

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Fourteenth Legislature
6th Day

Wednesday, October 18, 1961

The House opened at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

STATEMENT RE BILL NO. 56

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to inform the Assembly that yesterday His Honour in Council proclaimed Bill 56, The Mineral Contracts Alterations Act.

The Mineral Contracts Renegotiation Board has effected a compromised settlement between farmers and several of the mineral rights companies. Under these settlements, the term of the leases has been reduced from 99 years to 20 years, plus a further ten years at the option of the company, plus any additional time during which the leased substances are being produced. Under the compromise, the delay rental will be increased to 50 cents per acre, with the results that the farmers will receive 25 cents per acre for the duration of the lease. The companies, in addition to this, have agreed to return to the farmers all minerals in excess, or in addition to petroleum and natural gas. Potash will be the most valuable of these minerals to be returned.

A large majority of the farmers (more than 31 per cent even more than 41 per cent – in fact more than half the farmers in Saskatchewan having deals with Canuck Freehold Royalties Limited, Dome Petroleum Limited, Bueno Oils Limited, Prairie Leaseholds Limited, and Prairie Minerals Limited have endorsed the settlement along these lines. some of the oil companies have offered to go a little further, to extend the same revisions to farmers who had not even made complaints or filed applications before the Board, so that the benefits of this renegotiation will extend to hundreds of farmers who had not even availed themselves of the Board's services.

Canadian Williston Minerals Limited, however, is the one company in the Prudential Trust group which has declined to make an acceptable offer for renegotiation. It is to deal with this company on a compulsory basis that Bill 56 has been proclaimed, Mr. Speaker. The House will recall that when this legislation was presented to the legislature,

October 18, 1961

it was justified on the grounds that the recalcitrant companies should be forced to make some concessions which would bring them into line with the voluntary concessions of the other companies.

QUESTION RE IPSCO PERSONNEL

Mr. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Could the Minister say whether Mr. Jack Cameron, general manager of the Prairie Pipe Company has resigned, and Mr. Phil Webb, Sales Manager of Ipsco, if so what is the significance of these personnel changes?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I have no information on this, and I have no statement to make.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well then I should like to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government given any consideration to changing the top management of Ipsco as the Board of Directors have asked?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the government does not make changes in top management, or other management, so far as Ipsco is concerned. I do understand, and I do know a number of top people in the operation end of the Steel Company who have been brought in recently.

CORRECTION RE NEWSPAPER REPORT

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to have a correction made concerning a speech I recently made in this House. On October 18 in the Leader Post I notice an article which says, "C.C.F. Accused of Favoring Reds". I don't know what the hon. members opposite gathered from what I said in replying to the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, when he pointed to the economic progress in West Germany, but I did point out at that time that the reason for such economic progress is the fact that American dollars were going in there. I feel I have the right to speak what I consider to be the truth. At no time did I say that East Germans were coming into West Germany because of American dollars.

I did say that my impression was that in East Germany the Russians did not assist these Germans in establishing a high economy. I want to say at this time, and make it clear to all listening that I resent any insinuations that I have at any time supported the Communists, or that I have been a Communist, or anything of that nature. I'm a social democrat; I'm proud of what I am. I'm a good Canadian, and I hope the other members will recognize me as such, and not impute motives and allegiance to parties that I do not have anything to do with. I would like to see that this article is withdrawn. I hope the members who have misled the press will make the necessary corrections.

QUESTION RE WEYBURN MENTAL HOSPITAL

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and the Minister of Social Welfare, in the light of statements made by Dr. Clancy, who is the Superintendent of the Weyburn Hospital. Is the government taking further action to see to it that other institutions where foam rubber mattresses are being used will be done away with in the same manner they are being disposed of at the Weyburn Mental hospital, because of the fear of the harm that might take place, due to fire?

Premier Douglas: — The government appointed a royal commission to investigate the unfortunate fire which took place at the provincial hospital at Weyburn. I think it would be a mistake to draw conclusions merely on the basis of newspaper reports; we think that former Mr. Justice Thompson will make a very full investigation and will give a very complete report. On the basis of that report the government will then be able to decide what action should be taken in the light of his recommendation.

I think, however, to jump at conclusions would be somewhat premature.

Mr. Gardiner: — As a supplementary question, I just wonder if the Minister of Health or the Premier could say whether the foam rubber mattresses are being used in most of the institutions of the province under the charge of the government?

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to say whether all foam rubber mattresses are being used, but I do know that a good portion of them are foam rubber mattresses; certainly the newer ones.

October 18, 1961

I am quite sure foam rubber mattresses are not used in the provincial jails. I am making inquiries as to the number of foam rubber mattresses that may be used elsewhere.

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:

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, last evening I indicated that I wished to say a few words about the two subjects which had been made subject for comment in the Speech from the Throne — that is the proposed medical care bill and the Federal-provincial agreement, and the statutes which will have to flow therefrom. I indicated that I wanted to say one or two things about the comments which had been made by members opposite and by members on this side of the House on the debate on the Speech from the Throne.

I would now like to turn, Mr. Speaker, to a few comments on the Federal-provincial agreement which have been dealt with so ably by the hon. member from Touchwood, and to sum up my views on what should be the principles which should be incorporated into any particular Federal-provincial agreement. Some of these I stated during the last session of the Legislature, and I promise hon. members opposite, that I would not be dwelling on them at any particular length, but I did outline again the position which was taken then, and which I think is the appropriate position for anybody in this province to take.

I think I said that I believed that Federal-provincial agreements should incorporate four essential principles. The first one that I suggested should be included was that of tax simplicity. In a country such as ours, where business is carried on nationally, where corporations operation nationally, where individuals obtain their income from activities which are carried on inter-provincially and nationally, it seems clear to me that taxes such as income tax, corporation tax, and succession duties should be applied on a national basis. We have heard this feeling put thus: that we should have

a simple, clear tax structure, and should not have a tax jungle. So I am submitting that the Federal-provincial agreements should contain in them the idea of tax simplicity; the idea that the federal government should impose one tax on personal income, corporate incomes and estate successions, which should be applied equally all across Canada. That is principle No. 1 – tax simplicity.

The second principle is the one of tax sharing; that is that the proceeds of the taxes from these particular tax sources should be divided between the provinces and the Federal government. As we all know, both the provinces and the Federal government have the constitutional right to impose these taxes; both could do it; both have done it in the past; it is therefore only reasonable, on a theoretical basis and on a practical basis, that the combined sums from these three tax fields should be divided between the jurisdictions which can, in fact, raise them separately if they so desire.

We all agree on this, I think, and the only discussion which take place between the provinces and the federal government concerns the basis upon which these returns ought to be divided. I don't think there is any theoretical basis on which we can decide what would be the fair basis of division, and I don't think today's fair basis will necessarily be tomorrow's fair basis. These are the primary sources for tax revenue for any national government in Canada, and the proceeds from them must necessarily be divided, I am suggesting, on the basis of the governmental obligations which rest, for the time being, on the provincial governments or the federal government. These obligations will vary. In a time of way it is clear, I think, that the primary obligation of government will rest upon the federal government, and it will have to take the lion's share of these tax revenues. If defence expenditures, because of international conditions, are not so great, then clearly it seems to me that more ought to be made available to the provinces, if the provinces welfare benefits for the people of Canada.

So I don't think there is any theoretical level which we can say is right and just – that the provinces should get 20 per cent and the federal government 80 per cent, or vice versa.

The third principle that I want to suggest is that not only should these taxes be divided as between the provincial and federal governments, but that the provincial governments' share should be distributed to the province on the basis of equalization.

October 18, 1961

As you know, this principle has been abandoned by the present government at Ottawa, and I know that members on the other side of the House deplore this as much as members on this side of the House. The present government at Ottawa has adopted a sort of principle of averagization, if I may use that rather awkward word, which means that no province will be any worse off than the national average. This is a far cry from the previous principle which is contained in the agreements which were in force from 1947 to 1952, where the equalization payments were brought up to the level of the average of the highest two provinces. This is still not equalization, but manifestly the level of the two highest provinces is a better attempt at equalization than any principle of averaging.

I may say that when they ask for the division of the provincial share of these three tax fields on the basis of equalization, they, the poorer provinces are making a concession, simply by asking for equalization. They are making a retreat from what might be called a fair and just division of these taxes, and a retreat from the principle of fiscal need; a retreat from the position which was advocated by the Rowell-Sirois Commission which made the most exhaustive study of Federal-provincial fiscal relations which has ever been made in our country.

That commission, which made such an exhaustive study, reached the conclusion that the taxes ought to be based upon the principle of fiscal need, and even a basis of equalization is a substantial retreat from fiscal need. But this province, and other provinces have been willing to make this concession to the wealthier provinces. Any retreat from the principle of equalization is that much more unfair; that much less justifiable. And once again I want to repeat a truism here: these provinces are not poor because of any defect of the people in the province; they are not poor because the people are less energetic; they are not poor because of the people being less able; they are poor because of the application of economic policy.

I think everyone knows that the location of industry in Canada is determined by the national policies which this country follows, (and I am not complaining about the national policies which this country follows), I think all of us know that if this nation did not pursue a national economic policy; if it did not apply any tariffs; some parts of the country would be relatively very much better off than they are now. One of these parts of the country would be Saskatchewan. Certainly Saskatchewan is one of the provinces whose product is most viable on the world market. We are the people who produce a product which will sell on the world market.

We can produce wheat probably as cheaply as any place in the world, and it is manifestly not true that a textile mill in eastern Canada can produce textiles as cheaply as any other place in the world, nor can cars, nor many other products be so produced.

So the particular advantage enjoyed by the central provinces in Canada where industrialization has taken place, and has brought with it tax potential is not due, I am suggesting, to any superior characteristics of the people in that area, but due to the application of economic policy.

Again, I want to say I am not objecting to these policies. I think if we are going to exist as a nation, we must protect certain of our industries. I am not in favour of the level of protection on all industries which appears to commend itself to the present government at Ottawa, but then neither are the members opposite. We would probably have some quarrel with some of the aspects of protection which we see. But none of us in advocating a complete abolition of this national economic policy. What we are saying is that the advantages and disadvantages of this national economic policy ought to be distributed among all the people of Canada. It seems to be only common sense; it is fair and just.

So that we say the tax revenues which are fundamentally generated by the application of this economic policy; (the corporation taxes, the taxes on large personal incomes; and the taxes on large personal estates which stem from this industrialization), and ought to be distributed on the basis of fiscal need, because mind you, the need has been created by the unequal rate of development, and the unequal rate of development is due, I am suggesting, to the particular way in which the national economic policy has been applied. So we say they ought to be distributed on the basis of fiscal need. But if they are not distributed on that basis, surely the minimum basis that justice would commend is the basis of equalization. Any sort of retreat from this could not be justified on any basis other than that of, political expediency.

This position has been made clear, and I am sure it is not controversial. I just wanted to repeat it again, and to repeat the three principles which I have enunciated so far, (1) that we should have a simple tax structure; (2) that we should have a structure wherein the yields of these three taxes, (income, corporate, and estate), are distributed and divided as between the provinces and the federal government; (3) that the provincial governments' share ought to be distributed on the basis of equalization.

October 18, 1961

The fourth point really stems from No. 1 – the tax simplicity one, and that is that these three taxes ought to be controlled by the federal government in order that they may be used as a basis for applying fiscal and monetary policy.

We believe – I am one who believes, that the responsibility for unemployment must rest with the federal government. No province in this country can solve all employment problems by itself, since no province is a closed economy. A province can't keep products in or products out; it can't keep people from coming in or people from moving out, nor should it be able to. We have a national economy; it can only be regulated nationally. If I am to place at the door of the federal government the responsibility for solving problems such as employment, the responsibility for keeping our economy operating at a high level, which I do, and which I think members on this side of the House do, and many members opposite do, then I must agree that the federal government must have the tools in order to do this job which I am saying is theirs. And certainly one of the tools – one of the effective tools, in the hands of the federal government, is the ability to stimulate the economy, or to retard inflation, by a lowering or a raising of taxes, by an adjustment of tax incentives.

These, then, are the principles which I think out to be included in tax rental agreements, or tax sharing arrangements.

We have seen, and I think we have all deplored the fact that many of these principles are being abandoned by the present government at Ottawa. We are going to see the end of tax simplicity. We are going to see the imposition of a whole series of income taxes, which will mean that income taxes will vary in each province; that corporation taxes will vary in each province, and the possibly succession duties. We are saying that while the principle is agreed that the gross take of these taxes ought to be shared as between the provincial or federal governments, we are saying that this is not to be done on any basis of equalization; it is to be done on a basis of averagization, and even then it is being divorced from the tax yield as such, and has been introduced as a sort of separate item which can, I suspect, be adjusted at that whim of a federal government. Please note that these agreements, these 1962 arrangements, have come about as a result of whim or decision of the federal government, and certainly not be agreement between the federal government and the provinces.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We are saying that the federal government is, at the same time, divesting itself of one of the tools which it should be using to control the economy; divesting itself of the right to control the level of corporation taxes; control the level of income taxes, so that these might be used to dampen down an inflation, if one occurs, or to stimulate the economy in a time of recession. These, I am saying, are the principles which I think ought to obtain, and which are being abandoned by the federal government.

I want now to make one comment on this. I think it will follow from what I have said, that I believe the provinces are entitled to a share in these tax revenues as a right, and that when they raise with the federal government the amount which the provinces are to get, they are simply bargaining to obtain something that is theirs, and I do not think that a bargaining session such as this is one that calls for any particular expressions of gratitude from the province to the federal government.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — These are not grants which are given by the munificence of the federal government, but it is I am suggesting, the right of the province to share these tax fields. I want to pay full credit to the St. Laurent government, for introducing the agreements which were in effect from 1952 to 1957 (if my years are right). The principles in that agreement – perhaps the levels weren't just what we wanted – but the principles were the best principles. From 1957 to 1962 we have seen sort of a retreat from the pure principle of dividing up these revenues; from 1962 on we are going to see a retreat from sanity, so far as I am concerned.

I am suggesting we are not required to be grateful to a government at Ottawa which gives to us that to which we are properly entitled. I am saying this has been the position taken by all the provincial premiers. I don't know whether the approach taken by the provincial premiers between 1957 and 1962, in relation to the Diefenbaker government could be characterized as one of gratitude. I don't think it is fair to say that this government has complained more than others. I think it is grossly unfair. I can recall dealings between provincial governments and the federal government – provincial governments headed by Liberal premiers, and I don't know what term you would apply to the attitude assumed by Mr. Smallwood in his dealings with the federal government, but if you would term that an attitude of gratitude, I certainly would not.

October 18, 1961

I reach back in my memory to try to find words of gratitude spoken by Mr. Smallwood, in reference to Mr. Diefenbaker or Mr. Diefenbaker's government, in any dealings with the federal government, notwithstanding the fact that the Newfoundland government is getting more money per capita than other provincial governments are from Ottawa (and I think this is right and proper, because it is the poorest province.).

I don't hear Mr. Smallwood expressing his gratitude. I hear him complain that it is not enough. I think perhaps he is right on that score, I don't blame him for not being grateful, because I don't think it is the position of the provincial premier in this particular situation, to be grateful. Nor need Mr. Lesage be grateful; nor Mr. Robichaud – they have spoken out that in their view this would not have wanted them to do anything else on behalf of their provinces, and I would not, indeed, want any premier of Saskatchewan to do anything else. To suggest that a premier who goes down to Ottawa and says that a 13 per cent share, or a 18 per cent share of these tax sources is not enough, is somehow being ungrateful – is, I think, totally to misconstrue the nature of these agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I want to digress for a moment. I am sure the House will forgive me, but I think this is an appropriate place because I have mentioned the Rowell-Sirois Report. Members will know of the great contribution made in the Saskatchewan presentation to the Rowell-Sirois Commission by Dr. George Britnell. As you know, Dr. Britnell passed away recently and I think all members would want to join with me in paying our tribute to him. Some of those who knew him and his work better, will perhaps want to add to what I say in paying tribute to Dr. Britnell. He was a man who had served this province faithfully and well over a period of several decades. His contribution is one which will continue to redound to the benefit of this province. He has been a provincial advisor on provincial-dominion fiscal relations for sometime. He made a tremendous contribution in the field of economics generally, in governmental economics, and I think particularly in the field of transportation economics. He was a man of many talents; he was very familiar with our municipal system in this province, and will be remembered as commission-author of the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report. He was an author; and many will know his book entitled 'The Wheat Economy', which established his reputation. His last great service to this province was in the preparation of the provincial submission to the Royal Commission on Transportation. He has, during all this time been an outstanding professor and latterly head of the Economics Department, University of Saskatchewan.

He has given inspiration to countless number of students who have had the benefit of studying under him, and his recent death at a comparatively early age will, I am sure, call up in all of us a sense of shock and a very profound sense of how much this province has lost.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to turn to other topics. I think I might mention in passing a number of comments which have been made about the New Democratic Party by our friends opposite. I have had the opportunity of travelling about Canada a little bit during the last couple of months, and have been interested in many of the comments which have been made with respect to the New Democratic Party. I have been struck by some of the divergence in comments. I come to Saskatchewan and I am told repeatedly, by members opposite, that the old C.C.F. is dead, that it is now a labour-dominated party, and that anyone who is not in favour of a purely labour-dominated party should promptly desert the C.C.F. and join a different Party. It is not longer the party that commended itself to the people of Saskatchewan in successive elections.

Then the story comes forth that this may have been once a party that had the interests of the farmers at heart, but certainly no longer. The old C.C.F. is dead. In contrast to this, I was amused at the approach used in Nova Scotia. There the approach was quite different. Here in Saskatchewan the C.C.F. has been markedly successful. I venture to say that the case in Nova Scotia is that the same success has not been achieved, and so the Liberal people in Nova Scotia were saying, as you might expect, "Oh, but the new party – there's really nothing to this new party. It's the same old C.C.F., and if you didn't support the C.C.F. before, you'll not want to support the new party." I found it rather intriguing. It's either the same old party or it isn't, and I gather its character will not materially change across Canada.

Mrs. Batten: — Just more than one face . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — More than once face. Oh, you're speaking of the Opposition. That's what I was trying to illustrate. However, I think I made the point, only I got a little help!

I did want to say a few words about some of the comments of the members opposite on the matter of medical care. I would have hoped that we would have received, preferably from the Leader of the Opposition, but possibly from one of his colleagues, a more or less definitive statement of the position of the Liberal party with respect to medical care, and with respect to the medical care bill.

October 18, 1961

I regret that I did not hear that. I regret that we were treated, as I felt, to addresses from members opposite, which displayed verbal contortions – that is perhaps the word I would select – I know the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) in ringing and repetitive phrases told us hour after hour (it was a good two hours) that the Thompson committee was unnecessary; that it was a complete waste of time; that all the information gathered was available in 1950; that the Commission must have been appointed as a mere stall so that somehow the implementation of this plan could be delayed until an appropriate time, from a political view; that he had himself urged the provincial government to get in and introduce a medical plan earlier – I think in 1958-59 and that there was no reason whatever to pay any attention to this redundant report; that we should get on with the job and get this medical plan put in as soon as possible.

I think to use a particular mode of address which has become popular, this was my impression of what he said.

Mr. Gardiner: — You're correct, for once.

Mr. Blakeney: — The member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) on the other hand, pointed out that the report was incomplete; that it was contradictory and that, in short, it would be folly to go ahead until we had received the final report of the Thompson commission. I think that is a fair statement of the ideas which he was conveying to us. We have the hon. member for Melville shouting "Forward", and the hon. member for Saltcoats shouting "Whoa" and hon. member for Morse (Mr. Thatcher) not clarifying the position at all.

Mr. Cameron: — You had better stay with education.

