.

Mr. Speaker, we have found that since coming into this session we have once again experienced the same pattern that has been going on over the past seven years. Every session that has been called by the CCF government in the province of Saskatchewan has seen new or more tax increases placed upon the statute books of this province. Year after year after year, new taxes have been put on the statute books, or raises in old taxes have taken place.

October 17, 1961

So when we are called in for what has been called a 'special' session, once again we come in to place on the statute books of this province new legislation that will institute and levy more taxes on the already over-taxed people of Saskatchewan. The CCF have never understood, or never put into practice the basic principle of levying taxes. When you levy taxes in this province you must remember firstly, that the people must be able to pay, and secondly, the people must be willing to pay. What are the records of the CCF since coming to power in Saskatchewan? We find that across the board taxes have increased by about three and one-half times, but on the other side of the ledger we find that arrears of taxes have also increased by a likewise amount. It was only as late as two years ago when the rural people of this province were \$14 million in arrears of municipal taxes; \$11 million in arrears of larger unit and school taxes; \$3 million in arrears for the farmers' installation of power, bringing power services into the farms; over \$1 million in arrears for monthly billing accounts for power; three-quarter million dollars in arrears for mineral taxes. This is the situation of farm people of Saskatchewan who today and in the past have born the heaviest load of any segment of our society, as far as taxes are concerned.

After a period of ten of the most prosperous years in the history of this province, we are on the verge of a depression. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, how many years in the future — if we have ten years like we have at the present time, how will farmers ever be able to carry on their operations if taxes keep increasing by that amount, and new taxes are imposed.

No other person in our society in this province bears the amount of taxes that the farmers of this province do. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the whole folly of the CCF levying of taxes is their continuous statements that they are trying to make the rich pay for the poor, or they are trying to indicate that it is on a basis of ability to pay.

Just for your information, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to you why I think the farmers of this province will not be able to carry this tremendous tax burden any longer. We must realize that over \$5 per cent of the farmers in this province, according to the records of the wheat board office in

Winnipeg, are on between three-quarters and half-section farms or less. The bulk of the farmers in this province are the small farmer.

It may be interesting to note there are between 600 and 700 farmers in the section category. It may be interesting to note that about 1,000 farmers are three-section farmers in the 1251 acre category. Then we go on to where we find the big farmer. We find that farmers owning six or seven sections (which would be classed as big farmers in this province), there are only ten. Farmers holding over eight sections, are only four. Farmers holding over ten sections, there would be only three. So, when we are levying taxes on the farmers in this province; when we are asking them to pay for additional services, we must remember that the bulk of our agricultural industry is supported by some 65 per cent of the farmers who are in the half-section and three-quarter section category, or less.

The average acreage in Saskatchewan today for holdings is 402 acres, and in spite of the fact that we think in terms of big farmers when we are bringing down this legislation, we should be thinking in terms of the average farmers in Saskatchewan. I can remember on past occasions before I was a member of this House, accompanying delegations to interview the cabinet — on behalf of the farmers, asking them to cancel the tax on farm fuels and greases. I can remember the Minister of Highways at that time saying the reason we don't want to cancel that tax is because we want to get some of the money out of the big farmers. So, when you study the policy of CCF tax implementation, they are always trying to indicate that they are going to make the big fellow pay for the small fellow, but as against the 15 'big farmers' in this province, the bulk of Saskatchewan's 104,387 permit holders have to pay the major lion's share of the service.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say before we bring down further legislation, imposing new taxes on the farmers of this province, the first thing we should have in Saskatchewan is a policy whereby we could increase the production and set up services, whereby the farmer can pay for these additional taxes, or pay the taxes he already has. That is my criticism of this government today, that no leadership has been given in the Department of Agriculture; no policies have been implemented; no programs are in operation today to get the

October 17, 1961

farmers out of the present recession they are in.

The Minister of Agriculture has repeatedly said that his responsibility ends after the goods have been produced, but if we are going to get the economy of this province back on a solid basis, then he must take full responsibility for lack of leadership; lack of policy and lack of program to get the farmers out of the position in which they are now in.

When I mentioned the excessive taxes in this province, I wanted to refer to one holding in my own seat — my own constituency, and that is in an area where we have what is classed as heavy land. There is a holding which is comprised of one and one-half sections, and I want to give you some comparison between the taxes on that parcel of land when the government came into power in 1944, and what they are today. In 1944 the total taxes on that one and one-half sections of land was \$385.10. In 1959 it was \$1,187 — a tremendous increase in that period of time. On top of that, on the same land there is an additional \$24 in mineral tax. Then when you add up the mineral tax, hospitalization taxes, etc., you get into the category where it is well over \$1,200 in taxes.