Mr. Blakeney: — Well I'm not too well versed on medical care – I concede that. I feel that I am not alone in that. Members opposite, particularly the member for Melville, treated us to a review of the development of medical and health care generally in Saskatchewan over the decades, and he made a point, and numbers of others have made a point, of the desirability of keeping the administration of medical or health plans 'out of politics', as the phrase goes. Certainly I may say the Liberals have been rather successful . . .

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Because in 1919 – I want to make it clear that I am talking about keeping the administration of medical care plans out of politics -

they certainly haven't kept medical care plans out of politics, or discussion of them, because indeed, as will be known to members opposite, they included a medical care plank in their platform in 1919, and as the member for Moose Jaw said, it should still be a good plank because it has never been used. They introduced the Health Insurance Act in 1944, and I think that is the right title. We had a lengthy report of the provisions of the Act, how everything that has been done by this government since 1944 could have been done under that Act, and how health regions could have been set up under that Act, and how medical care could indeed have been brought in completely under that Act. Perhaps they overlooked it, but I didn't find anything in the way of a plebiscite.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I really don't know. If indeed, this statute was put on the books by the previous Liberal government, and if the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) is correct in saying that under this statute, a medical care plan could have been introduced, and if indeed it did not provide for a plebiscite, then I can only assume that this devotion to the idea of a plebiscite at this time is a recent acquisition of the party opposite, it hasn't very much to commend it; and has never commended itself to the opposition when they were in power.

As I say, the Act was passed, but I think a study of the budget of that year will indicate that the sum appropriated to provide administration of this Act was nil, and this of course does indeed 'keep it out of politics'.

We then had the Cancer Control Act, 1944 and it provided for the establishment of a Cancer Commission. As the member for Melville has indicated, the Act has been changed perhaps not too extensively since that time. But again, the amount of money provided and paid out under The Cancer Control Act by the Liberal government was nil.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, what a falsehood!

Mr. Blakeney: — The hon. member for arm River (Mr. Danielson) will have a full opportunity to correct. We then move on to 1957 and we have the federal hospital plan, put on the statute books by a federal government, by a Liberal government, and again how much was paid out under this? You know the answer now – nil. So the pattern appears to have developed. It is permissible even to include them in your platform; it is permissible even to put statutes on the books, providing an election is imminent, but the thing you must not do if you want to keep medical care administration out of politics, is at any time implement the plans.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — This has been the policy of the Liberal government in 1919; the last Liberal government in this province followed this policy in 1944 with the Cancer Control Act and The Health Insurance Act. The last federal Liberal government followed this policy by putting on the statute books and a federal Hospitalization Act.

Yes, if money had been appropriated for it, and if action had proceeded under it it might have been a good bill. I am not criticizing this bill.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . and the new one didn't either, so . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say one or two words about the financing of medical care and then I will turn to one or two things about education and won't take any further time of the House.

What I wanted to say about the financing of medical care is this — that it seems to me that all of us agree that the people of Saskatchewan should receive a high level of medical services. I think we all agree that everybody in the province should be entitled to receive these services, and I think we are agreed that if people cannot pay for these services, they still ought to get them and they ought to get them on a relatively unqualified basis. Certainly this would be the result of the introduction of a plan which I think members opposite approve of — whereby the provincial government would pay the fees of indigents to private medical care plans. If this were done — let us say that the provincial government paid in respect of indigents the fees to a private medical care plan, to Group Medical Services for example and these people would be entitled to go in and use Group Medical Services just as freely as any of us who are members of Group Medical Services.

I am sure this was meant, to cover all those who couldn't afford to pay themselves, and I think we can assume that people who can afford to pay for medical services when they need them will get them. This is not the sort of thing that you skimp on, if you can afford to pay and need medical services. I think we can assume that all the people in Saskatchewan would be getting the medical services which they require, and no one would be deterred on the basis of inability to pay.

Now, if this is the intent of the members opposite, and this is our intention, we've got a very large area of common ground.

We are agreeing that substantially the same amount of medical care ought to be provided to the people of Saskatchewan, and we are, I'm sure agreed that it ought to be all paid for. There's no way that all this medical care can be provided without being paid for, and what we are talking about, in effect, is the method of paying. When members opposite suggest it is going to cost a lot of money I'm suggesting they are being illogical here; because we are each saying that the same amount of medical services are going to be provided, it is going to cost the same amount no matter how it is provided – unless you are in favour of skimping on the bottom.

It can't be otherwise. If you're in favour of providing for medical services for all the people of Saskatchewan on a good level, and if you're saying this has got to be paid for, then presumably it is going to cost the same, administration aside, it's going to cost the same whether it is done by government plan, or private plan. Certainly there is no deterrent in G.M.S. that I have found. There may be exclusions, but with respect to services provided, there is no reason why I, as a member shouldn't partake of them.

So we're going to provide the same services and it's going to cost the same amount of money, and when someone says we can't afford it now, I wonder what he's saying. He's saying that presumably someone has got to go short on medical services. It's not going to be the people who can pay for it readily so it must be the people who can't. So all we're really talking about is how we're going to pay for this, and who is going to pay for it. It is the position of the members on this side of the House, Medical Services, which everyone agrees ought to be provided at substantially the same level, and which everyone agrees ought to be paid for, and which accordingly we are going to cost the same amount – the question is how they ought to be paid for. Are they to be paid for by people when they're sick; on the basis of fee-for-service, the full amount paid by the person who is sick, or are they going to be paid for by all of the people through a tax which is raised partly on the basis of ability to pay, and which is raised on the basis of collecting it from people who are earning and well, and not from people who are sick and not earning.

I think this is the real nub of it. If members opposite can show that a private plan would be cheaper to administer, then I would be delighted if they would. If they can show this is going to cost the people any less money, then I would be delighted if they would. But I don't think it is at all valid to say that because this is going to be paid for out of taxes it is going to cost more, unless they are arguing that somebody ought to get less medical services.

October 18, 1961

If this is their argument I wish they would pin-point the people who aren't going to get these services.

I think this is the issue and I think it avails us nothing to complain about it going to cost more, because as I analyse the thing, it is not going to cost the people of Saskatchewan any more, and all we are discussing is, who is going to pay for it and how will we raise the money?

Opposition Member: — And who's going to control it. By compulsion . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Yes. By compulsion — there's no other way to get people who are at the top of the income ladder to provide services for the ones who are at the bottom of the income ladder, services which we believe are essential services and the right of everybody in the province. There is no other way to get the man at the top to pay for the man at the bottom, except by community-imposed taxes and this is compulsion.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Presumably this is not acceptable to members opposite, but if they take the view that nobody ought to be taxed to provide medical care for other people, this is a position which is hardly tenable in a western country where the idea of the state using tax money to provide medical care for cancer victims, for T.B. patients, or for older people has been well accepted by any group who makes any pretence at being a progressive party — but if members opposite want to take that position, fine.

I want now to move into the area of education and just to say a few words about how the medical care plan might affect education. Members have been concerned about the financing of education, as I think we all are, and I think the concern of this government is demonstrated by the increase in school grants from \$3,100,000 in 1944-45 to \$31 million in the last year. This is a very substantial ten-fold increase. I think it demonstrates some concern by this government and by all for the financing of education.

We have taken the position that education is in a large measure a local responsibility — that it ought to be

. . .

Mr. McDonald: — That isn't what the Premier said.

Mr. Blakeney: — The hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) will have his full opportunity to give us his views.

We have said that there ought to be the widest possible measure of local participation in the direction of education, and we have, as you know, powerful and viable school boards in the province, which require a minimum of assistance – from the Department of Education. This is as it should be – locally elected powerful and viable school boards.

Well, the problem comes of putting funds in their hands and it has been admitted by all, I think, that these funds ought to come partially from provincial sources and partially from local sources. The way funds have been made available, in part, from local sources has been to relieve local taxpayers of their burdens, and many burdens have been taken off the local taxpayer in order to leave this tax potential free to be tapped for local services, including municipal services and education. Members here know many of the things which have been done to relieve local taxpayers' burdens, the elimination of the public revenue tax, the assumption by the province of 90 per cent or more of the cost of social aid; the assumption by the province of a large portion of the cost of main market roads and grid roads, and bridges and culverts, and what have you.

We move on now, and I think this is one of the effects of a comprehensive medical care plan. If it is true that this plan will not be financed by a land tax, then we see that a large number of local taxpayers in this province are going to be relieved of tax obligations by a province-wide medical care plan. These are by no means small amounts. There are a great many doctor plans – municipally operated doctor plans in this province, as members opposite will know. The average mill rate raised for these people for their doctor plans, is 4.4 mills, and many of these plans are much more comprehensive and the mill rate much higher. There are some that go as high as 4.7 mills; the R.M. of Spalding I believe runs to 10 mills. Now then, it follows, clearly that if the obligations which are presently being assumed by these municipal taxpayers are taken over by a provincial plan, there will be a very substantial measure of tax potential here for other local services . . .

Opposition Member: — that's what you said last year.

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . including roads and education. I know very well that anything resembling 10 mills will provide very substantial tax yields in most of our rural municipalities, so I think this particular aspect of the introduction of a medical care plan should not be overlooked. We are again assuming that this responsibility, a local responsibility, or at least what was recognized by a large number of municipalities as a local responsibility, will be taken off the shoulders of the municipalities and transferred to the general taxpayers of the province.

October 18, 1961

Here again we are releasing tax potential so that it may be used for other local purposes, including education.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, my main purpose in rising in this debate was to be able to make a statement with respect to one aspect of the Department of Education. This has to do with technical education. Members will know of the need for an increase in this particular area of educational activity; members will be familiar with the rising labour force; the fact that a large number of our young people need to be equipped to obtain and hold jobs, and the need to provide for them facilities by which they may obtain technical training in order to assist them in acquiring jobs, in order to assist our province and our country with its industrial development.

With this in mind, I would like to announce a major new programme of technical and vocational training facilities for the province. The programme will include the construction of new institutions of technical education at Saskatoon and Prince Albert, and an extension of facilities now maintained as the Moose Jaw Technical Institute.

Dealing first with the proposed extension to the Saskatchewan Technical Institute at Moose Jaw, I want to advise that facilities there will be expanded by approximately 50 per cent. The present enrolment in this institution or the expected enrolment for this academic year, not all at one time but from time to time, will be about 2,000 students. This is considerably in excess of what was anticipated three years ago. Moreover it was found that the courses which have been offered have met with ready acceptance; that additional courses would appear to be useful, and accordingly additional trade and technical courses will be included in the new programme.

The institution in Saskatoon which it is intended to build will be comparable in size to the present Moose Jaw institution. Members will know that there has been operating in Saskatoon, the Canadian Vocational Training School which has been a sort of make-shift school operating in a surplus war building – a part of an old airport building, and this has done very valuable work in the face of difficulties because of lack of facilities.

The institution which will be built in Saskatoon will be approximately the same size as the present Moose Jaw institution; it will provide a wide variety of trade courses for the construction industry, and for service occupations, and this we hope will serve the central and the northern areas of the province.

At Prince Albert we propose something different; something which will be in part an experimental institution – or

at least its organization will be partly experimental, in that we will be building facilities which will be at one and the same time, a technical high school for school age students, and a vocational training centre for young people and older people who are outside the school system.

Members will know that there are technical high schools at Moose Jaw, Regina and Saskatoon but none at Prince Albert. A need was felt for a technical high school for school age people at Prince Albert. A need was also felt to make available at Prince Albert facilities for vocational training for those who were outside the school system. We will be building a building which we hope will serve a dual purpose.

Discussions have been held with the Prince Albert collegiate board, and the board of the Prince Albert school unit, so that the school will be available for students who come by bus to Prince Albert, as well as students who are resident in Prince Albert. We believe this will offer facilities for training for young people who are not now enjoying this training, and will particularly offer facilities for providing courses of training geared to the natural resources of the northern half of the province. It will give us a better regional pattern which we believe will give fairly adequate coverage for the time being, of post-school technical training.

I would be remiss, in announcing this programme, if I did not at the same time acknowledge the very substantial assistance which the province will receive with respect to this programme from the federal government. They have recently invited the provinces to sign a new technical and vocational agreement under which the provinces receive very substantial assistance in the construction of facilities such as these.

I think all members will be pleased that we were able to see our way clear to make this expansion in the realm of technical training, and provide additional opportunities for young people, both in urban and rural areas. Many of us will know that a large number of these students who attend these institutions are young people who come off the farms, and know that they cannot find a future in agriculture, and who therefore wish to join the labour force.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to deal with some other aspects and criticisms of the educational system advanced by some members opposite; the reference to the luxury of non-essential services.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): —Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of the hon.

October 18, 1961

Minister? I would like to know what prompted the Department of Education's location of these two particular institutions?

Mr. Blakeney: — I think I can answer that. In each case, a reasonably exhaustive survey was undertaken with respect to the likely pupil lead, as one might phrase it. We had reached the conclusion, that a technical high school as presently conceived, could not be operated with less than 500 students. Members might be interested in knowing that I asked my counterpart in Ontario what they felt to be the minimum number of students for a technical high school, and he said, "We don't go ahead unless we can see 1,000 students". Well, the likelihood of getting 1,000 students in one place in this province is fairly remote, except in the larger cities. Our planning has been on the basis that we need 500 students to offer a reasonably adequate technical training course. This we could not quite see in Prince Albert, but almost that number. We have not been able to see enrolment approaching this in any of the other areas which we surveyed. Again, this is the state of thinking in educational circles; not only in this province, but across Canada. Maybe someone is going to have to come up with some more thinking on how small a technical school can be and still be adequate. But this is the prevailing thinking, and applying these standards, and after our survey, it is indicated to us that Saskatoon and Prince Albert were the only centres that had a need for these facilities, where they could be used as fully as it appears that it would be necessary, in order to make them worthwhile.

Members will note that there are composite schools in many other areas of the province which offer courses in vocational work, shop work, household arts, business, typing, shorthand, carpentry, etc. The sort of technical school we are talking about is a thoroughgoing technical school which requires very substantial amounts of equalization and instructors who are primarily technical men, and only secondarily teachers. It is this type of school which is felt, in our present level of thinking, that the 500 students are needed.

Mr. Kramer: — Is there any date available on . . . (inaudible)

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — We have some data available. I don't know . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Don't worry -

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — . . . just precisely what form you mean, but I would be very happy to discuss it with the hon. member.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. minister a question, and that is, he stated the purpose of the school in Prince Albert (and I might say I am very happy about it) would be to have courses that would qualify young people in the natural resources. I was wondering if, in view of the fact that quite a number of students in the north who have to come from the northern districts, there would be dormitory accommodation . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — On a point of order. If the hon. member is going to make a speech on behalf of his area, I think every other member should have an equal opportunity to get up and voice his opinion as to why the school should be in one location, or whether it shouldn't be. That is not a question. He is making a speech saying why he thinks the minister may have made an error . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — I am asking a question of the minister and the question is this, Mr. Speaker. Is there going to be provision for dormitories in this particular school for the northern people?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think that is a good question, and I would say that I am not now in a position to announce that there will be dormitories. The question of dormitory accommodation is one which is much vexed with respect to these schools, and it is a much vexed question in Moose Jaw. But we are not now planning to embark upon any provision for dormitory facilities for any of the technical training facilities which are operated by the province.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to comment on some of the remarks made by hon. members opposite, particularly by the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) who referred to non-essential services; what savings could be made – and I assume if he shares the view of some of his colleagues, that one of the alleged non-essential services would be the adult education branch of the Department of Education. I just want to refer to one comment which appeared in a recent issue of the Leader Post in which the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) indicated that the adult education branch was a dangerous organization; presumably he would dispense with it forthwith if he came into power. I just wanted to draw to his attention an article in the same newspaper on the same page further down, under the heading 'Adult Classes Popular', and the dateline in Melville. It says:

“Terrific” is the way that Public School Trustee Mrs. Esther Weinstein described her response to adult education classes which began in the Melville high school Tuesday night.”

October 18, 1961

I don't know whether he's going to dispense with these or not, but I think if he is, he should direct his remarks to the Public School board of Melville which has operated these classes on a grant basis from the adult education branch of the Department of Education.

Mr. Gardiner: — I can assure the minister if the whole article was there he definitely would know that it was the political implication of the adult education branch that he was referring to – it should have been the university.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think from the remarks I have made it will be reasonably obvious that I am opposing the amendment, and I wish to support the motion.

Mr. Karl F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, I too wish to associate my words of congratulations to yourself and to the mover and seconder of the Address-in Reply. I wish to congratulate all participants in the debate. I think they are making a sincere effort to come up with something which is exceptionally good.

I would also like to take this opportunity of wishing well those cabinet ministers who suffered illnesses; it is good to see them back, and I hope they are healthy and well now and will be able to carry on their duties as they have done in the past.

I was also going to particularly congratulate the speaker; who just sat down. He did make some wonderful points in certain places, however, last evening I couldn't help but be amused at the case he was trying to make for what is supposedly socialism, and I wondered if I could use any part of that in my classroom when I deal with the particular area. I don't think he really intended to convince anybody that he was right. However, I do say that I was impressed by the remarkable principles that he enunciated that should be carried out at the federal-provincial conference. I was most impressed by those principles, and I am a little disappointed that this government does not see fit to apply those same principles when they are dealing with their own local government in this province. He said particularly that the provinces should not be one iota grateful to Ottawa for what they get from them; that is their rightful share. So it may be. However, every speaker on that side of the House has attempted or at least indicated that not only should the local governments be appreciative of what this government has done for them. They should not be one iota ungrateful, and woe betide them if they ever are. They will just be cut off that much sooner.

So it is, if this particular principle is valid on the federal-provincial conference, certainly I hope he can convince the rest of the government members that the same principle should be applied in dealing with unit boards, in dealing with municipalities, in dealing with all phases of their junior governments.

He made reference to some other things – particularly medical care, which I intend to deal with as I continue. Speakers thus far have covered a wide range of topics in this debate, and I must say that I have been waiting for the government to justify why it was necessary, or why the urgency that the medical insurance act be passed at this particular time. There have been accusations that it is on the basis of political expediency. I haven't heard anyone on the government side of the House ever justify that it wasn't on those basis. Why couldn't this particular bill have been dealt with at the regular session? Certainly this session, even though it is not called a special session, was called to deal with special problems. The interim report itself says that medical care was not one of the immediate problems facing the province at this time. Why then, was there this urgency in dealing with the bill now, during the fall session? No one on that side of the House has ever informed us why it was necessary. Did you have a deadline to meet in order to get some money from Ottawa, or why did it have to be introduced now? I am still waiting to hear the reason why we have to do this at this time.

Surely if you had introduced all the information necessary, and let it circulate so that all people in the province could study, it, then we could have adequately dealt with this medical care at the next regular session. What was the particular urgency? I do think the session was rightfully called but to deal with some of the critical situations we are faced with in this province. That has already been mentioned – namely in the area of agriculture.

I, too, would be remiss in my duties if I did not bring to the attention of this House the dire predicament the farmers in our area are in. I hear a lot of members crying in areas where this is their first crop failure – this is their first drought. I happen to represent an area where drought is nothing new to us, and in the past ten years when other areas in the province were filling their granaries, we were just carrying on without a surplus of grain anywhere. This year, when the drought did hit, those farmers were extremely hard-pressed. They have no reserve to fall back on at all, where in other areas they do.

What is the position of these farmers? They are in such dire straits that they have to look for some other means of assistance. A lot of them are extremely proud, and it certainly hurts their pride to have to go and beg for social aid. I don't think that is the answer.