In the past few years there have been three crop failures on this parcel of land. Then, when the farmer went into the elevator one day to deliver his grain, the elevator man said he would have to put his name on the elevator list. After all these years, building up the land, seeing his taxes increasing year by year, and suffering three crop failures, he was in the position where he couldn't pay his taxes, and his name was placed on the elevator list.

I would just like to ask you tonight, Mr. Speaker, what will happen to farmers like these if we have to go through 10 years of similar conditions as we have experienced this past year. That is only one person. In that same area there were a great many more in the same circumstances.

Mention was made this afternoon by the Minister of Mineral Resources about the new assessment of farmlands in this province. He said on his farm he had been reassessed and his assessment went up. He gave as the reason for that the fact that he had been clearing some land. Well, I know in my own municipality and my own district where people have had their land reassessed,

and the assessment has gone up, and they haven't cleared any more acres of land. It was a reassessment and an increase in assessment on the cultivated land they already had before the assessment was made.

I have pointed out the tremendous increase in taxes; but here again they are being caught in a reassessment. I want to give you, Mr. Speaker, the difference in the assessed values of municipal lands, town properties, cities and villages in the period since 1944, to show that not only has there been an increase in taxes, but to show they have increased the assessment and got these people both ways.

There is a significant increase here again all across the board. In 1944 the rural municipal assessment was \$627 million. I will just give the round figures. In 1959 it had increased to \$704 million. In towns, in 1944 it was \$40 million; in towns, 1959 it increased to \$88 million, or twice as much. In the cities it has risen from \$107 million in 1944 to \$290 million in 1959. In the villages, from \$51 million in 1944 to \$69 million in 1959.

So I would point out to the members across the way (somebody says it is more abundant living), the tremendous increase that has taken place by not only raising of taxes themselves, but at the same time raising the assessment.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Would the hon. member be prepared to answer a question?

Some Hon. Member: — You wouldn't know anything to ask a question about, Bill.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Are the buildings the same buildings they were ten or fifteen years ago, that you are stating they are at this time, or was this a building program in the villages and towns?

Mr. McFarlane: — Listening to the speakers on the government side of the House, we have heard much about this so-called 'ability to pay'. Today in Saskatchewan we find that the people are being led to believe that the rich are still going to have to pay for these services to carry the poor. But we can only go so far in that regard also, because if you study the income tax returns for this province you will find that some two years ago, over 50 per cent of the farmers of this province weren't even in the tax bracket, so

October 17, 1961

that lets them out. Then the percentage who were in the income tax bracket, in what we would class the two or three hundred dollar bracket, was very small indeed. That follows the same pattern as with the business section of our province. So, if the people are going to be led to believe that the rich are going to be paying for the poor, the first thing that is going to happen in this province is that the remaining few people are going to have their financial backs broken sooner, and there will be no such thing as this myth of the rich paying for the poor.

The figures on social aid alone, I believe, would substantiate that because we have found an ever-increasing number of persons have had to apply for social aid during the last few years. I would suggest that with the crop prospects, the drought situation at the present time, there will be even a larger number of the rural population on social aid this winter. So this myth of the rich paying for the poor will be exploded and everybody will be paying, whether they can afford to or not. It is getting to the point where people are being taxed to death. Farmers can no longer shoulder the heavy tax burden in this province, when they have to pay for these additional services, medical care and all the other additional services, something has to go — either taxes are going to be left unpaid or hospitalization is going to be left unpaid. I would suggest that if we are going to have these increased taxes, and charges increased, then what will probably happen is they will find themselves with a terrific debt load on their shoulders.

Some of the remarks made by the Minister of Mineral Resources about the farmers and the opposition being concerned about the formation of the new party give rise to concern. I believe, as I have said they have reason to feel that way. I suggest his own actions with the new party, and especially down at the convention at Ottawa would give rise to anyone in this province casting a wary eye in that respect. Someone has remarked about taking articles out of context. I want to briefly review some of the actions of the minister himself. It is very interesting to note that not only at a CCF meeting at Swift Current a short time ago, when the press was not allowed, but also at their founding convention at

Ottawa, we found that the freedom of speech had been curtailed.

The people were very concerned when they found out that delegates to the convention at Ottawa, before they could get up and speak, had to have their credentials checked. It would appear that at that convention there were some persons appointed by the convention who had to make sure that any prospective speaker had to be passed by them. Then it will amaze the people further to note that a suggestion was made down there that before any person could accept the new party candidature in a constituency, that person's candidature had to be approved by a committee that was being set up. Then it was also interesting to note that the Minister of Mineral Resources was one of the chief spokesmen on that committee. It was interesting to note that at the meeting, I believe it was at Swift Current a few years ago, when the press was barred and the reason given at that time for barring the press, was they said the press had the habit of taking things out of context and making the party look in a bad light.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have never believed, since I have been in public life, and especially in this House, in using a church, magazine or papal encyclicals as the subject for debate.

An Hon. Member: — You can't get off the hook that easy.

Mr. McFarlane: — I was ashamed to find two members of the House within recent days, Mr. Speaker, taking a papal encyclical, taking passages out of context and trying to further their own party views. This principle was abhorred by a CCF convention in Swift Current. They wouldn't let the press into the convention in case the press would take statements out of context, and we find two members on the government side of the House doing that very thing in this legislature. That, I think, is reaching an all-time low in public debates.

Much has been appearing in the press regarding this new party. The farmers have had the opportunity to see where Mr. Jimmy Hoffa and his teamsters union are ready for a big organizational drive in Canada. I am going to quote to you from a clipping of September 8th, 1961, where it says:

October 17, 1961

“We are going to concentrate on Canada as soon as we can complete our consolidation here, said Harold J. Gibbons, 51-year old executive vice president of the one and a half million member international union, and a buddy of Hoffa, the union chief.”

Then we go to September 25th, 1961 and we see another press release:

“Max Greenberg of New York, international president of the 168,000 member union said the international union has already contributed to the new party. He would not say how much.”

Then the significant thing is this, that here in Saskatchewan we are led to believe that this is a grass-roots movement and all contributions are going to be made on a grass-roots level or from prospective members themselves. Here in Canada today we find one of the biggest and best-heeled political machines being set up in this country. As the member who just sat down said, he referred to it as a social vehicle. So it would seem that what Mr. Lewis had said previously, that the reason the new party was being called for by labour and organized by the CCF, it would appear that it will be one of the strongest political machines ever to be formed in this country.

Then another very interesting item appeared in ‘The Leader-Post’ of October 2nd, 1961. This has caused a great deal of concern because it came from one of our own cabinet ministers in this government. When the delegates to the CCF-NDP in Saskatoon became worried and wondered how they were going to get farm support, and wondered why they hadn’t had as much farm support as they should have, we find that Mr. Davies got up and said that the reason they didn’t have the farm support was because people had always been telling them that one of the reasons that farmers had to pay high costs for their services was because of labour costs. The statement that he made there was that prices could be lowered even more if industry would cut out the waste, Mr. Davies said. Pointing out the annual advertising bill in the United States for one item of fancy wrappings for goods was \$55 billion, or the equivalent of \$500 for every family.

Well, that is a surprising statement for a minister of this government to make because he has sat in cabinet and he has seen members of his government, year after year over a period of years, spend millions of dollars in advertising their monopolies. I refer, of course, to the Power Corporation, to the Government Insurance, and to the Saskatchewan Telephones.

The Premier, in his address said the Liberal party was the friend of the Sifton press, and the mortgage companies. So I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Sifton press never had a better friend than the government members opposite, when they can hand out thousands of dollars year after year for straight political propaganda. The significant thing in this expenditure is that it has always been the highest in the years of a provincial election.

Now I want to deal, for a few minutes, with a statement by the Premier in regard to the Liberal party being the friend of the mortgage companies. One of the first things that happened when a CCF government came into power in this province was to get rid of mortgage companies, and the adverse effect that has resulted from that move was that farmers in this province, over the years, could not obtain loans for expanding operations. Farmers on the Manitoba border had access to that type of service. Farmers in Saskatchewan did not. We were in this House a few years ago when they had to amend an act so that housing administrations could be changed, so people could get loans. Over that period of time we have seen the exodus of some quarter million people off the farm lands in this province.

Now the Premier said that the Liberal party was the friend of the mortgage companies, and that the Liberal government had never done anything for the farmers in this province. Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal party in the past was the friend of the mortgage companies, then I don't think that these figures would be very significant, and I would suggest to you that if the farmers of this province ever had a government favourable to them, it has been a Liberal government at Ottawa and a Liberal government here in Saskatchewan.