I have the operations or the commitments that a person farming a section of land has to meet, and in this particular cost-price squeeze they find themselves in, the provincial government has held their hands in his pockets pretty deeply. At least they didn't see fit to abandon those fields of taxation that hurt him. On a section of land today, a man's taxes are approximately \$700. Of that portion a good deal or it is, as some have indicated, 50 per cent for the cost of education, which you say is a provincial responsibility. Then he has to pay Hospitalization, \$48. And if he owns a car and a truck (and I don't think a farmer ought to be denied the ownership of a car or truck) he has to pay the licenses for these two vehicles, which will be in the neighbourhood of \$75. In order to operate that truck and car, if he does a reasonable amount of travelling, or if he lives any distance from town, he will in all likelihood have to buy approximately 1,000 gallons of gasoline, of which he will pay to this government the amount of \$140 directly. Then there is the education tax which he has to pay on all his purchases throughout the year, which would come to very close to an average of \$100; then when he decided to take the power and you broke him to make him use all his reserves which he had saved, in order to pay the \$500, his annual power bill would at least be in the neighbourhood of \$240. Add to this his immediate expenses of buying farm fuels; buying the necessary repairs, and to meet all the expenses and the poor man is faced with a bill of approximately \$1,600 before he can take anything out for his food, his clothing, his light, heat or any other of the necessities of life.

If he is farming a section of land, he would be seeing approximately 300 acres. The long-term average for that area is in the neighbourhood of eight to twelve bushels, which means he has an income of 3,000 to 3,500 bushels per year. This is the man, now who has to do something to meet his commitments. He dare not let his taxes go, because we all know what will happen if his taxes increase year by year. Eventually he would lose the land for taxes, so he doesn't dare let them go. The bonus he is going to get will have to pay the taxes immediately. He dare not, as we found out yesterday, not pay his power, because the first thing they do is snip it off, and there he is. No heat, no light – none of the amenities you people say you have given him, will be in use so he must pay the power bill. Certainly you cannot deny that he must eat, so what options has he therefore, to carry on as a farmer?

He has three possible resources that he can go to for help. First, credit. He can attempt to borrow sufficient money to carry on for another year. We have seen in the past years what has happened to farmers who, during the period of recession, have decided to take credit. Most of the time they wound up with the mortgage companies owning the land, or at least in a position to take it over. So he is loathe to take credit. He can try to supplement his income by finding additional work or labour – some job in his community. But you try and find a job in your community; there just aren't any when there are over 30,000 people unemployed now. Finally, his other alternative is to ask for social aid. How many farmers can social aid programs support? I submit that if you assess it on the basis of earning less than \$950 a year – I don't know what the percentage of the farmers would be that would qualify for social aid, but certainly it would be almost more than 50 per cent of them. Can your program support it?

These farmers are consulting with their members and saying, "Is it possible for me to go on social aid?" what should our answer to that farmer be? "Yes, I'll help you get social aid." This, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is a crisis that we are facing in every way, and no announcement as to what should be done has been made, nor any suggestions have been made as to what should be done.

If we continue to add the burden of taxation on the shoulders of the farmer, what will eventually happen to him? I have heard this said by many farmers already: "Take my farm; take my taxes; take the whole thing over and pay me a wage of \$100 a month and I will work it for you". Perhaps this is the best way of saving our farm population. He is either going to dispose of his land to big corporations, or indeed to a government-owned plan; the government will own the farm and that's their ultimate goal.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, if you went into the communities and made that deal with the, a lot of them will want to take it up. I think that is completely wrong, because as was stated over and over, the cornerstone of our society is the family farm, and if we do away with that family farm we have destroyed our type of society.

This adverse condition in which the farmer finds himself is reflected in the small rural communities. Our business places in these rural communities are folding up day by day, and where do they go? They are swelling the ranks of the unemployed. You try and make a living in a

October 18, 1961

farm community where farmers have absolutely no money to spend. You cannot sell anything; you can't make ends meet; the businessman too has to meet the commitments and the tax burden which you fellows have placed on him. He has taxes and licenses, enough to cover a bulletin board in his shop. There is very little trade going on when the farmer is in need.

But apparently the government has no policy. They cannot institute anything in order to help alleviate the conditions in the rural areas. We suggested last session to go ahead and build your power building if you like, but, while you are in the process of borrowing, borrow a little more to extend the facilities of gas into the areas you promised you would before the last election. There is one of your favourite C.C.F. supporters has to face the people of his community with a red face now, because he went around telling "Elect the C.C.F. government and you will have gas next year." Now he has to make apologies. He says, "I questioned the government. They tell me they can't do it; they haven't the money."

What would the effect of such a policy have been had we been able to have the gas installations along the towns mentioned by my colleague from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre). There would have been converting to gas furnaces. There would be a bit of employment. There would be a few appliances that could be sold and there would be something for businessmen to sell and keep them in business, and keep the wolf from the door. But no, there is no money for extending services. There is only money for big luxurious buildings. And why this concentration of spending money in city centres, I'll never know.

You have written off the rural areas as the forgotten people. If we took a look at the amount of money that was spent in city centres, it is fabulous. I have the answer to a return now, the number of buildings which were purchased or built, worth over \$1,000 in the city centres. You add that up. Practically the total building program; the total purchases have been in the city centres.

Someone – the Minister of Education has just said it is in the control of the federal government to spend money to control fiscal policies by putting money into circulation during recession, and to retard the spending of money at a time of inflation. If that applies to the federal government, certainly it can apply to the provincial government in dealing with the services they render in the province. How about spending a little of that cash that you filch from their pockets?

We don't have to be grateful, you tell us, for whatever you do for us. That's our rightful share. But when are you going to give us our rightful share in the country?

So we are driving the small businessman out of a job, out of business. Where is he going to show up again? He will either not show up at all, by leaving the province, or he will show up in the city looking for a job and join the ranks of the unemployed, or on social aid. There are only three places he can go to as a last resort.

The member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) made a remarkable contribution when he said he felt the government, instead of doling out social aid, should go into ventures, public improvement programs, all types of programs to provide employment. I say that was a valuable contribution, but I was a little bit amazed that the thing he is now pleading with his cohorts to do, they ran up and down the province, expounding before they won the 1944 election – that's what they won the election on – they said, "Put the C.C.F. members in power and there will be no more relief. In times of need we will have public improvement programs just as they are doing in the States. There won't be a need for social welfare or aid; or welfare." All they did was change the word 'relief' to social welfare.

I can agree that the government has it in its power to institute this type of thing, and especially after 17 years of the greatest income that we have ever seen, this program should have, if it is ever going to be instituted, should have been instituted.

In what fields of endeavour could you have done something? I think a perfect example of a program that helps out those people in need was the Metis Commission-opposition farm at Willowbunch. This group of people who were on social aid, with a leader went in and developed a truly commission-operative project in providing themselves with food. If these people who now sit in city centres or urban communities without gardens, without providing themselves with food, it is going to cost you a lot more money to feed and cloth them. If, for example, there were projects such as were started in Willowbunch, where these people did something to help themselves, and feed themselves, and to have a little left over to sell, your social aid program would not be quite so expensive. It was all right until you got your filthy socialist hands into it, and destroyed the thing – threw it out the window – it was not the kind of commission-operative that you people visualize, and that is the confusion that exists in the minds of that side of the House, Mr. Speaker. They don't know the difference between commission-operation and socialism.

October 18, 1961

They don't know the difference between socialization programs, social welfare programs and socialism. There is complete confusion, and we get this thing all along – Crown Corporations are socialism. Good heavens!

I have the responsibility of teaching what socialism is in the classroom, and never yet in any book in the Grade XI Social Studies course, when we study the development of socialism, did they ever say that social welfare programs were socialism. I would like to find the type of thing that we are supposed to use in dealing with that particular part of our definition of socialism – Mrs. Cooper, I'll write one out for you. I cannot imagine what authority you would use – Carl Marx?

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — My kids, who when they go to write their examination, they know what socialism is.

This is the type of program that could have, and still could be undertaken. The Minister of Agriculture is another man who sort of intrigues me. I am amazed that he is now searching for water under ground. Why he wants the water under the ground when he doesn't know what to do with the stuff he has on top, I'll never know. In discussing and speaking about programs that could provide employment to provide the small farmer with a place to work, what greater program (and he's the greatest author of this program) the forage program – that needs the support of the government, doesn't it? Across the southwestern part of the country we have three large dams – the Duncairn Dam, the Governor Dam and recently Thompson Lake. Each of those have a potential of irrigating certain acres – the number of acres he should know. Granted, the P.F.R.A. built the dam but I don't think they denied him the use of the dam for any irrigation project.

There is another dam near Mankota that is producing hay. It hasn't the ability to irrigate as much as the other three dams, but they are supplying a considerable portion of the fodder in that area, and at the same time they are providing employment for many of the farmers that are now not only looking for work, but having to buy the feed as well. Here we have three dams that are lying as idle as the day they were built. They are used for nothing. There is a wonderful water resource. What benefit has the Minister of Agriculture got out of those dams? Now he is looking for water under the ground, when he hasn't utilized the water that is right under his nose.

That could have been, and should have been, one of the main sources of fodder throughout all southern Saskatchewan, because I know there are many types of irrigation that can be put in there – such as sprinkler systems. The Thompson Lake – what is its potential of irrigating? How many can receive assistance if they want to go in there, and convert land to forage? It would be a wonderful occupation and, I think, and a well-paying job if they would put in a half-section of land into brome alfalfa – and cut it for feed, even if they couldn't sell it this year; they'll sell it next year. It gives a good return and it is good for the conservation of that soil. You can have rotation of crop programs, and everything else. Apply the principles of good agriculture, but they need you, Mr. Minister, to give them a little assistance.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It's there for them if they want it.

Mr. Klein: — I would like to know what it is. Why are these programs not initiated? Why, instead of feeding a lot of people in the urban centres, are they not placed on your projects that you develop – even if it is a garden project, near where the water lies for irrigation purposes, and have a home out in the country, have a cow and chickens and a few of the other things, a garden – they won't need as much social aid as they do now to purchase all their requirements, and they will still be well-fed when they are in dire straits.

These are some of the programs that you have said should be undertaken, but after 17 years of the highest revenues this government has ever had, nothing like that was ever done – the only thing they ever did was to destroy the people who dedicated themselves to trying to develop programs such as this.

Now then, there is another crisis which should have been dealt with at this session, and it was mentioned yesterday. That is the crisis we have arrived at in education. We feel the situation cannot be much worse. Trustees and teachers who are the custodians and backbone of a good educational system are now at loggerheads. Trustees apparently are trying to introduce legislation that would be contrary to what the teachers are negotiating for. There is ill feeling between the two. The teachers, by the trustee, is made out to be the culprit in the situation; that he or she is the one responsibility for the increased rise in taxes. This is reflected back again to the efficiency that that teacher can work in her room. The taxpayer is bound to feel the culprits for our high taxes is in the classroom; give her a bad time if you can.

October 18, 1961

So the situation in education is not good. The real culprit in this thing was sitting here in Regina getting out of it without being involved at all. That is where the real culprit lies. They permitted the relationships between the trustees and teachers – they permitted them to fight, and the whole fight was over finance. They sat back here, snug as a bug in a rug, glad to be out of the public eye, and I say to the trustees and teachers, forget your own differences; join your forces in the interest of education and start pressuring the group that needs to have the pressure put on them; tell them to get off whatever they've been sitting on and get to work, and do something about this critical situation. This situation was bad this year, but what is it going to be like next year? This has to be settled in some way.

Some years ago in this House the members on this side, as was mentioned, introduced and said the basic problem is the method of financing education. We cannot expect the taxpayer today to shoulder the entire load for this social work, and I was a bit dumb-founded when I heard the Minister of Education say that he has adopted the principle that he felt education was a local responsibility, mainly. This is contrary to all modern thinking. Why should it be a local responsibility? Nobody pointed out to this House more ably than the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) that it was not a local responsibility, but a social responsibility, where everybody in Canada should share in the education of our children.

The members of the government two years ago accepted and recognized unanimously that the structure for the financing of education should be changed. What happened to that resolution that was accepted unanimously? They put it aside and sat idly by, while the complete educational system was tumbling down before their eyes. Nothing was ever done about it. When is it ultimately going to end? Unless we get some reasonable and good policies, this crisis will continue and get worse. That is something we should have talked about now – the immediate problem facing the people.

There are other problems in this field of education that are not being dealt with at all. You have the problem of not being able to staff your high schools with qualified teachers. This problem comes about, by and large, because of the number of graduates who are leaving this province. Graduates of the Teachers College are leaving the province by droves. I am putting this question on the Order Paper (I hope the Government can answer it): How many of the teachers who have graduated from the College of Education have applied elsewhere for jobs?

There is a shocking number of qualified teachers who are leaving the province.

I am glad to hear that the minister announced he is doing something about the main problem of education. Only less than 15 per cent of the students who entered Grade I ever graduate from Grade XII. Of those graduates from Grade XII, not all of them go on to take further training to prepare themselves for their place in society. What then is being done for the masses who are attending our schools? Where again are they going to show up in future life? The child who quits in Grade IX, X, VIII – anywhere along the line – where does he show up again in our society? Unless he trains himself; unless he uses his personal initiative, he will show up on the unemployment line and figures and statistics bear that out. Seventy-five per cent of the unemployed have Grade VIII or less. So, as I said I am glad to hear the minister announce he is going to have some technical schools built in order to help those children qualify themselves for the type of society we are living in.

More than that is needed. One of the main problems of young people who leave schools before they are fully prepared is that there is such a variety of choices, avocations, vocations, if you like, that it takes almost an expert to determine in what field of endeavour he should work. True, the school must undertake a guidance program but most of the time the child does not need consultative services until he has left school and is actually faced with the problem of making a living for himself at 18 or 19. It is pathetic to see these confused young people, a year or two after they leave school dashing about questioning in their own minds. I have had dozens of them come to me and ask, "What can we do, Mr. Klein, in order to provide ourselves with good jobs." You can't advise them overnight. They need a place where they can get counselling, and I think some sort of counselling service ought to be set up in most centres in the province, when they do wish to find advice as to what they should take. Just going to technical school is not of too much value unless we can direct and guide that girl or boy who is looking for advice, we will not solve the problem of these masses of students.

But apparently the leaders of the C.C.F. party, (or the New Democratic Party or whatever it is) still say the major ills of our society can be eradicated through a planned economy. I have made a sincere effort to get from the C.C.F. themselves in this House, and outside of it, a pretty good definition of what a planned economy is, and to show us how this thing would work. They can correct me if they wish, but I have come up with this conclusion that in order to have a planned economy, it would essentially require planners.

October 18, 1961

These planners, of course, would be recruited from the fields of experts; then they would be bundled together, each to plan what should be done in this area; what should be done in that area; what are we going to allow private enterprise to do; they would have to necessarily plan all this. What good would the plans be unless they could compel people to follow your plans? There is no use making plans unless everybody follows them. Therefore you would have to institute laws to compel everybody to follow by law the thing that the planners planned.

Let's compare that with what Hitler did in Germany. He surrounded himself with experts in every field; they planned what ought to be done in all fields of endeavour; he instituted laws whereby you forced people to do as he planned, and what do we call that in history? We called that dictatorship. Where is the distinction between the two: Perhaps that is the answer. Yes, that party over there says it is. So that is the best I can come up with so far as planned economy is concerned.

Premier Douglas: — You could do better, if you tried.

Mr. Klein: — I wish you would some day, Mr. Premier, get up and tell us how this thing is going to work. Are you not going to plan it? Are you not going to force people to follow your plan? If you don't, better not start planning — it's a waste of time.

Premier Douglas: — If I might, I will just refer my hon. friend to the speech just made by Mr. Pearson in Victoria. He can tell you all about planning.

Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, as I said before, no one on that side of the House has yet shown to the members why it was essential that the medical care plan be introduced at this particular time, and why it must be discussed here and now. Various accusations have been made, and nobody has denied them; therefore they must be true. I don't know how anybody on that side of the House can interpret that we are opposed to the principle of medical care plan. There are two major things which the government members have always discussed and used in the way of ridicule, I suppose, and in support of their own plan — of course they think this is a mighty big joke, that the Liberals had this on their platform since 1919 — they had a big laugh over that. That's amazing enough. I might say it is a funny thing to be as ridiculous as you people are. We might laugh. Do you think it is funny that Leonardo Da Vince visualized an aeroplane but it wasn't built until several hundred years later?

Premier Douglas: — That's Liberal policy!

Mr. Klein: — . . . Well, you think that he was a Liberal? Thanks for that!

Then I have been reading some of the books on the medical scheme in England. I find out that England first talked about a medical care program in 1911 and in that country no party takes credit for the medical care program. They all say and the observers of that plan say that every party has contributed to the development of the medical care program. That's the way the thing should be. This is naturally in the interests of all the people, and all parties have contributed to the development. Britain first visualized it in 1911 and it was not instituted until 1958 or somewhere in there. They brought in different plans during a period of years, on an experimental basis and otherwise. So it has been here. Since 1919 medical care has been developed. So I cannot see where they have struck any great profound argument when they say the Liberals had it in their platform in 1919. All the more credit to the Liberals.

Because of the many countries of the world who have instituted medical programs, we in Saskatchewan, if we consider this thing in the light that it should be considered, in the interests of all the people of Saskatchewan and not in the interests of any political party, we ought to be able to evolve by critical analysis of what we intend to introduce, to be able to come up with one of the best. We should be able to take the best of all the programs that have been instituted in other countries, and have one of the best here in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Member: — By planning . . .

Mr. Klein: — Yes, planning by us, the legislators, who should do the planning and take responsibility for good legislation. If we are being critical because we want to better certain phases of this program, and then have the government members hurl the accusation at us that we are trying to destroy this thing, and put stumbling blocks in their way – that is absolute nonsense. We wouldn't be doing our jobs if we weren't critical of the plan.

Nobody has been more vociferous than the Premier himself in saying (last year when he talked about medical care), the first requirement of a good program is to have the co-operation of the doctors. I am not too convinced yet that he has the co-operation of the doctors. According to the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) those fellows will commission-operate or else – that's the type of co-operation they preach all the time. You co-operate or else. The ones that preach the most co-operation are the least co-operative.

October 18, 1961

Mr. Berezowsky: — I did not say what the hon. member imputes to me. If he looks up the record he will find out what I said.

Mr. MacDougall: — Your microphone was dead that day – I checked on it.

An Opposition Member: — You said ‘if they don’t co-operate we’ll license them’.

Mr. Klein: — I think myself, in the interests of a good medical program that that is true – we must have the co-operation of the doctors. I believe there are four main things that have to be completely clear before any of us can say we have the best possible program for the people of Saskatchewan. These four requirements are these, and if we can settle on these four I cannot see where there is going to be too much criticism one way or the other: first, you must have doctor participation in the plan. That is essential and fundamental, and I don’t think any more need be said about that. Secondly, you must have the best possible administration. There are all kinds of ways of administering medical care programs. I am not too sure or convinced that the best possible administration is a commission set up by appointment from the government. We have many other ways of administering, as was outlined by the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner). Perhaps a regional administration is better. Perhaps some type of administration, where the people if they see the thing getting out of hand, do not have to go to a government bureaucracy to stop anything they see going wrong. There is a better way of administering, as they do in our municipalities, where they sign contracts to provide services in a municipality and if anyone person in that municipality thinks that the doctor is reluctant to come, or that someone is misusing the plan, all they have to do is consult the first councillor they see, bring the case to his attention and somebody immediately rectifies the situation. I think that is the way of providing good administration.

Can this be done on a province –wide basis? I should cite a case. Let us suppose there is a complaint about the abuse in the hospitalization act. I know of a chap who wrote a letter complaining about the charges being exorbitant in the hospital that took care of his child. All he got was the run-around. They said, “Oh well, you know, we have to charge heavy here and less here to even it out.” You have no one that you can immediately place on the carpet, so what do you do? So I think there might be better ways of administering than is suggested now.