After ten years of continuous drought in the 1930's, what was the record of a Liberal government in Saskatchewan? After one year of drought, what is

October 17, 1961

the record of your CCF government here in the province in respect to the farmers. Well, I am going to tell you for the benefit of new members here. Mortgages from 1934 when the Liberal government was returned to June, 1944, in mortgagees and agreements for sale, \$37,140,000 had been written off. In taxes and tax deed certificates, \$24,617,000 written off. Relief cancellations already made \$85,841,000. Relief cancellations authorized by legislation in 1944, \$38,335,000. Adjustments by the provincial debt adjustment board, \$2,791,000. School land contracts, \$13,276,000. Homestead purchases, \$931,000. Provincial land, \$733,000. Local government boards, \$2,512,000, and then when you take the amount cancelled by the farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act, it is true it was a federal deal — an additional \$37,181,000 or a grand total for the provincial legislation of \$206 million. Add on the \$37 million and you would have a grand total of \$240 million. That, Mr. Speaker, is what a Liberal government in this province did to try and help the farmers and the people of this province get back on their feet.

What is the record of the CCF government, after we'll say two years of adverse conditions? Some two years ago when we had crops under the snow we found that all the farmers in this province had received from this government was \$3 million. Then this year when we were faced with some of the worst conditions in the history of this province, certainly the worst since 1937, what is being done by the people across the way?

I remember when the members on this side of the House had a meeting in Saskatoon this summer to discuss problems arising out of the drought. After the meeting was over we issued a press release, and we said this is what we think the federal government should do, and this is what we think the provincial government should do to help the farmers of this province. After all, many members had experienced these conditions in the time I refer to. When that report was published in the newspaper, what did the Minister of Agriculture say? He said, "All the Liberal party was doing was playing politics." Then later on when the terrific shortage of water became apparent, the leader of this party asked the government if they would do something in regard to stock watering and deep wells

in this province. Then when you read the press release from the Minister of Agriculture, all he could say was that the suggestion was too silly and wouldn't even be given consideration, and that it would be dealt with in the manner it had warranted.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — On a point of privilege, if the hon. member is attributing that statement to me, I never made any such statement. I haven't made any comment on the Liberal convention as yet, and I still don't know what they are.

Mr. McFarlane: — I will give you the press clippings here, Mr. Speaker, if he wants the press clippings — that is the statements emanating from him.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Quote them.

Mr. McFarlane: — I have lots of time — I will quote them. If they are not here, they are in my files, but Mr. Speaker, I will have them for the hon. gentleman if he wants to see them. Here is one: 'Minister Answers Thatcher's Charges.'

“He said Mr. Thatcher's statement on lack of ground water to replace surface water is too silly for comment, and will be judged accordingly.”

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that Mr. Thatcher was referring to the water in the potash mine at Esterhazy.

Mr. Thatcher: — Make your own speech.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — This is what he was talking about. The hon. leader of the opposition will verify this.

Mr. Thatcher: — No, I won't.

Mr. McFarlane: — That, Mr. Speaker, is the sum and substance of what the provincial government has done to date. It was interesting this afternoon to note, when some member on this side of the House (the member for Pelly) was speaking, explaining the agricultural program in Manitoba, and the actions

October 17, 1961

taken by the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba in regard to tying up the fodder reserves in that province, the feed situation, etc., the Minister of agriculture got up and interjected to say that “he had got his ideas from me”. Well, Mr. Speaker, if he got his ideas from any Department of Agriculture official in this province, he was getting ideas that had already been rejected here, because during the years the CCF government campaigned prior to 1944, stating that the first thing they would do in this province, after the experience of the drought in the 1930’s would be to build up feed reserves for the maintaining of the livestock herds in Saskatchewan.

On top of that they were going to see that adequate water supplies would be established. Besides that they were going to store feed grains and granaries and storages were built for that purpose. Then over the years, and in fact the other day, I asked a question on the order paper as to where the storage facilities that were set up in those days were at the present time, and what they were being used for. Well, I appreciate the humor of the Minister of Agriculture when he said “We don’t know what they are being used for now, because we disposed of them” — so that is how he has prepared for an emergency of this type.

Then the great fodder reserve bank program was established. When we came to the period of years when we needed a fodder reserve bank most, what do we find out? We found that there wasn’t one tone of fodder in these feed banks, and that the whole policy was later discarded. When Mr. Hutton established a feed bank policy in Manitoba, when he advocated the setting up of fodder reserves, feed banks on a municipal basis, I imagine that is what the Minister thought when he said that possibly some of (his) Mr. Hutton’s ideas came from him.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — As to where these feed banks are in Manitoba which the government set up — where are they?