Thirdly, we must have public acceptance of this plan.

In areas where people are used to medical care programs, they will readily adapt themselves to the new scheme, but where it has never been in effect before, the public must be fully conversant with the program and understand how it operates. Let no one think that because the government is paying for it, I can go to the doctor with every ailment and not hurt the plan. Each person who is affected by the program must be conversant with it, must know how it is financed, must have all the information necessary.

Fourthly, this medical care program must be financed on a sound basis, so that we can be assured that regardless of how high the costs sky-rocket we will not have to scuttle the plan in any way. That is the fourth essential requirement that it be financed soundly, and this will, of course, come up in discussion. I want to be sure and know what I may do and what I may not do under this plan, right here and now in the Act, not in the regulations. I want to know what the doctor's status will be? What will be the benefits to the patient? What regulations do I follow? That must be incorporated before anybody can give you consent on this bill.

I was going to add this next phase, but I don't think it is worth it because it's well, rather ridiculous. However the members on that side of the House have constantly confused this issue, I was going to point out that their second big argument they used is ridiculous if we carry it over into other areas. They are saying it's costing us that much for medical fees now. Well, if we apply that argument to its obvious conclusion, I would say that my groceries are going to cost me that much, regardless – the people of Saskatchewan have to pay that much for food, why not give me a grocery insurance Act. That's the type of argument they advance. If it is valid in one case, the truth should stand up under any test, and if the law is valid in one instance, or a principle is valid in one instance, it ought to be valid in all cases.

However, that is neither here nor there. I don't think it is worth pursuing. From what I have said, and from the lack of information and the lack of dealing with the crisis in the province, it is quite obvious that I shall support the amendment, but not the motion.

Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — In rising to participate in the throne debate, I would also like to add my congratulations to those of my colleagues, to you, Mr. Speaker, for your participation in the Commonwealth Conference in London this summer, where I am sure you represented this assembly with dignity and ability.

October 18, 1961

I would too, like to tender my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply, and to all previous speakers in this debate.

This debate, I am sure all members will agree, has come at a very important time in the history of our province, and at a time when the farm problems in Saskatchewan are greater than they have been since the thirties. It has also come at a time when the Premier, the leader of the government of this province, is about to depart into federal politics. This of course, immediately raises the question as to who will take his place as the premier of this province, and when that happens, how will the government proceed with some of the present suggestions they have before them.

After listening to the hon. Minister of Education this morning, one thing concluded was that the long awaited race for the Leadership of the New Democratic Party may have begun this morning.

Before directing some comments on the Speech from the Throne, I would like to comment on one or two of the remarks of the Minister of Education. First of all, I am sure all educators and those interested in education in this province will welcome the news that we're having an expansion in the technical training educational program in the province. Coming from the northwest part of the province, I am pleased to see that the new Minister of Education seems to realize that there are other cities in the province besides the city of Regina. This of course has not always been the case with the government across the way. Because of the location of my constituency, I can understand the concern of some hon. members, and the hon. member from Battleford (Mr. Kramer) that the city of North Battleford was not included in this program at the present time. I trust that the city of North Battleford, and all other cities in the province, of this size, will receive future consideration in the matter of technical educational facilities, because I think there is some limit as to the size of educational institutions with regard to efficiency, and with regard to efficient educational instruction. And the same principle that many of us have spoken in favour of with regard to the cottage type of mental institutions may receive some consideration also, from the point of view of technical education. I can see of course, the advantages of the very large institutions from the point of view of economy, but I don't think we should overlook the possibilities of extending this service, to our smaller urban centres. However, at this time I wish to register my pleasure at the expansion of the technical services in the province.

I was not quite so receptive towards some of the

other matters that were dealt with by the hon. Minister of Education. His argument last evening, in connection with equasions, is certainly within the realm of the Department of Education, when he stated that if one was opposed to socialism then one must necessarily be opposed to public ownership. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, there is very little relationship between the two matters, because certainly private enterprise governments, have for many years acknowledged the importance of the public ownership and operation of large utilities and large corporations in Canada and other parts of the world. Certainly there is a great deal of difference between public ownership as operated by a socialist government, and public ownership as operated by a private enterprise government. The interpretation in many cases is quite different. In other words, it is not so much the mechanics of the activity as it is a matter of control.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Education dealt at some length this morning, on areas of agreement with regard to the medical plan. Then he noted that about the only area of disagreement was – how we are going to pay for the plan. I think my colleague the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) certainly dealt very well this morning with the fact that there are considerable areas of disagreement, not only on this side of the House, but certainly on the government side of the House. I certainly agree with the Minister of Education that we are all certainly in favour of whatever improvements can be made in medical service in this province. There is no question of that. But at the same time we are concerned with costs, we are concerned with the taxation problem and we do require a good deal more information than we presently have before we can make a definite and binding decision on this matter. I intend to deal further with this later in my remarks.

I too was very much taken aback when the hon. Minister of Education departed considerably from tradition in this government, when he stated that education is a local responsibility. That is what first suggested to me that the leadership race for the new party in the province had begun. Because this is certainly a great departure from the days when the hon. Premier went around this province before 1944, suggesting that the CCF would take over the entire cost of education in Saskatchewan. He has been quoted on many occasions as having made this remark. We know that of course after 17 years of administration, his government is now paying about 40% of the cost.

I recognize the fact that the hon. minister may have

been referring more, to the local autonomy of education than he was referring to the matter of finance. Nevertheless I feel it is significant that the statement was made, because it does point out a considerable area of difference between the position held by ministers of this government in the past and their position as he outlines it. He mentions social welfare as one of those burdens that had been removed from the local taxpayer. But here I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the matter of social welfare, let's not forget that 65% of it is paid by the federal government.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: —Did the member say 65%?

Mr. Klein: — I thought it was about that.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Oh no, you're wrong. It is 42%.

Mr. Klein: — I stand corrected. I knew it was a substantial per cent and I will accept the minister's statement – 42% paid by the federal government. Then in the matter of social welfare, the burden of the taxpayer at the moment, I believe, is around 10% - some member said 8% is the prevailing rate -

Mr. Gardiner: — Not counting medical services.

Mr. Foley: — I understood with medical services it was 10%. However, again I will accept the minister's statement there. So that actually in the matter of social welfare we haven't removed too much burden from the municipal taxpayer.

Again I want to stress that rather than this government approaching the position that education is a local responsibility, at least from the point of view of finance, I feel this government should be doing all in its power to move towards the position of accepting more and more of the financial responsibility for education. Again I think my colleague, the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) dealt very well with this topic – the necessity for more assistance from the provincial and federal governments for education and the fact that taxation burdens have become excessive. I believe the people who are interested in education in this province, are correct in taking the view that taxes on land and property for school purposes have already reached oppressive levels and should go no higher, and in fact should be lowered if possible.

I believe that federal governments too must accept more of the responsibility for the cost of education in the

provinces and more should be one to make this possible. There is no doubt that taxation is a very serious problem at all government levels today. I want to deal extensively with this topic, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I might now call it 12:30.

Premier Douglas: — Prior to your honour leaving the Chair, I wonder if all members would agree that in order to facilitate the work of the Clerk and the staff, that we take motions for returns when we reassemble at 2:30, before the hon. member proceeds with his speech, if that is agreeable to the House and to him.

Agreed.

The assembly recessed at 12:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — Before 12:30 I was reviewing some of the remarks of the Minister of Education, and some of the matters which he dealt with, not only in the field of education, but in other fields including the medical care plan.

Before I proceed further in this matter, I wish to express regret on behalf of the members on this side of the House at the low and uncalled for attack levelled by the member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) on a former member of this House, who was not present and thus not able to defend himself. In my opinion this was neither necessary, nor was it wise. As far as I am concerned, but I am convinced that because of this action, the hon. member for Wadena should certainly give this House an apology and also apologize to the former member for Saltcoats.

I would like to present at this time, Mr. Speaker, a message on behalf of the former member for Saltcoats directed to the member for Wadena. I will quote the former member's remarks:

“The member for Wadena made a statement . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I don't think we can have messages or excerpts from newspapers or anything of this kind regarding proceedings in this House. Parliamentary privilege reserves the right to take part in debates to members of the House and I don't think we can have those outside taking part in any debate.

Mr. Foley: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will abide by your ruling.

October 18, 1961

The former member for Saltcoats is naturally very concerned about the tactics of the member for Wadena. I would challenge the member for Wadena to make the statement which he made yesterday outside of the House, in order that the former member for Saltcoats may have the normal recourse of the law. I can only conclude that if the member for Wadena is not prepared to make this statement outside of this legislature, then the statement can neither be true, nor can the member defend his position in this matter. I challenge him to that.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Foley: — If he is not prepared to do so, then I suggest that he make an apology to this legislature, and one which is long overdue from a matter of the 1957 session when he himself took advantage and attempted to attribute political support to a person who was deceased and who never at any time had been a member of his party.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Education attempted to make a case for the necessity of compulsion with regard to the medical plan. While I agree with the hon. lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) that there are many cases in our present society where land taxation and various other taxing authorities require a degree of compulsion, nevertheless it seems to me that to compare this with a form of assistance such as the medical plan, is not altogether accurate. Is the hon. minister aware, for example, that in Australia, if I understand the situation correctly, the health plan there is on a voluntary basis and it has achieved about 90% coverage in that country in the areas that it operates? I would think, Mr. Speaker, that when this government made it possible for members of the committee to go to various parts of the world to investigate existing plans that in the interim report we would have heard more about the plans that are operating in that country. I have read the report in its entirety and as far as I can recall, no specific mention was made of the details of any particular plan in other countries.

I am willing to agree that much of the interim report no doubt inculcates measures that are in existence in other countries. Nevertheless I would hope that in the final report we might have more details along that line.

The hon. minister also went on to attribute to himself apparent opposition to a plebiscite on this important question and at the same time seemed to poke a finger at the members of the opposition, suggesting that possibly we should not have requested this.

Mr. Speaker, I need hardly remind this assembly of the times in the past when this government has resorted to a plebiscite on problems not nearly as far reaching, certainly on problems which did not involve the provincial treasury to the same degree. I can see little wrong, after this assembly has debated this important matter, whether or not the government see fit to go along with the request of the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) who suggested that it might be in the public interest – if this assembly had an opportunity of meeting with the committee on medical care. It would seem to me that it would indicate beyond doubt the feelings of the people of the province. It is all very well for hon. members over there to say that they know what the people want. Maybe they do and maybe they don't. It seems to me that we had some rather surprising results to plebiscites in the past with regard to plans on a regional basis – certainly negative to an extreme degree at times. I am not suggesting for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that this plebiscite would not receive a substantial majority, but it would I think indicate to a democratically-minded legislature exactly whereof we speak, and whether or not this government see fit to present the people with an opportunity of speaking precisely and definitely on one issue, rather than interpreting the last general election as a yardstick, with regard to this health plan. It seems to me that it would be a most positive step after our other deliverations have been completed.

Yesterday the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) brought up the matter of a brick plant at Estevan and stated that according to his information it was being closed down. The hon. Minister of Mineral Resources denied that this was true, and I think if I quote him correctly from yesterday's 'Leader Post' he said, "It is not closed down; it is operating today, will operate tomorrow and next day and on into the future and no notice has been given to employees." Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, whether the minister knew whereof he spoke or not, according to the information we have, that was not a correct or a true statement. We have the information that three union representatives were called in and Mr. Stuart informed these representatives there would be a lay-off at the Estevan brick plant as of November 10th. This was to be passed around by word of mouth, and no written notices were given. I understand however, that in the meantime the situation may have changed, because today we find a strange aura of quiet surrounding the plant. Whether the Minister of Mineral Resources has used his influence in some manner, I don't know. I can only say that on behalf of the members on this side of the House, we are very happy if the brick plant will continue to operate, on behalf of the fifty or sixty employees who were yesterday concerned about the future of their employment there, we are very pleased if the minister has been able to make some change in the situation.

October 18, 1961

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is an indication, where a wide-awake and aggressive opposition can assist industry in this province. I hope the Minister of Mineral Resources gives us credit for it at the appropriate time.

Now I might say, Mr. Speaker, when I arose this morning I had expected that normal procedure would be followed, and that after the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) a member from the government side of the House would rise. It was my understanding from other members that the hon. member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) was going to speak this morning, and I for many reasons would have enjoyed speaking after he had taken his seat. However, no doubt he will enjoy his privilege if he does get up and speak. The only contribution he's made so far, in my opinion, was to rather discourteously disrupt the Minister of Education. He and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) have both had plenty of time to make representations to the Minister of Education on behalf of the matter of the technical schools, and I was rather taken aback by his actions this morning, as I think was the minister.

While I am on this matter, I think it is two years ago that the hon. member for the Battlefords and myself, along with the Department of Natural Resources had a bit of an exchange of views on the matter of a certain real estate deal up in our end of the country. Some hon. members may remember at that time that the government expropriated certain hay permits and hay leases, in order to make way for the establishment of an Indian reservation up in the Helene – Birch Lake area, north of Glaslyn. This action was taken in order to provide for an exchange of real estate which made the formation of the Battlefords Provincial Park. While a number of our farmers of course were very concerned about the loss of their hay, I think all hon. members were pleased to see an addition made to the recreational facilities of this province. However, it was my hope that the Department of Natural Resources, as a result of this action would be prepared to take any further action necessary to make this transaction as acceptable as it possibly could be under the circumstances.

It developed that the Indian people who now had access to certain hay and timber resources in the reservation area were left without an access road. As a matter of fact they were four miles from a road allowance. At that time I had occasion, on behalf of the municipalities involved to make representations both to the provincial and to the federal governments, particular to the department of Indian Affairs, for assistance in building this four miles of access road. Yet, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the action had been taken by this government without prior consultation, either with the farmers concerned or with the rural municipal

bodies concerned, in spite of that fact, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that I received a letter stating that the government could not see that they had any responsibility in this direction at the time, and to the best of my knowledge unless something else has occurred that I don't know of, to this day they have not accepted any financial responsibility towards the building of that proposed four miles of access road, which is jointly located in the rural municipalities of Parkdale and Medstead. I regret this decision on behalf of the Minister of Natural Resources very much, and whatever other minister may be responsible.

As far as I'm concerned I think the municipalities have a right to expect some assistance on this road in order that the Indian people will not be forced to haul their hay and their timber out across private land, as they were forced to this spring thus creating rutting and various other problems in the deeded land of private farmers, resulting in one case of some of the Indian's timber being seized and in other words, in placing both the Indians and the farmers of the area in a rather unfortunate position. I hope that the government will see fit to extend some assistance to this road. It is not an expensive road, being only four miles in length, and I think something could be done and since the hon. member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) was, in a sense, associated with this transaction, I hope that if he does speak in this debate he will give us some assurance on behalf of his government, that something can and will be done. If he does that, I can assure him that when the next educational institution is proposed by the government, I will try and back up North Battleford as the site.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words at this time, regarding one of the most important natural resources in Saskatchewan, that of North America's largest game animal, the moose. I regret that I did not have an answer to the question I placed on the order paper only yesterday in regard to the number of animals taken in the early calling season in the various game regions in the province. However, I do have some figures here from reports in the 'Leader Post' of the other day and I would just like to quote very briefly, Mr. Speaker, a few excerpts from a report made by Burns Matheson of the provincial Department of Natural Resources, who states:

"That an all-time record moose harvest has been established in the Prince Albert region during this year's calling season.

He goes on to state:

"That a total of 609 animals were taken in the

October 18, 1961

Three-week period, and that the largest kill apparently was in the Dore Lake region where over 235 moose were recorded. In the Dore-Smoothstone Sled Lake region.”

He goes on to say:

“About one third of the hunters this year were from the United States.”

Then he concludes his remarks by saying that:

“Hunters who were not successful in taking their moose during the early season would again have an opportunity to try during the season from November 6th to December 2nd, in most game animal zones.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I bring this matter up because I believe, that our moose population in the northern part of this province, continues to be one of our greatest tourist attractions, and certainly one of the greatest attractions for the hunters of this province and other provinces. I am confident that all hon. members would want to feel certain that the moose populations today can bear such an all-time record kill of 609 animals. I note that the Nipawin Fish and Game League, Mr. Speaker, are not so certain about this action. I notice that after Glen Peterson, the conservation officer, gave the meeting of the Nipawin fish and game league these figures regarding the moose kill, that a brief was prepared and no doubt is in the hands of the government now, drawing attention to the waste of game through inability to track the wounded animals, the lack of sportsmanship in connection with the early calling season with respect to the male animals. Mr. Speaker, I know that in the Dore-Smoothstone Sled Lake area that certain outfitters were inuring hunters to be flown in to inaccessible areas and were more or less telling them in so many words, that if they were prepared to spend one hundred dollars or so for the flight that they could almost be guaranteed an animal. Mr. Speaker, this to me seems certainly far removed from what a sporting activity should be. With any type of wild game in this province, it is my firm belief that unless there is an atmosphere of uncertainty and challenge that it ceases to be a sporting venture and to me is simply outright slaughter.

The northern part of Canada contains the great moose herds of the world. I think the Department of Natural Resources officials have a very serious responsibility in this matter. I think much more careful supervision is necessary, particular in the early calling season than what has been the case in the past.

I am very concerned about the ratio of kills to the estimated number in our herds and I would appreciate having some more definite information from the Department of Natural Resources in this respect. I have no reason to believe that the kills are badly out of proportion to the herds. I realize that good conservation practice requires that the older animals be killed off from year to year in order that the source of food does not diminish. But I would want to be very certain, and I am sure the government will agree, that we institute and supervise such practices as will insure that this valuable tourist and hunting attraction will remain with us throughout the years. If it turns out that flights into inaccessible areas are almost a sure thing, in my opinion something should be done about it. I hope that the hon. Minister of Natural Resources will assure this House that supervision of our game resources is continuing unabated. I believe that the Nipawin Fish and Game League and I think other fish and game leagues in the province are concerned about what is taking place in the early calling season. I too was pleased to hear the suggestion made to this government by the hon. member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) with regard to making Moose Permits available to the Metis and the Indians who are in need. If we can afford to send that many game animals out to the hunters of this province, possibly we can afford to make more available to those among our Indian reservations who are in real need.

While I am on what I might consider to be local constituency matters – we had a very tragic automobile and bicycle accident in our constituency this summer, in which a young girl was unfortunately killed. I believe that some reason for the accident could be attributed to the very dusty condition of the gravel highway leading in to a village in my constituency, thus hindering visibility. Had it been possible to bring in a plane to the village that evening, the girl might have been taken to the University Hospital in Saskatoon. This course of action was not possible because of the lack of a proper landing field.

To me it brings out two matters, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to bring to the attention of the government. First of all I think the time has come when this government should give serious consideration to blacktopping all those portions of highway which pass through villages and urban communities in the province. I realize of course the tremendous cost of such a project, but when we are weighing the difference, between building a road such as is now being constructed from here to Lumsden and the safety advantages and other dust-free improvements which would result from such a policy, I am inclined to feel that the province as a whole would benefit from the government building without charge to local authorities, asphaltting and paving those portions of

highways which pass through our villages and other urban communities, at least before any large and extensive paving projects are undertaken elsewhere. I think also that this government might give some attention to assisting local governments in making more landing strips available for emergency aircraft, in the province, and I feel that since we are all very safety conscious these days in the light of the unfortunate accidents throughout our province – I think both of these movements on the part of the government would in my opinion make a real contribution, not only to safety in our smaller communities, but would make a real contribution to shall we say ‘dust-free living’ in our smaller village and urban centres where dust created by the traffic on a summer evening can sometimes blot out visibility over the entire community.