Mr. McFarlane: — So that I think, Mr. Speaker, indicates how the government of this province intends to deal with the farmers in a case of this type of emergency.

I read out to you some of the expenditures paid out by the past Liberal governments on behalf of the farmers. Now, I am going to further show how the Libel government best served the interests of agriculture in this province by their record of 1937 to 1938. For agriculture alone, the number of farmers receiving assistance in that period of time was 80,000. The value of seed wheat supplied was \$7 million. The value of feed oats supplied was \$8 million. The value of seed barley supplied was \$1 million. The value of feed oats supplied was \$6 million. Feed, grain, gas and oil for summerfallow, \$700,000. The total for agriculture was \$24,450,000. Then we go on from there. That was in a period when the average net revenues from revenue budget amounted to approximately \$19½ million.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Where did those expenditures appear in the . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — Today the average of your provincial net revenue budget alone would amount to an average of \$100 million over the last 10 year period — within \$2 million, give or take either way. There is the difference between what this government does for a farmer, and what has been done in the past to carry the farmers through. If we have another ten years of similar conditions, what are you going to do? Each one of you in turn has stood up in this House and talked about the Power program — how they have put power on the farms. Well, the farmer paid \$500 on an average to put that power on his land, and then what happens — what is going to happen this time next year if we have this same type of climatic conditions? Your actions don't indicate that you are going to do what past governments have done. Today, if the farmer is in arrears, after a certain period of time, on his power account he gets a letter saying that if the power bill isn't paid within three days' time the power is going to be cut off.

What has been your record in regard to the payment of mineral tax? Well, after that legislation was instituted if the farmer didn't pay his mineral tax, the mineral rights reverted to the crown and he lost his rights, and it went back to the province, which is exactly what this government set out to do. That is how you treat the farmers who are in arrears with mineral tax, and then what will you do after ten years' time, or even a year's time if he is

October 17, 1961

in arrears of hospitalization tax or this new medical plan tax. Will he have to pay a fine and will he have to go to jail, as it is on the statutes at the present time? That is what we want to know when we are in this legislature at a time of economic emergencies such as we have today.

Then a Liberal government set up what I think was probably one of the major things in establishing diversified farming in this province. I refer to the establishing of the P.F.R.A. The program that made the farmers of this province prosperous, I believe to a greater degree than anything else was the program of water conservation.

Because in this province we know that we suffer drought failures, and we know that conditions are such that preparations have to be made for alleviation of the farmers, the P.F.R.A. was set up, and then the farmers had stock watering dams, stock watering dug-outs and because of that and because of climatic conditions which were favourable, we found that our cattle population reached an all-time high, until I believe a year ago it was 1,900,000 head of cattle. I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that this doesn't represent a surplus of cattle in this province. This represents a figure which the farmers of this province are going to have to maintain if they are going to carry one economically, and more of this should be done in dry land areas.

I would suggest this to him, and time is fast running out — something has to be done in regard to this water situation to try and maintain some of these herds over the winter months. I was amazed when I read in the newspaper the other day of the new program which is being shared jointly by the federal government, the provincial government and the municipality. I am sure that that must have originated from P.F.R.A., because if it had originated here, you would have taken credit for it, and there would have been all kinds of publicity and we would have known it. What I would suggest to the minister is this — that the time is short, the situation is critical and if there isn't something done in the very near future, there is going to be a large depletion of herds in this province.

In my own area, which I think was probably one of the hardest hit areas in the province insofar as the drought was concerned, we had 1.6 inches of rain during the growing season. Because of the shortage of rainfall and because of no spring run-off, at the moment there isn't a reserve of water on the farms. In my locality alone, a group were out trying to bore wells, and the last results I heard the other day, out of 14 wells bored, some as deep as 130 feet, only seven had brought in water.

I would suggest that, regardless of the statement he made in reply to Mr. Thatcher, earlier on this summer, that in all sincerity something should be instituted immediately, and some help given to try and see that those herds will not be depleted.

I want to draw to the attention of members on the other side that we have been continually criticized as they say, for 'not bringing up constructive criticism and not offering suggestion'. I recall when we were dealing with the Minister of Agriculture's estimates, some two years ago, we pointed out to the Minister then the possibilities of shortages of water in this province. I think that we pointed out to him in this province. I think that we point out to him that some equipment should be provided to try and make sure that the level in the stock watering dams be brought up, and that water could be pumped. Then I was disappointed to know that this spring all that was available to the farmers of this province was one pumping unit. Then as the situation worsened . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . and pumped your dug-out full, too.

Mr. McFarlane: — I have the answer from the Minister of Agriculture. I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question on the order paper the other day — how many units were in operation as of May 1st, this year, and his answer was 'one'.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . and you know . . . yes or no.

Mr. McFarlane: — . . . according to your information, and if this information is not correct, Mr. Speaker, then I think he should apologize to this House, because on the answer to the question as of May 1st in this province, there was only one pumping unit in operation. At the present time there are only five. So I would say to you, sure you have five pumping units operating in this province, but have

October 17, 1961

they been used to towns? I am not complaining if they have been used for towns, but if they are being used for towns, then you must have enough to pipe to transmit the water over at least two miles.

What the people are up against in the country today is the fact that they are being told there is only enough pipe to pump the water one and a half miles. Now, there are some areas where the farmers could have the water if they could get more pipe, and if there was more pipe put on for their disposal, then more water supplies could be set up for the winter. So I leave that as a suggestion for your department to try and at least get something done before it freezes up. That is why I believe that lack of foresight and lack of policies have endangered the cattle population in this province, and has endangered the economic status of many of the farmers who depend on cattle to supplement their cash income.

The Premier said that the Liberal party was the friend of the mortgage company. I want to indicate to him some other programs that have been of great benefit to the farmers of this province. I don't think any farmer would turn down P.F.A.A., which was instituted in 1939, and for the information of members of this legislature, I would like to give you some idea of the amount of collections and the amount of benefits that have been received by the farmers of this province.

I think it is significant, Mr. Speaker, that when you look at a map of this province and realize that P.F.A.A. has been instituted and payments have been made for 21 years, there are some points in this province who have received a P.F.A.A. payment every year for 21 years. There are many areas that have received as high as 18 payments out of the 21 years. Many 14 and many 15, and so forth. The significant thing as far as we in Saskatchewan are concerned, Mr. Speaker, is that we have paid in a sum of approximately \$72 million — \$72,554,000 to be exact, but we have received from P.F.A.A. (the farmers of this province) 702,024 payments in the total of \$172,768,000 or \$100 million more has been sent back to the farmers than what they put in originally.

It is also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that if you average the payments out, while it doesn't happen this way in practice, it would amount to each farmer in Saskatchewan having received P.F.A.A. payments seven times. While I say that some of them have received it twenty-one times, some have received it eight times, fifteen times and so forth, it is true that some areas have received it only once, twice or three times. But this alone has been a tremendous help in the farm economy of this province.

Now we have gone into crop insurance in Saskatchewan as they have in Manitoba. When crop insurance was first discussed in this province, I believe members on this side of the House, and I believe the Provincial Treasurer from the other side of the House pointed out that in years of severe drought or adverse climatic conditions, the revenues of the province wouldn't be able to stand the payments that would have to be made to a great many farmers and over large areas.

I think when we think in terms of crop insurance, and when we realize that if we are going to go into crop insurance we must abandon P.F.A.A. I think with their record on the books like this, we should do a much as we can to at least preserve the P.F.A.A. type of insurance over as large an area as possible. I am led to believe that in the province of Manitoba, this year, where they had a higher sign-up than we did here in Saskatchewan, their crop insurance plan is in difficulties. As they started out to try and carry the plan on their own, they find now that they have to ask the federal government for assistance. So I would say to the Minister of Agriculture, when he is looking at his program, trying to adjust it to see what he thinks may be done, I would suggest that if we are going to have climatic conditions such as we have today, that in the interests of the economy of the province at least, then we shouldn't abandon altogether the type of insurance that we have under P.F.A.A. I think it would be of interest to members to know that in that period of 21 years there are 42 municipalities and L.I.D.'s in the province who have received over \$1 million in that period of time.

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out, these are some of the things which would refute what the Premier had tried to indicate was the position of the Liberals in this province. I would be remiss at this time if I

October 17, 1961

did not ask the government, because of the fact that we are an agricultural province, because of the fact that as far as Canada as a whole is concerned, we are recognized as the great agriculture province of the dominion, I believe that it is the duty of this government to set up agricultural policies that will strengthen the income position of the farmers of this province.