There is another matter with regard to fishing in some of our northern lakes that I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Natural Resources. In many of our resort lakes, it has become almost impossible to have any luck in fishing. Many fishermen are having difficulty in catching fish with ordinary tackles in some of our lakes. Where commercial fishing and sport fishing is extensive in such lakes as Jackfish Lake, Cochin, Turtle Lake and various other lakes. I have been told by many that if live bait were allowable that this might improve fishing, and in turn might attract more tourists. Now I think you will agree with me that the most important attraction to our tourists is the ability to catch fish in our lakes. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I fully agree with the policy of protecting our game lakes from carp, I thoroughly agree, but would it not be possible for us in this province Mr. Minister, to adopt the actions of our neighbours to the south of us, where at various lakes, supervised government bait stations are in operation, where a supervisor at the lake catches the live minnows from the lake, sells them to the fisherman who puts them back in the lake. It seems to me that this action would insure that there be no smuggling of live bait, which I understand does take place to some extent now, and at the same time might improve the fishing in many of our resort lakes, consequently improving the number of tourists coming into our area and I think improving this great economic natural resource which means so much to many people in our province. It is just a suggestion Mr. Minister, and I hope you will take it under advisement.

I have just a brief word I want to direct to the minister of municipal affairs. In the constituency I represent we have parts of three L.I.D.’s. Now I realize of course that the L.I.D.’s were set up at a time when the population in these areas was very scarce and very sparse, and that possibly it was the only type of administration that could be made workable at the time.

I think the local improvement districts Mr. Minister, have served their purpose in maintaining and encouraging development in these areas. I think the time has come, however, when some of these local improvement districts could now be considered eligible for municipality status. I don't know whether any surveys have been made or attention given to this as yet, but I know that many residents in these areas would appreciate consideration from the Department of Municipal Affairs in this direction. I would be pleased to have the minister give the local improvement districts, which I share with the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) consideration in this matter, in order that one or more of these areas could now be converted to municipal status.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a little more regarding the Indian people, particularly in my area. Various government speakers in the past have assured the Indian people that they were concerned about the bringing of electric power and telephone service to our reservations as soon as economically feasible and as soon as possible. I believe, if I recall the words of the hon. Premier, he promised that he would be sending some representation to Ottawa on behalf of the Indian people, since of course it required some type of a federal-provincial agreement.

Now I know that many of the people are extremely interested in the prospects of having hydro and telephones, and I would again be pleased to have some statement from the government in the near future, concerning the outcome of any representations that have been made to Ottawa and what prospects the people have on such reservations as the Thunderchild and Seeskakootch, Wichigan and Pelican reserves in that area, and of course I am speaking on behalf of all reserves in the province who are no doubt just as interested as the reserves in my area.

There is one other matter that I think the Indian people are in great need of and that is improvement in housing. Now I know that housing improvements are being made through the federal department of Indian Affairs, I wonder if it isn't possible that more might be done by provincial bodies in this respect. One further item – it has come to my attention that a number of our Indian folks who for one reason or another, have need of legal assistance with respect to the laws of Saskatchewan, sometimes have a good deal of difficulty in obtaining legal advice and legal assistance. I think, Mr. Attorney General, that while I don't know what provisions have been made, if any, by your department, or whether the Indian folks are on their own, or whether some federal agency is empowered to act on their behalf, I would appreciate you taking this matter under advisement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I took my seat at 12:30 I was having something to say about the necessity of more provincial and federal assistance for education.

October 18, 1961

I was interested to note recently in the press that the Saskatchewan association of rural municipalities voted to ask the government to set up a committee to study this matter, and noted further that the government look favourably on such a committee. As far as I know at the moment this is not being acted upon and I trust it will be, because there is no question, Mr. Speaker, of our need for a more equitable basis of obtaining taxes for school purposes in order to ease the burden of land and property tax. I am pleased to note that widespread interest exists in this matter, and that definite action has been called for and will no doubt be taken.

According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Saskatchewan had the highest per capita municipal tax for school purposes of any province in Canada in 1960. This is all the more significant because of the fact that in provinces like Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia they had probably much more highly assessed buildings in their urban centres, such as the head offices of large firms and large corporations from which to obtain taxation revenue, which we do not have. Since our present system of school finance rests mainly on agricultural revenues, land resources which of course in the time of a bad crop year may fade out, it seems to me that this is one of the most serious problems facing us today.

Now I listened with interest to the words of the hon. lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum) the other day when she made her annual appeal on behalf of the cessation of nuclear warfare and cessation of nuclear tests and so on. I am sure that all hon. members of course are concerned with this very serious problem. I note that she was displeased that the Prime Minister of Canada did not consider it worthwhile to protest nuclear testing taking place in Russia. As I listened to her remarks, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that on the morning of her address, Mr. Khrushchev of the Soviet Union had announced that he would explode a fifty megaton bomb on October 31, a bomb equivalent to fifty million tons of T.N.T. as the climax of Russia's nuclear tests, it seemed to me a little strange that she neither mentioned this nor took exception to it.

Mrs. Strum: — Was I supposed to know that?

Mr. Foley: — Well, since it had been made public 24 hours or so before you spoke, I thought you might have been aware of it. If you were not aware of it, of course I must accept that.

However, there have been other speakers on the government side since this announcement was made and their silence, in my opinion, has been rather significant. To me the rather cold-blooded announcement by Nikita Khrushchev that he would explode the largest nuclear explosion in the history of the world, seems to me might have drawn some comment from members opposite. When I hear hon. members on that side of the House crying because they are accused of favouring the Reds, as the headline reads in the paper this morning, and here I sympathize with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) in his remarks before the orders of the day: He may have been innocently drawn into being sensitive to his position. Yet nowhere, Mr. Speaker, can I recall, either the leader of the New Democratic Party in Canada or any of his colleagues making any strong note of protest directed toward the Soviet Union, specifically, for having instigated the present series of nuclear tests, and I think they, and they alone must accept responsibility for whatever unrest has taken place in the world today.

Premier Douglas: — That statement is not true. I issued a statement which appeared in almost every newspaper in Canada, calling the resumption of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union callous, contemptible and stupid. There is no order about it, the hon. member just made a statement saying that I had made no statement about it and I did make a statement.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! A statement can be made at the close of the speech, otherwise it can be made at this time with the consent of the member speaking . . .

Premier Douglas: — I presumed he would allow me to correct the misinformation which he had given to the House.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Premier will have all kinds of opportunity to correct me if I am wrong. I have only access of course to press reports, Mr. Premier. I would like to quote from the Premier's Calgary address when he said, "The Berlin crisis was the greatest farce of newspaper propaganda the continent has ever witnessed." He accused the majority of the press of Canada and the United States of trying to befuddle the public on the Berlin issue.

Who in your opinion, Mr. Speaker, is responsible for the issue in Berlin today? Is it the Western world, or is it Khrushchev? While I quite agree with the Premier's right to criticize the press of Canada and the United States, I suggest that the onus for this very serious problem be placed fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Soviet

October 18, 1961

Union in no unmistakable terms. I object to the leader of any political party in the western world attempting to do anything which would get the Soviet Union off the hook or encourage them in any way shape or form.

Mrs. Strum: — May I ask a question?

Mr. Foley: — When we hear hon. members opposite crying because of the fact they may have been accused of being sympathetic with the Soviet Union, in my opinion if they are not guilty by action, they are guilty by omission, which is every bit as serious. Every member in public office has an absolute duty not only to his own conscience but to the people he represents, to stand up in our legislature and in our House of Commons and make it absolutely certain that everybody in Canada knows exactly and precisely where he stands on these important issues.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier goes on to say in Calgary: “There must be no any sir, either to Whitehall or to the Pentagon.”

Why does he not include the Kremlin, I ask him? He alludes to Whitehall; he alludes to the Pentagon; why did he not include Moscow? I am not putting words in his mouth, I am only quoting what the press has alleged him to say.

When hon. members opposite complain because this side of the House may get a wrong opinion from time to time, certainly it is because your leaders have not made entirely clear, where they stand in this matter.

I notice in the press just the other day, where the Communist party U.S.A. must register, according to Attorney General Robert Kennedy. Kennedy based his comment on the Supreme Court’s refusal to reconsider its decision upholding provisions of the 12950 subversive control act. The action said, and I am quoting from the ‘Leader Post’:

“The action said Kennedy, means that the Communist party U.S.A. has exhausted its least legal recourse, after years of contesting the order of subversive activities control board, requiring the party to register as a communist action organization.”

“Kennedy said that the communist party will be required to register and file with the justice department, the names and addresses of the party’s officers and members during the last years, give an accounting of its finances and a list of the printing presses which it owns.”

Mr. Speaker, I will give credit to the government of the United States of America since there is no doubt where they stand on this matter, and I would be only too happy to see some such action taken by this government and other governments in Canada towards the Communists whom, I consider, to be the greatest enemy of the western world and all we believe in.

Opposition Members: —Hear! Hear!

Mr. Foley: — So I say, Mr. Speaker, that when hon. members opposite want to take about nuclear disarmament, let them talk in no uncertain terms and not with a forked tongue. Let them come out directly and say where they stand and what they believe. Why not a motion of censure? Why not a table of protest from the ministers of this government directed to the Soviet Union, asking them to not explode these huge bombs on October 31. I challenge any member of this government to send such a cable, making the contents of that cable public, immediately.

An Hon. Member: — He's giving his views. You've never done it.

Mr. Foley: — I am giving my views and I am sure that I could draw some support for them from this side of the House, Mr. Premier, which is more than I can say for over there.

Mr. Speaker, we heard the hon. junior member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) and I wonder what the senior member, who is now retired would have thought. We heard the hon. junior member for Moose Jaw regret some of the remarks of the hon. member for Melville, (Mr. Gardiner) and I think he made some allusion to the problems in Cuba and the problems in Hungary. It reminded me again, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion this government ignored their duty with respect to those world tragedies. Never did I hear any public word of regret on behalf of this government or any of its ministers with regard to the persecution which took place in those countries. I think this government has not spoken out and done its duty to the people of this province with regard to issues which could have very serious consequences to our life and limb right here in our own province of Saskatchewan.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Foley: —The hon. member for Bengough (Mr. Dahlman) had a good deal to say the other day, Mr. Speaker, about the wonderful Valhalla, I think we call it, or is it Shangri-la over in

October 18, 1961

the land of Sweden, in a social democratic paradise. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a good deal of respect for Sweden. I had the pleasure of reading a number of articles recently in Financial Post, and I am sure other hon. members read of the amazing industrial work that is being done by the Swedish people, and I thrill in their accomplishments and their projects. I am pleased to note that Swedish farm machinery is being made available to the farmers here in Saskatchewan. But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, it makes me sick to see the member of this legislature pounce on the country of Sweden and attempt to hold it up to the world as a demagogue of socialism in the world today, when in my opinion, all that is really being accomplished over in that country has been as the result of hard working private and free enterprise. I think it is all the more to their credit with the government that they have, and I am not finding fault with their government, Mr. Speaker, they have their right to have the government which they have elected, and I don't take that right away from them either by thought or word or deed. I want to point this out however, and I would like to quote from the 'Western Producer' of the 17th of August, a letter which appeared in the press from a gentleman in Blaine Lake in which he quoted from remarks April 22nd Edition of MacLeans Magazine made by Dr. H. Challis, a British doctor, I don't know if this gentleman is an expert on Sweden, but he made several references to the social welfare situation over there which may have some bearing on this debate, Mr. Speaker, he is commenting on Sweden and he says this:

"Sweden has become a land of paradise with social problems because of excess social planning. The state has taken over the people's responsibility, until now people find life very boring. Sweden paid very heavily for their excessive planned economy, in the way of exorbitant taxation, a neurotic population, Sweden now has suicide, divorce, drunkenness, burglary, delinquency, and mental illness rates, which are believed to be the highest in the world."

An Hon. Member: — How do you like that? It was on T.V. too this year.

Mr. Foley: — May I finish, Mr. Speaker?

"Britain with much less social planning is now experiencing undue difficulty in financial operations of its nation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear

that this is a quotation used in a letter appearing in the August 17 edition of the 'Western Producer' and written by a gentleman from Blaine Lake, Saskatchewan. I don't know what his true knowledge is of affairs in that country. But in my opinion, something of what he says is correct, (You will have the opportunity of refuting this gentleman's statements, if they are not correct).

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member who is speaking to give me the name of the writer of this letter from Blaine Lake. Who is the author of this letter?

Mr. Foley: — I think I have given you all the information you need sir, but I have no objection if the member wishes it. The name of the writer is Stewart Makaroff of Blaine Lake. The August 17 edition of the 'Western Producer'.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this gentleman would not have made his remarks in the public press, if he did not have a good deal of knowledge on the subject whereof he speaks.

Certainly then, there are some dangers to this type of government and this type and extension of welfare benefits.

Only one other comment I had regarding the hon. member of Bengough (Mr. Dahlman). I was rather astounded to hear him eulogize the leader of the New Democratic Party on the one hand, and on the other hand giving considerable publicity to Mr. Thompson, who may well be an opponent in the next federal election. That was a rather interesting departure from custom.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about taxation at this time, and particular with that portion of the Throne Speech which deals with the discontinuance by the federal government of the tax sharing agreements. As I understand it, under the new agreement which we are being asked to vote upon, here is the legislature, Ottawa will continue to collect corporation income tax, and it will also act as the provincial government's agent in collecting the province's share which will in the first year be 16 per cent of the personal income tax and 9 per cent of the corporation tax. Also the personal income tax will rise one percentage point each year for the next five years, to reach a maximum of 20 per cent. Now the thing that I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, since of course this matter is entirely out of the hands of the legislature in that we must make this agreement

October 18, 1961

the thing I am concerned about is this. It is my understanding that the province may request Ottawa to levy additional amounts over and above what I have mentioned as a surcharge, and that these additional amounts could be levied to pay for such things we will say as the medical plan, or other public enterprises. Mr. Speaker, while the government has this right, I hope that the hon. Provincial Treasurer and his colleagues will be so able to handle the finances of this country that additional levies or surcharges will not be necessary.

I want to say this, that at the time when we here in the legislature of Saskatchewan are giving consideration to possible taxation increases, it is interesting to note that in the province of Manitoba, a hospital tax cut is planned, according to a recent statement in the press. Now I realize of course that possibly we can't compare our circumstances with theirs, nevertheless it is gratifying to see somewhere a headline stating that there is to be a cut in taxation. We haven't seen such a headline in this province for many, many years.

Premier Douglas: — Did you read the article?

Mr. Foley: — I did.

Premier Douglas: — It is doing the very thing you are arguing against- put a surcharge on income tax.

Mr. Foley: — It would permit the government to reduce insurance premiums to \$4.00 from \$6.00.

Premier Douglas: — Read the rest.

Mr. Foley: — And to \$2.00 down from \$3.00.

Premier Douglas: — Keep going.

Mr. Foley: — It goes on to mention a rebate amounting to the difference of the new and old rates.

Premier Douglas: — No, No!

Mr. Foley: — . . . and I'll agree with the Premier, it does state the additional one per cent tax on personal and corporation income tax, to bring as I said, I wasn't attempting to make a comparison between their situation and ours.

I was only commenting upon the suitability of the headlines stating that there was to be a tax cut, and if the Provincial Treasurer can so arrange this, I am sure we would appreciate it.

Premier Douglas: — When it is brought down, what would you bring it down to?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Foley: — . . . I think it's a challenge to this government and I hope they accept it.

During this session the opposition I think have done a tremendous job in spotting taxation increases, and believe you me, it has kept us busy, because there have been a lot of them. On the matter of taxation however, I think there is one tax that has escaped the eye of a good many of us, and that is the matter of increasing camping fees, by our hon. Minister of Natural Resources, who has remained rather quiet about this matter. I am not suggesting that additional revenue wasn't needed by his department, but I just wonder whether this was the best means. If my memory serves me right, the camping sites and the recreational facilities of this province have been, relatively speaking, free to the people of the province as a public right for many, many years. I would be the first to admit, Mr. Speaker, however, that improvements are being made and in some cases costly improvements, which no doubt the public do appreciate. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, to suddenly turn around, just at the time when we thought this government was becoming a bit more conscious about the needs of the people, and the needs of the tourists, just when we had our tourists flocking in to the recreational areas, in large numbers, and I know that certain hon. members on your side of the House must also be aware of this; suddenly the long arm of the Minister of Natural Resources reached out and clamped down a tax, and I am going to call it a tax, Mr. Speaker, of \$7.50 a week for those people using a campsite served with electricity, and \$4.50 a week if it was not served with electricity — right out of the blue sky. Now I question, Mr. Minister, if that action is going to encourage greater use of our recreation facilities, and greater inroads of tourists in the province. It is a serious matter. Now I can only see, one advantage and that was if a person bought a \$7.50 permit, even if he visited four campsites in a week, he would still not have to pay any more than that. Then it occurred to me that under the old scheme you got a permit at each camping site you went to at the courtesy of the government, if I remember correctly. So I can't see much improvement in this, Mr. Speaker, and sincerely regret this additional tax.

October 18, 1961

I want to say one thing further on taxation. The fact that we are faced with higher taxation in this province at the moment, is indeed regrettable for many reasons. I don't think I need dwell on the farm picture, I know the D.B.S. has said something about farm income being up, but I am confident now that existing grain stocks are rapidly dwindling, I think even the Minister of Agriculture, while he hasn't been very agreeable in this debate, would agree with me, that probably we will end up with a drop in farm income over a year ago, before the year ends. I was interested in the remarks of Mr. M. J. McKinnon, president of the Imperial Bank of Canada, as reported in the press recently, in his annual report when he made this statement. I think it is something that all hon. members should consider in the light of possible tax increases, and I quote:

“Incentive for industrial growth cannot be created if level of taxation diminishes initiative, either by the corporate body, or by the individual.”

The level of individual taxation, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, may more insidiously govern the degree of energy or enterprise and imagination put into the corporate effort by the management and technical staff. What high tax rates do is to make sure that the large income levels produce not more, but less aggregate tax revenues than lower rates would. I think in my opinion, the key line in his remarks there, and of course I am only quoting in part from a rather lengthy report, that incentives for industrial growth cannot be created if the level of taxation diminishes initiative.

I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer, certainly all gentlemen in Canada in his position, must be concerned with this matter of initiative, must be concerned that there remains in any economy sufficient motivation for the people to utilize to the fullest possible extent their talents. This in my opinion, is one of the greatest dangers of socialism and the socialist state. The fact that it has been proven in so many areas of the world that it has diminished initiative, it has decreased motivation for individual talent, because of the penalties of high taxation to those who would have the audacity and the courage to step out into corporate enterprise. I would suggest to this government that they view very carefully any suggestion of taxation increases at this time, unless of course it is absolutely impossible to avoid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on a rather surprising array of events which took place just prior to this legislature sitting on October 11.

An interesting triangle of events, if I may call it as such, which in my opinion serves to draw to the attention of the public of this province, the degree of domination by organized labour which already exists with the party across the way, Mr. Speaker. I refer here first to a gentleman — whom I shall call the amazing Mr. Smishek. Why this man, according to reports, and I can be corrected if I am wrong, not only was a very outspoken and voluble member of the medical advisory committee, but I understand from the press that he attended the New Party convention in Ottawa, which was no doubt his right I don't quarrel with that . . .

A Government Member: — A lot of good men attended that convention.

Mr. Foley: — Yes, and I'll quote from a few of those good men in a few moments. But not only that but this gentleman who was supposed to be serving the public of this province, on what I consider to be an extremely important investigation into the field of medical plans, why he had the responsibility of preparing the program of the New party. You know that made me very happy, Mr. Speaker, because in the light of some of his remarks in his minority report, I fear for the future of any program which he drew up for the New Democratic Party. Not only this, Mr. Speaker, but he had the unadulterated gall, in the words of a member of this government, to take issue with the minister of labour. Oh yes! When he said,

“We regret that the Minister of Labour did not commend Mr. Elkin for his speech and endorse what he had to say at the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour meeting in Saskatoon.”