I believe that we have the conscientious staffs in these departments to carry out any project that is given to them. To administer and set up plans that they may be asked to do. I am indeed disappointed that this provincial government over the years has not seen fit to come up with a sound and aggressive and practical agricultural policy. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the only agricultural policies of any account, that they have in this province today are carry-overs from former provincial governments. You can go into any policy you want to look at — as far as the animal industry branch is concerned, your stallion policy, your pure bred sire policy, your boar policies and so forth are the same as were instituted on the books at that time.

You go into the extension department, the forage policies and so forth were placed on the statute books before. There are swine clubs, calf clubs, poultry clubs, colt clubs and all that were instituted and in effect in this province long before the CCF came into being. All that was done was the name was changed to 4-H, and so it went on as that.

Mr. Speaker, I say for all practical purposes nothing new has been developed in the way of an agricultural program by the governments that sits to your right. I am afraid that now that the end of the train is in sight, in order to save their political hides, that they are going to no longer exist as the party that they are at the present time. I am afraid that under the new set-up, agriculture is going to be forsaken.

I was not surprised, Mr. Speaker, when the Speech from the Throne was handed to us and nothing was mentioned of the economic plight of the farmers in Saskatchewan. I was not surprised when nothing was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne to bolster the small businesses in this province and the people who operate them. I was not surprised to know that nothing was being done for the wage-earner, and for the worker who is employed by these businessmen in the

smaller communities of Saskatchewan.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the reason for that was this, because these people across the way were no longer representing the party that they asked the people to elect them as, and because their alliance is now with this new party, at the moment they have no agricultural policy. If nothing was put in the Speech from the Throne that would help the farmers of this province, it was because for all intents and purposes they are no longer the CCF party they were elected as; they owe their allegiance to this new alliance of labour union and socialists, and then they have no policies for the smaller businessmen of this province.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there was no mention made of agriculture; there was no mention made of unemployment, there was no mention made of help for the people in this province who have to pay the cost of all these services, because for all intents and purposes, they are no longer a CCF government. They are an alliance between the labour union bosses and the old-line socialists, and until they have their convention there will be no policies laid down to take care of this type of problem for this province.

Mr. Speaker, I have never yet and never intend to support a want of confidence motion or program for socialism. I have never done and never will, and at this time I certainly can't see my way clear, to support a program which in effect would be giving this government a vote of confidence. I have never believed in their policies. I believe that as far as an agricultural province is concerned — it has been proven beyond any shadow of a doubt that they have failed to build and to give Saskatchewan that degree of prestige and that degree of stability, and degree of aggressiveness that a strictly agricultural province such as ours deserves, and should have. I believe it isn't the policies that they didn't put into effect, Mr. Speaker. It isn't the promises that they didn't carry out that has ruined this province. It is the promises and the policies that they did put into effect that ruined the economic status of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe that something should have been done for the basic industries of this province, because I believe it has been neglected too long, I will support the amendment.

October 17, 1961

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I arise in this debate primarily so that I may be enabled to make a statement of policy with respect to one aspect of the Department of Education. Prior to turning to that, I would like to make one or two comments on the Speech from the Throne and one the remarks of the hon. members with respect to the speech.

I first would like to add my word of congratulations to those expressed by other hon. members to you for representing us at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in the United Kingdom this summer. I think we all owe you our gratitude for representing us so ably and so well.

I would like also to express a word of congratulation to the mover of the motion, the hon. lady member for Regina, and the seconder of the motion, the hon. member from Touchwood. I am always very pleased and proud when I hear the hon. lady member for Regina make a speech in this House. I am pleased because I think she is a credit to this House, and I think that is a statement which will be agreed with by all hon. members. I am proud because she is one of my colleagues, representing the city of Regina. It is, I think, not given to many members to have a colleague who is so able and so gracious.

The Leader of the Opposition, in the course of his remarks, made a number of comments with respect to industrial development and with respect to public enterprise. His remarks have been added to by other hon. members, and I would like to comment briefly on one or two of them. I won't take much of the time of the House to join with him in his laments about the loss of industry, because apparently the horses are closing down. I doubt whether this is any evidence of a lack of industrial virility. I won't commiserate with him with respect to a company which was alleged to be in receivership, but which is in fact thriving and is not in receivership. I will not commiserate with him about the long list of companies which is alleged to have left the province by reason of the fact that they have been struck off the register of joint stock companies. The Premier dealt with one of these companies, I thought rather effectively.

Mr. Thatcher: — It wasn't on the list!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — It was on a previous list. I know one of these companies which was from eastern Canada, and which so far as I am aware had never done a day's business in Saskatchewan but had placed its name on the register because they had thought it would help them in a particular legal action which was carried on on their behalf by a very fine legal firm in this city, and the action was successful, I am happy to say.

Mrs. Batten: — How does he know?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Well, as a matter of fact the action was carried forward by one of my partners, and whatever his virtues may be, they do not include socialism.

At any rate, the action was brought to a successful conclusion, and this company felt that it should not carry its name on the list. So this is another of the companies which evidently left the province because of this socialist government.

I did want to comment on a few of the remarks with respect to public enterprise. I detected in the remarks of a good number of the hon. members a further and continuous attack on public enterprise of the type which I heard in the House during the last session, and which I am sure hon. members on this side of the House have heard for many sessions past. We heard them branded quite improperly, I suggest, by the hon. leader of the Opposition as 'pet theories and unproven ventures'. He again re-stated his opposition as did a number of the other members to borrowing for public enterprise, opposition to borrowing for power and telephones. He deplored the increase in the gross provincial debt from 1949 to 1959, I think those were the dates he used. He deplored this substantial increase in the gross provincial debt, every penny of which is due to borrowing for power and telephones — and every penny . . .

Some Hon. Member: — . . . borrowing for the Power Corporation head office.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — This certainly is not included in these figures. The figures you were deploring do not, I suggest, include very much for the head office of the Power building. I will come around to that particular building which will be erected

October 17, 1961

in the city of Regina. But whatever may have been included in those figures, they did not include figures for the head office building of the Power Corporation, and notwithstanding that, the Leader of the Opposition deplored this increase in the gross provincial debt, all of which, and indeed more than all of which (if I may use an Irishism which the hon. member for Cannington might use) — more than all of which is attributable to the fact that the government has carried on a program of expansion of power and telephone.

This borrowing was deplored, and it was suggested that this is a burden on the taxpayers — the interest on this debt. I think we can look at the public accounts ourselves and see what has been provided over the years for servicing the public debt by way of interest, and we can see that the sum has decreased from 1944 when it was \$4.4 million and decreased steadily to the figure which it is now, which is under \$2 million. This is hardly consistent with an increase in debt, unless hon. members are taking the position that money borrowed for power and telephones ties a millstone about the neck of the taxpayer. If that is their position, then their position is clear and we are happy to know this. If it is not their position then surely their statements are not consistent.

I think that we here in this side of the House are in favour of borrowing for power and telephones because we believe in public power. It is certainly socialism, and I suppose we on this side can easily believe in this, and I suppose members opposite have difficulty in believing in this. Since the hon. member for Morse is pledged to eradicate socialism, as I believe he said, he is presumably pledged to eradicate public power. There may be some who say, “Oh well, public power really isn’t socialism, because it was introduced by the Liberals. It is sort of different from socialism.”

This would have been a position which some hon. members opposite could take, but not the hon. members for Morse, the Leader of the Opposition. He, as a matter of fact, indicated his position in some chit-chat across the House, earlier in the debate. Someone (I think it was the hon. member for Cumberland but perhaps it was some other member) said, “Even in British Columbia the Social Credit are taking over the British Columbia Electric Company. Even they are marching into socialism.”

The Leader of the Opposition's comment was, "They are socialists, too". Now they don't have many other attributes of socialism, I can tell you that. So the only attribute which he must have attributing to them was the fact that they believed in public power.

Mr. Thatcher: — It may have been a good comment, but it wasn't mine.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I will accept the hon. member's word. It was one of his colleagues. I take it that he is repudiating it.

Mr. Thatcher: — It may have been a good comment, but it just wasn't mine.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — It seems to me that if hon. members opposite feel that the Social Credit people in British Columbia are socialists by reason of taking over the B.C. Electric, and surely this is their only claim to that august title, then clearly they must believe that public power equals socialism. I am perfectly willing to accept this equation. I hope they are, and I hope they are honest when they say they want to eradicate socialism and admit that at the same time they want to eradicate public power. I believe this is what they want, and I hope they will inform the people of Saskatchewan that this is their position.

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I can see how they won the case.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I appreciate these remarks of the hon. member for Maple Creek. I only wish the judges were as much impressed.

Mr. Speaker, there were a number of things in the Speech from the Throne, two primarily. These are medical care plan, or the reference to the legislation which will be brought in to introduce into this province a medical care plan, and the legislation with respect to the imposition of income tax, as a result of the changes in the federal-provincial tax-sharing arrangements. I would like to say something about each.

Mr. Speaker, I might at this time request leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The House adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.