This amazing Mr. Smishek, I don't know the gentleman personally, and I don't wish to make any personal reflections, but you know when I read of his deeds it reminded me of that statement from Julius Caesar. I think the statement went something like this:

“Why man he doth bestride the narrow world like a Colossus.”

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, I am sure all members interested in the public interest, were a little surprised to say the least, and no doubt greatly shocked when the Deputy Minister of Labour in his remarks to the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour convention, not only once, but twice, Mr. Speaker, alluded to the New Democratic Party, and implied that all should support it.

October 18, 1961

This in a prepared speech, as I understand it, in which on one occasion, if I quote him correctly he said:

“The party in power is similar to the British Labour Party and Canada’s New Democratic Party”
(when referring to Sweden.)

And in the other case when he said:

“As regard the practical steps which must be taken by wage earners to help bring about first, understanding and then actual changes required.”

I am quoting Mr. Elkin’s remarks as reported in the press recently.

“These will have to be determined by the wage earners themselves, through their own organizations such as Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and by wage earners in company with others, through a political organization such as the New Democratic Party.”

Mr. Speaker, I don’t think there can be any doubt of the direction in which his words led. I was disappointed and I am sure many people were disappointed when the Minister of Labour saw fit to make only one small statement that I know of, in which he said: Mr. Elkin did not have his permission to make this statement.

Later when Mr. Smishek, the amazing Mr. Smishek chastised the minister for not having spoken in support of Mr. Elkin, the press reported “that labour minister Williams lashed out at Mr. Smishek. I think we took some comfort from that fact, and then he said ‘he felt it would be better had Mr. Smishek not made statements.’

Why, Mr. Speaker, did the Minister of Labour not express some regret at the statement of the deputy minister? Why did he not publicly censure him in some manner in order to leave no doubt as to where the control lies in the Department of Labour? I feel the time is not too late for him to clarify that matter, and I urge him to do so in the public interest. This indicates to me that organized labour is playing an increasingly influential role with the party across the way. I know of late that it has become common for members over there to laugh and say ‘why are the hon. members worried?’ Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say right now that I think there is quite a little difference between worrying about something and

a member of this legislature representing his constituents and attempting to express normal responsible concern over the future of this country, still in the hands of the party across the way. That is what we are doing here, expressing responsible concern for the welfare of the people of this province.

I want to say one more thing with regard to what I consider to be indiscretions of this government. We are all familiar with the fact that the first news of the interim report of the new health plan appeared in the Toronto Daily Star, many hours before the news broke here in Saskatchewan. This is the Toronto Daily Star with the headline 'Saskatchewan medical care plan to cover all.' I think we are all familiar with subsequent events. The fact that after the uproar had died down, the fact that the chairman of the committee, Mr. Thompson, had issued a statement of censure, that the Premier had issued a statement denying that he had given out information on the plan in advance, and that a Toronto reporter admitted that he incorrectly attributed certain information to Mr. Douglas. Now, Mr. Speaker, I raise this matter at this time, because I feel first of all that the Premier, or certainly no member of this legislature can plead inexperience with members of the reporting staffs of our newspapers, who are after all concerned with news. If any information were made available, then I consider it a breach of trust by the Premier's office. Thirdly I consider the reply of the Premier to these charges to date as unsatisfactory, and I note that the Premier says in defence of this matter that he did discuss the terms of reference and he also 'mentioned something of the fees of the Swift Current health region' but he went on to say this:

'that anyone following progress of the advisory committed could provide details by guessing.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to understand that statement, and when I go back and I read some of the matters which the Toronto Star attributed to the Premier, I wonder if either he or the reporter from the Star, could have guessed as accurately as this. The fact that the fee was to be \$3 a month, there was to be universal coverage, there was to be a deterrent fee and so on and on and on.

A Government Member: — Probably they are smarter than you are.

Mr. Foley: — Possibly. But in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, in view of the doubts that has arisen over this matter, I think the Premier owes to the

legislature and to the committee some statement with regard to this. The only statement I am familiar with as yet is a statement to this House and to the committee, and if he recognizes certain indiscretions here, I think he should make it abundantly clear that he apologises . . . I hope he will do that in the near future, and remove any doubts in connection with it.

I want to say a bit more about the medical plan before I sit down, Mr. Speaker. One of the things that I think has been disregarded to a good extent in this debate has been the role of the medical profession in any future plans. Now I know that certain members have alluded to it, members on our side of the House have suggested that a contract be drawn up with the College of Physicians and Surgeons before any taxing takes place, or any tax proposals are drawn up, while other members have suggested various ways in which the physicians might be paid — some seem to have favoured salaries and here again I was rather surprised to see how many members on that side of the House seemed prepared to follow Mr. Smishek's minority report, holus-bolus. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we must be genuinely concerned with providing a plan which will meet with the approval of the greatest majority of the medical profession. And I might ask, would the Premier and the members of this government promise the people of Saskatchewan that no new taxes will be levied for the purpose of the medical plan, until the co-operation of the doctors is assured. Mr. Speaker, because if this is not done, then this government may be making promises to the electorate that they may not be able to keep. Is the Premier and the members of this government aware that two hours ago the College of Physicians and Surgeons passed a motion, almost unanimously that they will not commission-operate with the government in implementing the medical act before this legislature. In view of that, and in view of the fact that the premier is now in his seat, Mr. Speaker, I would repeat again: will the Premier promise if the information I have quoted is correct, and I believe it to be, that two hours ago the College of Physicians and Surgeons passed a motion almost unanimously that they will not commission-operate with the government in implementing a medical act which is now before this legislature — if in view of that and if that is correct, and I believe it to be, will the Premier or the Provincial Treasurer promise the people of this province that no new taxes will be levied for this purpose until the commission-operation of the doctors and the medical profession is assured? I am prepared to give him a moment to reply to that question if he wishes, otherwise this government may not be able to give the services that they are now promising to the people.

Premier Douglas: — Is my hon. friend suggesting that this legislature should abrogate its powers to the College of Physicians and Surgeons?

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't say that, but I am suggesting that unless you have a plan which is mutually acceptable by both those who would serve and those who would receive the service, it seems difficult to me for you to proceed with taxation legislation, and I would appreciate a reply from the Premier in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I think we were rather taken aback in view of the problem I have just mentioned, when one of the members said — and I am sure it will appear on the Hansard of this House, 'that while he hoped the doctors would give their full commission-operation to this plan, that if they did not, he would consider licensing the doctors.' I don't think there can be any doubt that that statement was made . . . I am not suggesting that he made the statement as an utterance of government policy, but at least it suggested that in the minds of least one of the members over there, Mr. Speaker, there be a policy of absolute bureaucracy if necessary. I think this is important. So I say, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the medical plan, no one questions the desirability of improved medical services, as soon as it is possible, no one questions — at the same time, some of the difficult financial problems we have in front of us. No one questions either, the necessity of the fullest commission-operation of the medical profession if this plan is to be the success that many hope.

In view of this, Mr. Speaker, in view of the many important matters lacking in the Speech from the Throne, in view of the many inadequacies of this government, I will oppose the motion. The Premier is about to desert the provincial scene, without any sign of a replacement as yet, in spite of the efforts of the hon. member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) who as far as I know, was the only member over there who has taken any action; he is forming a special committee I understand, which is his privilege of course. I am rather surprised that he hasn't stood up before now and attempted to stir up a little enthusiasm for his committee, and I think, Mr. Speaker, the lack of enthusiasm for, or any vestige of a leadership race by the party over there is rather remarkable. It certainly demonstrates a surprising lack of enthusiasm as this party begins its painful transition from the old defunct CCF to the New Democratic Party. I think this lack of enthusiasm will be very heartening to all hon. members, at least on this side of the House.

Mr. Kramer: — We won't accept cast-offs.

Mr. Foley: — So, Mr. Speaker, in view of the rather chaotic ship of state, particularly of the position at the helm, in view of the omission of an important policy statement of any type regarding agriculture, I think it is obvious that I will be happy to support the amendment. I will not vote for the motion.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman has made the statement that I have never at any time issued any public statement with respect to the resumption of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union. I have in my hand here a statement which was issued to all papers in Canada, and which appeared in practically all the dailies and which was carried by the radio and television media. I think it ought to be placed on the records in view of the very serious charge which has been made by the hon. member. It reads as follows:

“The announcement by the Soviet Union of its intention to resume testing of nuclear weapons comes as a stunning blow to man’s hope for achieving world peace. Should the Soviet Union carry out its announced intention, it will have created a situation fraught with peril. It invites the resumption of an intensive nuclear armaments race, which, in an international atmosphere overshadowed by the Berlin crisis, could prove disastrous.

For the past three years, an unofficial moratorium and the testing of nuclear weapons has served to encourage and reassure the peoples of the world. Despite the often-intense cold war between the East and West, this cessation has led many to hope that no nation would resume testing. These hopes have been dashed.

The Soviet announcement, coming on the eve of the Belgrade conference of non-aligned nations, can only be interpreted as an expression of contempt for the stand which these nations have taken on nuclear testing. It is well known that these uncommitted countries strongly favour a ban on the testing of all nuclear weapons.

A precipitate resumption of testing by western powers in response to the pressure exerted by the Soviet announcement would only intensify an already critical situation.

The New Democratic Party believes that since nuclear testing would affect all the peoples of the world, it is therefore imperative that this subject be debated immediately in the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Canadian government has an obligation to insist as strongly as it can that this procedure be adopted.

At its Founding Convention last month, the New Democratic Party made it clear that ‘Canada should continue to support and demand an immediate ban on nuclear tests, both to avoid the dangerous effects of fall-out; and as a first step toward nuclear disarmament.’

Yesterday’s developments underline the urgency of carrying out this policy.”

This was the official statement which I made. I also made a shorter statement to the ‘Regina Leader Post’ which appeared on September 5 stating that:

“In my opinion the resumption of nuclear testing by the Soviet Union was callous, contemptible, and stupid.”

Mr. Gladys Strum (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member who just sat down made some rather serious charges and I would just like to, for the sake of the record, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, quote what I did say last year on the 6th of April when I finally forced this resolution back on to the floor and forced a vote on it and this is what I said. If you can’t read that is your misfortune.

“No one detests the methods of communism more than I do. No one detests the lack of freedom and dignity more than I do.”

I went on then to suggest that:

“We could use the advances made in technology to wipe out famine, hunger and to rehabilitate the unproductive areas in the earth.”

And on that day, on April 6 when the vote was taken, I would like to read the names of the people who supported this resolution on the protest. The hon. member didn’t have the

October 18, 1961

intestinal fortitude to vote. He was out of the chamber. He didn't have the honesty to vote either for or against it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mrs. Strum: — I just want this chamber to know. Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to ask him a question. Why could he not be in the chamber?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! . . .

Mr. Foley: — On a point of order. Certain charges have been made.

Mr. Speaker: — . . . as I understand it, I don't think there are any further charges.

Mr. Foley: — I just want to say . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Foley: — . . . in order to fully . . .

Mrs. Strum: — Your name does not appear, either for or against.

Mr. Foley: — Maybe I was busy that day.

Mrs. Strum: — You sure were . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! If hon. members would kindly address the chair. These conversations across the House are not permissible, and I think we should consider this matter closed.

Mr. Foley: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if you're going to allow statements such as that I think I have a right to answer.

Mr. Speaker: — She was only quoting from her speech that she made last year, and which you had formerly quoted as I understand.

Mr. Foley: — No! I did not quote from the speech she made last year. I wouldn't dream of it. She was out of order from the beginning.

Mrs. Strum: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you

a question. Is it not permissible to quote from a speech of a former session?

Mr. Speaker: — This is right.

Mrs. Strum: — Well that is what I was doing. I was answering a charge of the member who accused me of being on the side of Communist Russia. I have never been on the side of Communist Russia and he knows it.

Mr. Foley: — I never said that.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the point was well taken and I consider the matter closed as of now.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) suggested that members on this side were either reluctant or unwilling to discuss this whole question, and I think the House should know that the Saskatchewan Farmer's Union has issued a challenge to the hon. members to discuss the question on the farms and we have accepted it and we hope the hon. members on the other side, including Mr. Thatcher will accept the challenge.

An Hon. Member: — Are you the head of the Farmer's Union?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I think there has been an attack against myself. I don't know whether it is deliberate or not and I am sure the hon. members on the other side wouldn't want to continue doing what I consider is a personal injustice to myself and my family. I pointed out this morning what had happened and I don't want to go into that, but this afternoon again the same statement has been made that sympathies of certain members and there was an insinuation toward myself. I would like to read the exact words that are on the record of this House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Are you making an explanation of something that was said concerning you?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I am asking for the right, Mr. Speaker, to quote what I have said, and I would like the hon. members to refrain from making further attacks on my character.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe this is quite in order.

October 18, 1961

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I said on page 84, of Monday, October 16, this is the record. I said:

“I don’t know whether I should mention this point but I think it is relevant . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Enforce the rules of the House and then they’ll all sit down.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe that the hon. member was quoted in this House as saying certain things. May I read the rules? No man may make a speech twice, except in explanation of a part of the speech which has been misunderstood. I understand that the hon. member is doing just that.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, thank you and here is what I am reported to have said and it is correct.

“I don’t know whether I should mention this point, but I think it is relevant, but I think he should have the record straight, and that is the reference to West Germany and how wonderful that country was there. Well the hon. member should have mentioned that had it not been for the Marshall plan, had it not been for the fact that the United States had been pushing money into West Germany to prove to Europe that capitalism is a wonderful system, West Germany today wouldn’t be anywhere near where it is.

Mr. Thatcher: — I wish we could get some of those American dollars in this country and maybe we could show them the same as West Germany.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I have a friend who came back from West Germany and I would like to take his word for this fact. He says the only difference between West Germany and East Germany is this.

Mr. Thatcher: — Everyone wants to get out of East Germany.

Mr. Berezowsky: — (It was not my statement but Mr. Thatcher’s).

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Berezowsky: —

The only difference is that the Communists in East Germany say to the German people, ‘You got us involved in the war, if you want to get on your feet you pull yourselves up by your own bootstraps.’ And in the West, he said the West was pushing money in to West Germany and they had wonderful progress, and on that kind of reasoning I would say that maybe somebody should have come into Saskatchewan, whether it is American capitalists or any other kind of capitalists and maybe they could have gone ahead and subsidized this province as they did in West Germany and then maybe we would be just as fortunate.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well let’s get rid of this government and then maybe we can get some American dollars.

Mr. Berezowsky: — You must remember, Mr. Speaker, that any time you accept that kind of assistance from anybody, be it American or British or anybody else, you are behaving as a colonian dependent.”

I have said enough of what is in the speech to indicate that I have not shown any allegiance to any foreign country or anything like that and I would like the hon. members to refrain from making a personal attack on myself. This is just an appeal to reason.

Mr. Thatcher: — I would like to set the hon. member’s mind at rest. I will only take thirty seconds.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I just read that no debates shall be allowed upon such explanations.

Mr. Thatcher: — I was just going to say, I wasn’t implying that, and we are quite sure he is no Communist. I certainly didn’t mean to imply it.

Mr. Hans A. Broten (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder. I think they did this House a tremendous favour by doing such a good job in moving and seconding the Address-in-Reply.

October 18, 1961

I am proud to be a member of this side of the House at this time when we are bringing in a bill such as the medical insurance act. It will indeed be a forerunner of medical insurance acts all across Canada. It is true there have been many municipalities that have protected every member within their borders to a greater or lesser degree. I live in a municipality, Mr. Speaker, that has had this protection since 1931, and this was put into force at that time when conditions were actually, probably a little worse than they are today. And the people knew they had to have protection, and the protection because of the times and need.

I want to congratulate all the men who envisaged these plans and kept them running so efficiently for so many years. The people in the Swift Current health region should be thanked also for showing to the die-hards across the way that a comprehensive health plan on a large scale is efficiently-run plan that can put emphasis on preventive medicine and also treat the ill and aged when necessary, without the dreaded means test. There has been much said regarding the medical plan in this debate, so I will pass on to the tax agreement.

We all seem to agree that a Conservative government at Ottawa made it necessary for us to go into the income tax field, because they scrapped the former tax-rental agreements. It is a most regressive step to say the least — a measure we could expect from a Conservative government, which is sufficient to say, Mr. Speaker. It seems that some of these governments like to cut their own throats. I am sure this is what will happen because of these measures in the next federal election.

For a moment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the amendment. This masterpiece demonstrates to me the bankrupt condition of the Liberal party. The member from Kelvington (Mr. Peterson) dealt with it yesterday, and one thing it tries to imply, after much searching, is that the Liberal party is the champion of the farmer. Let us for a moment look at some of the facts regarding Liberal policy and agriculture in Canada. One is that in the federal field the Liberal party, which was in power in 1957, has not a member in the prairies because they were completely bankrupt for ideas to help the farmer four years ago. We can all hear echoes of 'he never had it so good' and after a pat on one of the farmer's stomachs, he was told 'you are doing all right'. These people told the federal government in no uncertain terms in 1957, how inadequate the Liberal plans were.

Just at this time, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition chose to leave the federal politics (I am speaking about 1957) when the people of the west thought that the

Liberal farm policy was so inadequate, this is about the time that the Leader of the Opposition decided to go in with the Liberal party. It was a reverse of what the people of Canada, as a whole, thought should be done. He not only did that at this time, Mr. Speaker, but he was picked as a leader of a bankrupt Liberal party in Saskatchewan. This is very significant and I think the farmers should be reminded of this fact, as far as the Liberal party is concerned, their choice of a leader etc. and when they pretend to be the friend of the farmer, I think this should be brought out in no uncertain terms.

So what happened, Mr. Speaker, three years later at their federal convention. The convention adopted a program of giving to the farmer an additional \$1.00 a bushel for the first three hundred bushels of wheat. Now this program, Mr. Speaker, didn't come about very easy at that. In the January 11 paper of last January, it mentioned that the fight was on the floor regarding getting this measly \$300 per farmer. What does this 300 bushels actually represent? It represents to the farmer in Saskatchewan \$300 for the first 300 bushels, or in other words, a parity price for the first 300 bushels and for the rest of the wheat he is supposed to get half of parity. This would be just like telling a shoe store operator that he could get a fair price for his first 300 shoes, and half price for the others. This is the treatment the farmer of this Saskatchewan could expect if we had Liberal policies in this province and in the country as a whole that I think should be told the people of Saskatchewan. It is no small wonder, Mr. Speaker, that they haven't a federal member in the west. Let us remember, this Liberal program was brought out three years after they were rebuked in the 1957 election.

Let us for a moment look at dollar values. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is something that the farmers in Canada, and the people in the west should remember and pay more attention to than they have in the past. The \$300 would be like \$100 in the thirties, and as our bushel of wheat has the same purchasing power as it did in 1933, or in other words our dollar today is worth about 34.7 of the 1930 dollar. Mr. Speaker, the \$300 would not even cover one-quarter of the increase in household expenses for two or three years let alone cover the increase for the rest of the expenses which the farmer has on his farm. It is utterly ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, for these people to say they are the champions of the farmer when they come out with policies such as this.

Mr. Speaker, that \$50 million would only increase the price of wheat on 340 million bushels, which is approximately the amount of wheat which is moved forward every year,

October 18, 1961

by about 14¢ a bushel. But if you look at dollar values again, Mr. Speaker, this amount of money, 14¢ would be just like a little less than 5¢ of 1932 money. And remember what we did because of this federal action by the Conservative government in 1932 — we kicked them out of the federal seat for 25 years because they gave us 5¢, but here they are going to give us 14¢ which is less than the 5¢ value of 1932. These are things that have to be brought to our attention many times, because there is a tendency for people to forget dollar values.

The Premier told us on T.V. the other night, he is entering the federal field because he feels that all of Canada, not only the western farmer is suffering because the New Democratic Party in order to get a square deal for agriculture, which can only be done by federal influence and action, and thereby solve a lot of the unemployment and other problems that arise because a segment does not get its proper returns.' Mr. Speaker, I think I have indicated that I will vote against the amendment and support the motion.

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, in my opening remark this afternoon I must confess that I am going to range far and wide from the two subjects introduced in the Throne Speech. Needless to say that document was one of the very weakest efforts that has ever been presented in this House.

First of all, however, I would like to say how pleased I was to hear a plan, as outlined this morning by the Minister of Education, for a new technical and vocational centre in the city of Prince Albert. The people of Prince Albert have been requesting such an institution for many years, and they have been backed in their request by the La Ronge home and school association, who through briefs and letters have at all times, backed this desire for a technical institution which would serve our area.

I have said many times, both inside and outside this House, that one of the greatest needs in northern Saskatchewan was an institution of this sort where the Indian, Metis and white students could get some training in an environment in which they are familiar. I feel that the plans announced this morning will at least partially fill that need. I think I can speak for the people of La Ronge, and my constituency when I say 'thank you' to the minister and his department, for the consideration given to the construction of such an institution as he outlined this morning to serve Prince Albert and the northern areas.

Now as far as the medical care plan is concerned, I will leave any remarks that I might have until the second reading of the bill. I might just say that it must be obvious to everyone at this time, that here we have a plan that is necessarily weak, due to the views of one of the members of the medical advisory committee. The CCF because they do not dare to offend the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour at this time, whose views from the minority report, do not in any way resemble the views of the other eleven members of the committee, the government opposite have now tried to shirk their responsibility by leaving it to a committee, to decide the most controversial issues presented in the interim report, hoping by so doing, to save face with both labour and the medical care committee.

As far as the speeches from the other side of the House are concerned, there is little to be said about them except that they appear to have been written by the same speech writers that were used before, and because of that there is nothing new in them. I was sorry that I didn't hear the speech of the forceful lady-member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum) but I heard later that it was the same speech that was given in this same assembly last spring. I have never seen the members of the government so loath to take part in the Throne Speech debate. The Minister of Natural Resources, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Industry and Information, the Attorney General and so on, who are usually so eager to beat the drums of socialism, are now content to sit there and do nothing but interrupt the speakers from the other side. Only two out of fifteen cabinet minister have had anything to say and one of them came in here very ill-prepared, despite the fact he carried half the library with him, and the other cabinet minister got up only because he had to make a statement of policy for his department.

The Minister of Agriculture, who has sat there waving his finger and shaking his head, the man who has the most responsible position in this province at this time, with the plight of agriculture, has not seen fit to stand up and make any statement.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Don't worry about it.

Mr. Guy: — I think we will worry about that Mr. Minister of Natural Resources, and I think the people of this province will worry, when they find out that the heads of departments have no responsibility whatsoever, and are sitting there waiting to draw their pension at the end of the next session.

Now, when the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources

October 18, 1961

addressed this assembly, I was sure it was to be another one of his leadership addresses. However, I was very disappointed to read in the 'Commonwealth' of October 11, a headline — "Brockelbank will not run for Saskatchewan leadership." He gave the reason that he thought it should go to a younger man. Now I do not agree with a remark that I think came from this side of the House yesterday, that possibly he was in his dying days, because he looks perfectly healthy to me, and I would like to assure the hon. minister that there is no doubt that he will be here long after the CCF and New Democratic Party are dead and buried. However, I was surprised to hear him praising the oil industry as he did the other day: How there were so many oil wells in Saskatchewan; how every year there has been an increase in oil production. This was a very different story than the one he told in Calgary. I am inclined to believe that for perhaps the only time in his life, the hon. member listened to his conscience and told the truth to a meeting of the Canadian Sedimentary Basin Symposium. His speech, as it was reported in the 'Leader Post' of September 11, 1961:

"J.H. Brockelbank, Saskatchewan Minister of Natural Resources said Friday, his province had gone two years with a major new oil discovery, and the government is deeply concerned with the problem of finding more oil.

He went on:

"He is certain that there is proportionately as much oil in Saskatchewan as in Alberta."

Now this was further borne out by another statement that appeared in the 'Leader Post' October 12:

"Spending in Saskatchewan Declines." (also from Calgary)

"British Columbia will rank second to Alberta this year in spending on oil and natural gas development, moving ahead of Saskatchewan for the first time, the Canadian Petroleum Association predicted Thursday. A CPA survey of western Canadian companies involved in exploration and development shows a steady decline in Saskatchewan since its peak year of 1957. B.C. has been experiencing a rapid growth since 1958."

Now on another occasion, further insult was added when we read in the Saskatoon Star of August 2.

“Oil refinery for The Pas. Construction is started on a now \$4,500,000 oil refinery plan at The Pas, Manitoba. The plant will be built by Canadian Kodiak Refineries Limited, Edmonton.”

This is the point that struck me, Mr. Speaker:

“It will buy crude oil from fields in southern Saskatchewan. It will employ 150 men at its peak.”

Why is it that we can't get these in the northern part of our province? Why can't it be Saskatchewan men that are being hired? Why should northern Manitoba build a refinery to refine oil from our province? Well, Mr. Speaker, that question has been answered many times in this House. Here again is the absolute proof that socialists are driving the oil industry from this province.

I was going to be a little hesitant about bringing the following matter to the attention of this assembly, mainly because I did not want my dear friend, and I'm sorry he's not in the House — the minister in charge of the power corporation, to have too rough a session, in view of the possibility that he might be our next Premier. However, since the Minister of Natural Resources was so kind as to take him off the hook on so many matters the other day, I have decided it was necessary when the Minister of Mineral Resources said the Saskatchewan Power Commission under a Liberal government, did not give service. If this is true, things have not changed for the present Power Corp has evaded its responsibility with regularity.

The minister in charge of the power corporation has consistently stated in this House that the policy of the corporation has been to provide electricity and natural gas to areas, whether the revenue of these areas is sufficient to cover the cost or maintenance of these services. Finally this myth has been exploded by the refusal of the power corporation to provide natural gas to parts of the city of Prince Albert. A few weeks ago, the residents of north Prince Albert petitioned the power corporation for extension of natural gas across the river. They have been led to believe that as soon as the new bridge was completed, gas would be available to that area. The reply they received from the power corporation, and it was reported in the Prince Albert Herald, September 23:

“A letter from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to the city council Thursday night said there were

October 18, 1961

no further plans to install gas across the river. The letter further stated that it would be impossible to justify the cost of installing facilities to get the gas across on the basis of the revenue which would be obtained.”

Unfortunately for the power corporation, the people of Prince Albert, the city council and other public-spirited citizens were not satisfied to accept this reply. They created quite a stir in the newspaper and on the radio, so in a few weeks another letter was received by the council, from the director of public and employee relations of the power corporation, saying that it is quite obvious that the power corporation had not fully explained its position, and that the city was perfectly justified in being alarmed. They went on to say that the next step was for the city and power corporation were to meet and discuss the situation.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is this: Here we have a city of over 20,000 residents, but the power corporation were determined to deny natural gas to a segment of the city because they were across the river. Had the people and the council of Prince Albert been satisfied with a ‘No’ answer, that portion of the city would likely never have natural gas and no discussion would ever have taken place. It was only when the power corporation’s bluff was called that they got down to business and started a negotiation that should have been carried out before any answer was given.

To end it all, the minister in charge of the power corporation got into the act by writing a letter to the editor of the Prince Albert paper, which was headed: “Minister says Criticism of Corporation Unfair”. I’m not going to read it all to you, but I would like to read one or two paragraphs here. This is what the Minister said:

Hon. Mr. Brown: — Go ahead!

Mr. Guy: —

“On two occasions recently, in one instance in an item purporting to be a news story and in another in a column headed an editorial, your paper has carried an unfair critical comment of the Saskatchewan Corporation in relation to natural gas service for North Prince Albert.”

In other words he is suggesting that because a portion of the city of Prince Albert had been neglected, and because it had

requested to have some consideration given, that this was an unfair criticism of the power corporation. Then a little later on he goes on:

“The corporation is not oblivious to the needs of Prince Albert, but it does not feel that those needs are best served by any measure of premature comment in the press before all aspects have been explored. The decision on the river crossing and ultimately on the question of gas service to north Prince Albert cannot be expected to be final until such time as the matter has been studied from the city’s point of view.

In the corporation’s view it is regrettable that this subject has been raised editorially, in what is essentially a detrimental fashion, because all aspects of the situation should be fully examined.”

Mr. Speaker, how could the minister in charge of the power corporation say that any comments are premature, when the answer came back to the city council a definite ‘no’. How can he blame the city for not judging the matter when it was they who issued the request? I hope that this will provide a lesson to other areas who have requested, or are considering a request for natural gas from this government. In the future a ‘no’ answer is only the corporation’s way of trying to dodge a responsibility, and a promise made during the last election.

I don’t intend to make reference to the New Democratic Party in this debate; however the remark from the member of Bengough (Mr. Dahlman) that the C.C.F. and the new party have the same platform made me decide that it was time that the babes in the woods on the other side of the House woke up and faced reality. The old platform of the C.C.F. and the platform of the C.C.F. party are as different as day and night, and Mr. Speaker, I would like to give you several illustrations which will prove this.

The C.C.F. convention in Saskatoon last fall passed an unanimous resolution for Canada to withdraw from NATO. At the convention the C.C.F. members wanted the same as the plank in the New Democratic Party’s platform, but it was voted down, and opposition to it came from the leader of the party that passed the resolution last fall. C.C.F. members from B.C. called for ‘more fire-in-the-belly’ socialism, and Dr. J.M. Thomas from B.C. said he fears the convention will labour to produce nothing but a new Liberal party. However, the chairman of the new party groups said, the new party is not in favour of control.

October 18, 1961

That was Mr. Leo McIssac —

“We shall oppose vigorously any irrational attempt to impose unnecessary controls or to usurp any unnecessary freedom from ourselves or our neighbours. But we are not sympathetic to widespread centralization of economic power under governments, any more than under private control. This is fire-in-the-bell socialism?”

The Premier then stated while he was down there that he would not be the lackey of any segment of industry or society yet he sang at the top of his voice, ‘Solidarity Forever — the Unions Made Us Strong’. Then there was the question of whether the new party wanted Communist support, and I want to make another reference to an article which appeared in the newspaper. From Star-Phoenix August 2, 1961:

“New party delegates make it clear non-communists Unwanted in Ranks”.

But,

“Harold Ritsberg, C.C.F. representative from Vancouver centre, suggested that members of Communist led unions, especially those members who were already C.C.F. be allowed in the party.”

Those, Mr. Speaker, are only a few of the differences that exist between the C.C.F. and the new party. We have already mentioned that C.C.F. farmers did not receive a break at the convention, and I would like to point out one other proof of this statement. This appeared in the Star-Phoenix, August 3, 1961 from Ottawa:

“A farm delegate to the New Party Convention Wednesday touched off a demonstration to show that the convention is not being attended by only labour and C.C.F. delegates, and drew a reprimand from the Chairman.

Ole Turnbull, a wheat and cattle farmer from Kindersley, told delegates that farmers are interested in the new party too, and called on farm delegates to stand, with their wives. The delegates clapped and cheered, and the 250 odd farmers stood, but Chairman George Gruhe said he didn’t want this to happen again, or all kinds of groups would be getting up all over the place; all kinds of those farmers, and he adds farmers were welcomed at the New Party Convention?

It must be clear to all that the unions are interested only in gaining political control and if they can do it through socialism and 'Tommy' Douglas, well, they'll do it. The C.C.F. were at the point of vanishing federally, so they grasped at any straw from sinking, but the true C.C.F. socialist knows full well that the wedding of convenience is doomed to failure. What the program will eventually be that the new leader will fight an election on, will of course be determined in the future, when the labour bosses tell them what it will be.

A great deal has been said concerning the many problems facing the people of Saskatchewan, and the need for government programs to solve these problems. I would like to point out to the members on both sides of this House that the past summer has been a difficult one for northern Saskatchewan as well. We experienced the worst forest fire season in the history of this province. Fires broke out as the last snow was melting and continued until on into October. More than 535 fires were reported; 1 million acres of forest burned, and 30 million board feet of mercantile timber killed, and more than a million dollars has to be spent fighting these fires.

I would like to say, before going further, that the local conservation officers; their supervisors; their smokejumpers and the Indian Metis, and white residents in our northern community deserve considerable credit for the job done in keeping the losses as low as they did. For the most part they did a most creditable job. To the many Metis and Indian residents particular, the time spent in fighting forest fires cost them dearly. Many of them were taken during the commercial fishing season. Some attempts were made to keep from taking them, but eventually they had to go, and some of them many times. The fisherman close to the settlement seemed to suffer the most because they were the handiest when the call came to fight fires.

The tourist industry also felt the effect of the forest fire season. Guides were in short supply in many cases, and outfitters were hard-pressed to satisfy their customers.

What all the solutions are to these problems is difficult to say, but I think the time has come when consideration must be given to a program which will provide adequate fire fighting resources, without having to depend so completely on the guides and commercial fishermen of our northern communities.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do know one step that should be taken and that is to pay wages that will, to some extent,

make up for the income they lose by giving up their other occupations. I am certainly glad the Minister of Natural Resources has returned to his seat. A decent wage would also make it easier to recruit fire fighters from among the men who have no steady jobs. Mr. Speaker, if ever a government should hang its head in shame, it is the government that is sitting across from me today. We have heard the Premier, on many occasions, speak of the advanced labour legislation on the statute books of this province. We see how he has sold the interests of Saskatchewan out to labour bosses of eastern Canada. We have listened to his repetitious speeches of how he and his government are the friends of the workingman. We have heard the Premier condemning the federal government for the treatment of the Indian population, but nowhere in Canada are the Metis and Indian people who risked their lives to protect our natural resources, subjected to the exploitation of their labours as they are in Saskatchewan, under a socialist regime.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what this government — the friend of labour — the protectors of the underprivileged, are paying their fire fighters? They pay them \$4 a day regardless of whether it is a ten, 12, 16 or 24-hour day, and many days these people fight fires 16 to 24 hours, for their mere pittance. When you break that down on a hourly basis we find that they receive 33 cents for a 12 hours day; 25 cents an hour for a 16 hour day; and 16 cents an hour for a 24 hour day.

The cabinet ministers across the way were eager enough to raise their pensions to \$4,200 a year at the last session, but this eagerness stopped before considering the plight of our northern forest-fire fighters. There appears to be only one reason why, in this day and age, this situation exists, Mr. Speaker, and it is because it is in keeping with the policies of this government of ignoring the rights of our Metis and Indian people and in keeping them as second-rate citizens.

Let us see what some of the other provinces in Canada are paying their fire-fighters, because probably the next thing we know the Minister of Natural Resources will get up and say, "Oh, I know, but the other provinces are paying them less." I have here in my hand the Regulations under the Forest Act for British Columbia, and under Division 8, fire-fighter rates of pay, the full compensation for volunteer or compulsory assistance in the fighting and controlling and so on of forest fires, for labours, 75 cents per hour for fire-fighters. This does not include board.

All right, we go on to Alberta, and this wage scale effective April 1, 1958, labourers 55 cents per hour, board furnished. We go to New Brunswick, which happens to be a Liberal province. Wages paid to fire-fighters (this is in a letter from the New Brunswick Forest Service, Department of Lands & Mines) \$6 per day. We go on to another Liberal province, Quebec, Department of Lands & Forests, wages paid to fire-fighters, regular fire-fighters per hour are the following: 75 cents per hour, with board. We come to the province of Newfoundland — that's the province we have heard from the other side of the House is so opposed to labour, their labour laws are so outdated, and what have you, and in a letter addressed to myself from the Department of Mines, Agriculture & Resources, we have here that wages are \$1 per hour for such help. Isn't that a fine comparison to \$4 a day? I would imagine that our forest fire fighters in northern Saskatchewan would like to have 'Joey' Smallwood come to Saskatchewan.

It will be interesting to hear what excuses the government will come up with for their deliberate exploitation of our northern labour, but I hope they will not have the sagacity to stand in this House and tell us what men in the Department of Natural Resources have told me. On more than one occasion I was told they could not pay more, because then the Indian and Metis would go and deliberately start fires. There is a typical example of our government's opinion of our Indian and Metis friends. To suggest that these people who spend their lives in the north, who make their living from their natural resources, and who have seen the devastation resulting from a forest fire, would deliberately start fires so that they could get work, is not worthy from any man.

During the summer 1 million acres of timberland were destroyed. This means 1 million less acres for use as trapping grounds for the coming winter. There is going to be a terrific hardship on a large number of our northern trappers, whose trap-line was either completely or partially destroyed. I am quite certain these trappers are going to need help this coming winter, and I hope the government opposite won't sit there and suggest the \$4 a day they receive in fighting forest fires will keep them over the winter ahead. The ideal solution, of course, would be to provide some other job opportunity. However, if the government's lack of ability to provide new jobs, as their past record shows, continues, direct financial help will have to be given. I will certainly be interested to hear from the Minister of Natural Resources, just exactly what help their department is prepared to give.

However, the Minister of Natural Resources has been

October 18, 1961

strangely silent concerning any programs to provide jobs for the northern people. In fact I was interested in his reply the other day to a question put to him by the Leader of the Opposition concerning the pulp mill of northern Saskatchewan. We got the same answer we have been getting for 18 years — negotiations are under way. This, Mr. Speaker, is at least a change, because before negotiations never got under way until the spring before an election. At least we've got a head start this time.

We hear continually from the Minister of Natural Resources, and the Minister of Industry and Information, how difficult it is to get a pulp mill at the present time. The industry is depressed, costs are high, and so on and so forth. If that is true for Saskatchewan it would be logical to assume it is true for the other provinces, and for Canada as a whole. However, from the reference tables of the Canadian Pulp & Paper Association, June 1961, one sees on Table XI that there is a steady increase in pulpwood production in Canada. There were 12 $\frac{3}{4}$ million cords in 1958, increasing to 16 $\frac{1}{4}$ cords in 1960. This shows also that the number of pulp and paper mills are increasing. Canadian exports show a steady increase; total number of employees in the industry were increased. Total production of the industry was increasing. Surely this doesn't bear out the bleak outlook for the pulp and paper industry as pointed out by the Minister of Industry and Information.

In the Leader Post, September 18 the following report appeared:

“Expanding Pulp Program in British Columbia

British Columbia's pulp and paper industry is in the midst of a \$125 million expansion program, the first stage in a drive to double its \$240 million annual production by 1980.

World consumption of the industry's product is expected to double in the next 20 years, and B.C. hopes to hold its market share.”

Then we had another news release; this time from Alberta, The Leader-Post, October 11, 1961:

“Newsprint Mill Will be Built

Construction of a \$38 million newsprint plant at Whitecord, Alberta, will begin Thursday. The contract has already been let.”

Mr. Speaker, if British Columbia and Alberta are able to get pulp mills, and the pulp industry is on the increase as the reports from the industry shows, why is it that Saskatchewan cannot get one little tiny pulp mill. Well, there again, we've had the answer in this House many times. As soon as we get rid of the socialist government and elect a government that is more sympathetic to private enterprise, and will provide a more favourable and economic climate that can be trusted, then we will get our result.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — You fellows were here for 35 years; why didn't you then?

Mr. Guy: — I'm not going to go in to an argument with the Minister of Natural Resources about 35 years ago.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Manitoba has one.

Mr. Guy: — That appears to be his only answer for every problem that arises in this House — back in 1939 or 1940 the Liberal government did this, and the Liberal government did that. Well, it's no use being repetitious to suggest that conditions have changed somewhat. What I would like to suggest, though, to the Minister of Natural Resources that he should compare what Saskatchewan has done since 1944 with what British Columbia and Manitoba have done in the same time. There is the proper measure of what is being accomplished.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — They compare very well.

Mr. Guy: — The Premier the other day, when concluding his remarks, told us that during the 18 years he had been Premier the government had never been a one-man show. That I believe is quite true. Rather during the last 18 years the people of this province have been subjected to a continual three-ring circus from the other side of the House. One ring has been full of commissions and committees. We have had to wait for their performance before the main show got under way. We could call the second ring the 'patronage ring'. There the ministers and their friends chased each other around to see who could get the largest number of friends and relatives on the pay roll. Then in the centre ring, it was centred on two magicians, our two provincial treasurers, who had learned the magic of making the taxpayers' money disappear, but had not learned the act of making it reappear in the form of industrial and resource development and aid to the municipalities and the farmer.

The barker of the whole show was the Premier, telling

October 18, 1961

his jokes, taking his bows, misleading the public, making them think that all was right with the world, when actually the show had gone broke, and the province with it. Now the Premier is starting a new show of his own, and he is using for his attractions David Lewis and Jimmy Hoffa, and while saying goodbye he advised the Liberals to quite worrying about the C.C.F. and the New Democratic Party. The same idea was voiced by the Minister of Mineral Resources the other day. We can assure him that we are not worrying about the future, since it will be so short, but we are worrying about their past and the mess they have left behind them in Saskatchewan. Little did the 40 per cent who supported the socialists and put their faith in the Premier in 1960 realize that they would be looking for a new leader before half of their term of office was through. Little did they suspect that their idol was laying plans to desert them in their time of need. Now they are forced to look for a replacement, and they know as we know on this side of the House that this search will be in vain. From the speeches we have heard in this debate, and from those we have not heard, it is obvious there is no replacement there. In addition to there not being a replacement there are none who want the leadership. After all, who wants to climb on a dead horse if they want to go anywhere?

However, probably someone will be persuaded to sacrifice their political career by taking over the premier-ship of a government which will be condemned from here to eternity, for their bungling and mismanagement during the last 18 years. That, Mr. Speaker, is why the Liberal party and the opposition in this House are concerned. The government that we can expect from the other side of this House will be worse than no government at all. They have proved it this session. The cabinet ministers sitting there, day after day, one after the other, not daring to open their mouths — whether it's because they are waiting to make their speeches at the New Democratic convention in Saskatoon, or whether they are heeding the old saying that it is better to remain silent and be thought a fool, rather than to open their mouths and prove it.

So it appears very obvious, Mr. Speaker, that in the months that lie ahead and the years that lie ahead, that with no leadership over there, it will be the opposition on this side of the House that will have to carry the debate as we have carried it in this session, and we have carried them in the past. This will continue until the electorate of this province, which in a very short time, will give us the opportunity to sit on your right side, Mr. Speaker.

In the meanwhile, the Premier will go his merry way,

unconcerned about the people who elected him for 20 years, and he will try to mislead the people of Canada as he has misled the people of this province. However, there are definite signs that this enchantment is wearing off before it begins. The last issue of the Financial Post carried an editorial about him being more eloquent than sensible.

October 14, 1961:

“Tommy Douglas of Saskatchewan has had a country-wide reputation as an orator for years. As leader of the New Democratic Party he is now making claims to be an economic thinker, and it turns out that there is more music than logic in his golden words.”

Then they conclude:

“Mr. Douglas may have a point to make about the short-coming of this welfare state, but he should refrain from confusing the multitude with statistics turned upside-down.”

We have listened to that year after year, arguing about net debt or gross debt; when it has all got to be paid for by the taxpayer of this province.

I hope that the people of this province will not forget him, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure they will not. They will remember his betrayal of the C.C.F. movement to the big labour unions; they will remember how he left them in time of depression; they will remember how the cabinet ministers and the ministers on that side of the House, during this session, have shirked their responsibility to their constituents by sitting there refusing to participate in this debate. They will remember the Minister of Agriculture, for letting the amendment on agriculture go through this House without the courage to stand up and state his convictions.

They will remember the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Industry and Information, and the other ministers for their lack of ability, lack of courage to stand up and put the problems that face this province before this legislature. They will not be forgotten, and when the time comes and an election rolls along, they can go into their constituency and hang their heads in shame.

October 18, 1961

As far as the Premier is concerned, as I said, he is leaving this province, and he will no doubt be remembered. In fact, the words (and I cannot recall at present who said them) but I know they apply in this case, so I am going to quote them:

“Just for a handful of silver he left us . . .”

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is quite evident from my remarks here today that I have no intention of supporting the motion, but I will support the amendment.

Mr. Robert Perkins (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask permission to say a few words in support of the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I wish to congratulate those who have spoken before me in support of this motion. One also should I suppose take recognition of what has been said on the opposite side of the House. I'm afraid I cannot make it a congratulation, on account of the fact that practically every shade of contradictory opinion has been expressed, and if you congratulated some on this side of the opposition, you would be condemning some on the other side.

I wish to also compliment the mover and seconder of the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) and the hon. member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). I think in regard to the discussion on medical care, as mentioned from the Speech from the Throne, the ground has been pretty thoroughly covered. Most of the things that can be said, I think have been. It seems to me, sitting here quietly all through this session, that there has been pretty unanimous support for the principle of an all-embracing medical scheme for the province of Saskatchewan, and which everybody, regardless of their ability to pay, will be covered by full medical attention. It seems to me that the main differences evolve around either timing or method, and with those words I am only going to say that for myself and my constituents, I wholeheartedly support a medical scheme at this time.

I have to say that I am sorry I have seldom heard more vigorous opposition to what has not been mentioned in the plan, than what I have heard from the members of the opposition. Things that I am sure no government has ever dreamed up has been brought forth as though they had been proposed by this government, and have been wholeheartedly condemned on the opposite side of the House.

I would just like, in passing, to mention the reference

made to a good doctor in our constituency by the Minister of Municipal Affairs yesterday, referring to Dr. Kitley, one of the grand old gentlemen of our district, who once sat as a Liberal member in this House. He is well over 80 years old; he was chosen from our district as the pioneer of the year during this past summer; he was, a couple of years ago, invited by Hollywood people to appear on 'King for a Day' program in Hollywood, and is one of the highly regarded people in our community.

I have to say that when he ran as Liberal member in that constituency he was requested by many of the progressive-minded people in the constituency at that time to not run as a Liberal or a Conservative member, but to choose some more progressive group. At the time he thought he could come down here and have some impact on the thinking and policies of the ruling group of that day. After a term, or possibly two, he returned to Nipawin a completely disillusioned and disappointed man. He told me shortly before the election that he thought he could have some influence in bringing about some advanced medical measures by being a member of this House. He says that he couldn't get to first base. He said he was wholeheartedly supporting the C.C.F. candidate in the past election, and that he hoped we would be instrumental in bringing about a medical care plan at this next session.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Perkins: — Just for a moment or two I want to refer to the personal attacks made on the Premier of this province, by some (and I am glad to say only some) of the members on the opposite side of this House. I wish to say I am disappointed in the tactics of the Leader of the Opposition, and that is putting it mildly. I hesitate to mention the next man, the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) who, in my opinion, debased himself, the party he represents, and the quality of debate in this Chamber by the statements he made about the Premier of this province.

It is very difficult to adequately criticize the gentleman without getting down to the level that he chooses to occupy. No one denies anyone the right to his or her own opinions, when a member chooses to degrade himself by indulging in this kind of mud slinging, Mr. Speaker; this kind of personal attack, he deserves nothing but the contempt of decent-minded people.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Perkins: — The tactics also of the hon. member from Turtleford (Mr. Foley) —

October 18, 1961

singing this old song of anyone opposed to him, or his group is somehow connected with Moscow. This is a despicable distortion of fact. I must point out to the member that this is exactly typical of Fascist psychology. I hate to see this sort of witch hunting, this character assassination show its ugly head in this province of Saskatchewan. It has lived its day during the former administration in the United States; it had its fling in the Nazi build-up in Central Europe, and I would appeal to members on both sides to try and not press this so-called 'witch-hunting' and what was once called 'Red Baiting'.

I was intrigued by the proposition that the hon. member from Turtleford (Mr. Foley) put up when he challenged anyone of us here to send a wire to — or asked us if we had sent a wire to Premier Khrushchev, protesting against the testing of nuclear bombs in this country. I have to say that I didn't. I didn't send a protest to anyone else either. I am wondering if the hon. member was thoughtful enough, or learned enough, to send that kind of a demand. I am wondering if he sent that kind of a demand to the United States when they tested, not their twentieth test, but their hundredth and something test. I am wondering if he sent that kind of a protest to the United States when they dropped, not tested — but dropped two atomic bombs on Japan on unsuspecting and innocent people, including women and children, and non-combatants in the war.

I will take the hon. member up on his challenge, and if he will pay for half the costs I will go along with him, and we will write out wires to Premier Khrushchev and to any or all countries that are testing, or contemplating testing nuclear bombs anytime he wishes.

I just want to say a word or two, Mr. Speaker, about the interests and concern which the opposition seems to have in the New Democratic Party. They have predicted this is an unworkable arrangement and of course they don't agree in the things that are the matter with it. We have a member who has just resumed his seat, saying that the new party is completely different — as different as night from day, from the old party, while a day or so ago we had the Leader of the Opposition saying it is the same old party — same old bunch of socialists. If the opposition are so sure this New Democratic Party won't work, why are they so fearful? Why spend so much time in this House trying to point out its weaknesses and its unworkability?

One wonders where the hon. members have been all this past summer. From the opinions expressed, you would think

they had taken no account of the articles in the papers of the holding of the founding convention of what was then the new party, and one wonders why they are so out of step with the expressions of opinion of the papers at that time. I would like to take a minute or two to give some of the opinions of one or two of the notable people who were at that convention, and also to read you some of the opinions of some of the press men and one or two of the editorials that were written in the papers at that time. I would like to read from the front page of August 4 issue of The Montreal Star, in which they are describing the convention at the time of Mr. Douglas's acceptance of the leadership of this party, and accepting the challenge laid down by the Prime Minister at that time. It says:

“Close to 3,000 people packed into the Coliseum rose to their feet in a wild roar of endorsement. These people had been engaged all week in forging a new political force out of the C.C.F. and organized labour. Now they have the man they wanted to lead the party they have built.”

That was from (Staff), Ottawa Bureau. Then by James Stewart, Star's Ottawa Bureau, in describing the leader of the new political party said:

“The new leader of this political union of socialism and labour is a shrewd and passionate political leader, western style. Like J.S. Woodsworth, founder of the C.C.F., and Mr. Stanley Knowles, one-time C.C.F. Member of Parliament, he is a Protestant minister. Like Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, he is a teetotaller and a master platformer in an evangelical strain today. Like all of these three he is a westerner.”

I would just like to pause here and say that it was hard not to be thrilled at the time of that convention, in hearing the numerous comments on the people from Saskatchewan, all over the place, streets, restaurants, motels, wherever you went, you would hear something like this: “How is it that these two leaders come from the province of Saskatchewan? How is it that we have a Prime Minister of Canada who comes from the province of Saskatchewan?” Several of the heads of the committee in this large convention were Saskatchewan people. I will continue reading this:

“ . . . Tommy Douglas in the national arena is leader of the new party. His own political views are discernible in the party platform which he will take to the voters, and his political assets have

October 18, 1961

failed little, if at all, in the 17 years that he had been Premier of Saskatchewan.

His talents that had won him a federal seat in 1935 and brought him to a landslide victory in Saskatchewan in 1944, are still strong. He is agile in debate; swift and devastating in rebuttal, and a darling of the hustings. He is an advocate of the master of the short speech, laced with wit, humour, good stories but sharp and to the point. A former lightweight boxer, he is exceptionally good in a tight corner and never pulls punches. He was gold medallist at university in debating, dramatics and oratory and he has lost none of these talents.”

Then, as the delegates head for home there is a short comment here. Some of the comments of our present municipal affairs minister who was chairman of that committee, are as follows:

“This has been a historical moment, and just a few seconds before 4:00 he looked at his watch, paused and then said: ‘Now the new party can come into being. I move the adoption of the report. This is a historical moment.’

“This new party is more conservative than its C.C.F. predecessor; more to the left than the Progressive party which, in 1921, elected 65 members to the Commons, as elements of solidity in that none of the predecessors could hold. Certainly there were divisions in the convention. Foreign policies was one; but there was nothing all week to indicate that the trade unionists and the farmers and the leftists — those who want nationalization pursued as an end in itself and those who would use it only in particular cases as a means to an end, will not pull together will not pull together in harness.

All the dissent at the convention did not come from the extreme left. Dr. Eugene Forsey, Research Director of the Canadian Labour Congress, warned the convention it was going too far in guaranteeing jobs to all who want to work — the brethren were (inaudible) the depths, he said.”

Here is what the paper says Norman Campbell said:

“It was the hardest-working, the most faithfully attended political convention ever held in Ottawa,

as well as being the largest in point of official delegate registration. Only nine of 1,780 registered delegates failed to cast their ballots in the leadership election.”

That was from the Ottawa Citizen. The Montreal Star, August 5 says:

“Voting delegates at the five-day convention at the Coliseum numbered 1,801 — (they are out about 20 from the other figure) the largest registered attendance of any political convention.

As well as being the largest, the New Democratic Convention is probably also the best in interest, enthusiasm and day-to-day attendance. There was little milling around in the halls; no horseplay and very little humour. These people had come to work, and work they did.”

Hope I’m not reading too much, Mr. Speaker, but it seems to me that misrepresentations or the inability of the opposition to have looked this up at the time of the convention justify this, and so perhaps I might be permitted to read just one more article from this paper: This is a couple of paragraphs from an editorial in the Montreal Star, dated August 5. It says:

“The challenge from the Left.

Nobody in his senses should end this week without recognizing that a new and powerful force had been developed in the left wing of Canadian politics. The long and often difficult negotiation between the C.C.F. and the Canadian labour Congress over the past years has been crowned a success.

A party obviously far stronger than the C.C.F. ever was has come into being. It may be that as it emerges today from the delivery room it appears healthier than it may, in fact, later turn out to be. That remains to be seen, but it is equipped with a platform which omits much of the phraseology which in C.C.F. days, offended middle-of-the-road voters. It has also elected by a huge majority, a leader who on his first national showing at least, is admirably . . . not only to attract the left wing, but to make an appeal of great force to the middle ranks of both the Liberal and Conservative parties.”

October 18, 1961

Mr. Speaker, the record of the Premier of this province will suffer little from the loose-mouthed efforts of some of the members opposite to discredit him. I wish for him, both personal and for the people of the Nipawin constituency, the hope that he may continue to serve and lead us in this great task that he has undertaken.

I would like now to spend a few minutes (I see I only have about ten) until 5:30, but would like to deal a little with some of the work of the Department of Agriculture which has been noticeable to me as one of the M.L.A.'s of this government. I would first mention the effort that was put up to secure feed in the constituency from which I come. The method with which it was carried out was to me a model of efficiency and speed in the face of what looked to be an emergency for the livestock people of this province. As soon as it was ascertained that the Supaniuk Channel area, which has approximately 1,000 acres of hay or more growing every year, inaccessible by car or truck — as soon as it was found out that that area had drained sufficiently to cut hay on it, a 50 mile road was bulldozed in from the end of the road — that is from the Squaw Rapids site, over an old trail into the hay-land. Within weeks trucks were rolling in there loaded with hay machinery, and within a few days more, swathers were busy cutting and balers baling that hay. People from Weyburn, Stoughton, Wakaw, Aberdeen, Southey, Waldheim and many others which I am not familiar with, secured hay from this area. Some 4,200 tons of hay were cut, and are being moved if they have not already been moved, out of the area. This was quite a tremendous task. This hay was supplied at no cost to the farmers who came in to get it. They had to do the work themselves; pay part of the transportation for the machinery to be brought in, and part of the transportation to get the hay out. The bulk of it was paid by the two senior governments, provincial and shared in some cases by the federal.

I want also to just mention another help which has been given to a great part of our district, and that is the establishment of three community pastures within the constituency of Nipawin. None of them are fully broken up and pastured, as yet. Each one of them has practically all the cattle and all the carrying capacity they are allowed.

I would like to mention some of the other things which appear to me to be a critical attitude of the opposition, which is unwarranted. This seems to me to point up that the Department of Agriculture, the Animals Branch, the Field Crops Branch have been right on their toes. As early as March 15, 1961 the federal-provincial meetings were held in Regina attended by the officials of the three prairie and federal agricultural departments. At that time in March, they made a recommendation that there should be oats sown on fallow for fodder;

no seeding of stubble on prairie areas; conserve pasture for breeding stock which also entails culling out your poor stock; conserve water supplies and the fodder carry-over from 1960. It seems to me that issued in March, this was good advice.

By May 3 the first pumping outfit started. Remaining outfits were added on May 16, June 24, August 1 and August 5. To September 15, they had pumped 330 dugouts plus water, for Abernethy, Wakaw, Balcarres and Wolseley. About September 25 started pumping for Estlin, with 17 miles of pipe and four pumps. Additional material ordered the first week in September will be in operation by September 25.

It goes on here, outlining through the whole summer the action which has been taken by this department. June 23 a written request from the Hon. I.C. Nollet to the Hon. Mr. Alvin Hamilton of a draft of a policy requesting further participation and the cost of it. A policy based on 75 per cent of rail freight; 66 2/3 per cent of hired trucks, and four cents per ton mile for movement of fodder increased somewhat on hay harvested by the farmer. It goes on to the different moves that were taken as the summer progressed.

June 29, the government was advised by the Wheat Board that they were withdrawing shipping orders on oats as requested, and were issuing instructions regarding holding stocks of grain in elevators at the R.M. request. July 14, they amended the emergency fodder policy — 100 per cent rail and 75 per cent trucking up to \$12 per ton, and five cents per mile for farm movement of fodder. I mentioned part of the costs were paid on the hay that was taken out from the Supaniuk Channel area, and this was the rate. Assistance on movement of oats and barley for feed, basis 75 per cent of rail or truck bales and 4 cents per ton-mile for farm trucking, with deductible 25 miles. The policy of sharing 50-50 with the rural municipalities cost of hauling grain, wheat, oats or barley in elevators.

On July 14-23, correspondence to the Hon. A.W. Hamilton, advising all agriculture. reps., that all councillors, reeves, secretaries and agricultural committees would be allowed \$6 per day and 11 cents per mile while arranging for fodder and food grain requirements, effective up until August 19. Arrangements were made with the Saskatchewan Seed Grain Commission-opposition in Moose Jaw to hold and obtain seed grain supplies of oats for next year. This is a bare outline, and only mentions some of the things which have been done in the securing of feed alone.

I see my time has almost passed, and I can only have to say that I congratulate the Minister of Agriculture for the steps he has taken to help the farmer.

October 18, 1961

I can sympathize certainly with people who are in drier areas than ours, and certainly with the comments which have been made about the lack of water in the different districts. I drove from here down to Assiniboia last Sunday, and the drive over that some hundred miles south of Moose Jaw presents a pretty desolate picture. The grass is short, feed appears scarce and it certainly merits the pity and consideration of us all.

The only thing, of course, that I know of which can solve this thing is rain. Unfortunately this government nor any other possesses the ability to make it rain. I can assure you that as far as I am concerned, and I know I can speak for every member on this side of the House, that the question is a live one — that the sympathies for the farmers of this province is one of the main ones of this government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I just wish to say that I will not be able to support the amendment. I will vote for the motion.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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