

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Fourteenth Legislature
7th Day

Thursday, October 19, 1961

QUESTION RE MEDICAL CARE

Mr. W. 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 Premier. In view of news reports yesterday that the doctors will refuse to participate in this medical plan, is any meeting contemplated in the near future between representatives of the government and the College of Physicians and Surgeons to see if any compromise can be worked out which would be satisfactory to them?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am told by the Minister of Health, at least I was two days ago, that the president of the Saskatchewan College of Physicians and Surgeons had, through the deputy minister, requested a meeting with some members of the government. That meeting was arranged for 10 o'clock Saturday morning. However, statements made by the president of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, as appearing in this morning's paper, if they are accurate, raise some questions as to what the purpose of the meeting is. However, the government is quite prepared to carry through with its original agreement to meet the representatives of the college on Saturday morning, if they still desire to have such a meeting. As far as working out any compromise is concerned, the full details of the plan have not yet been made public. I do not therefore see how they can be at the stage where we can talk about a compromise. All that is before the House and all that has been made public is the legislation which has received first reading. The full details of the plan of course will be divulged when second reading is moved by the minister, and I feel that when that is done and all the information is before the public and the profession, then some of the objections which the profession may have had will disappear.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Premier a supplementary question. Would he feel like giving the House and the people of Saskatchewan

October 19, 1961

any assurance that no new taxes will be imposed for a medical scheme until he is sure he can get the commission-operation of the doctors to provide the service.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the government is not prepared to abrogate to the College of Physicians and Surgeons, or anybody else the responsibilities which properly belong to this legislature.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — The government will carry out whatever instructions it receives from this legislature and carry out any administrative responsibilities which are given to it by this legislature.

Mr. Thatcher: — I am not suggesting that you should but let's not . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

QUESTION RE TELEPHONES

Mr. J. W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to ask the minister in charge of telephones, if due to the protests that have been made by the city of Melville, if his department will reconsider their change in plans to operate the telephone service for the city of Melville, to the city of Yorkton until such time as both the Chamber of Commerce and the city have an opportunity to make further representations to his department.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, some of the telephone officials did meet with a delegation from the city council of Melville about a week ago. But I know of nothing from the Chamber of Commerce or the Board of Trade to the effect that they are making any protest. I have no word about that at all.

Mr. Gardiner: — This is a supplementary question to the minister's answer. I was just wondering if there was any reconsideration being given by his department to change in plans, so that service will not be directed through Yorkton.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — No, we have no change of plans at this time. It is just the sort of a St. Paul, Minneapolis deal I think. Yorkton and Melville are both rivals.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Hon. Mr. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply, particular the lady member for the city of Regina, who provided the House with a very excellent analysis, and a very constructive appraisal of the proposed medical care plan. I wish also to congratulate the hon. member for Touchwood for the diligent work which he did in connection with his presentation regarding the financial arrangements between the federal government and the provinces, particular as it relates to our own situation in Saskatchewan.

I wish also to congratulate the hon. members opposite for the contribution that they have made in this debate. The one thing that impressed me, Mr. Speaker, however, was as one hon. member after another arose to speak, the addresses by both the mover and the seconder of the speech by comparison became that much better, Mr. Speaker. I have been in the legislature now for a great number of years, and I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, in all my experience have I listened to such an ineffective opposition as expressed by the hon. members opposite in this debate so far. They have asked for a special session of the legislature in connection with drought problems. They regretted that there was no special provision or any extraordinary measure in this regard contained in the Speech from the Throne, but after listening to them, Mr. Speaker, I just wondered why they would want a special session. I haven't heard one single constructive proposal come from the hon. members opposite. They haven't made one single point as to what respect the government has been delinquent in its responsibility and has not adequately met the present emergency situation. Their remarks have been punctuated by extreme statements, unsupported by facts, Mr. Speaker. One of the futilities of speaking in this House is an endeavour to try to point out simple facts,

October 19, 1961

obvious facts, to the hon. members opposite — it is a futile job, Mr. Speaker, because they will not accept facts. They believe that if they go about, particular when there is a calamity, or a natural disaster, they believe that somehow people are going to believe them, that they can stir up unrest and ill feeling, while it doesn't prevail throughout the province despite their best efforts in this House and so on the hustings, Mr. Speaker, because people know otherwise. They know the facts.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. members seem to feel that this is good political tactics. I would suggest to them that it is the poorest kind of political practice that can be followed by any party that ever hopes to become the government in this province. They are putting a very low value on the intelligence of the people of this province, Mr. Speaker.

I had expected that when the Premier had announced that this was his last session the House, that I would hear some expressions of gratitude for what the Premier has done, and this administration has done under his leadership in this province. On the contrary, they said that this period will go down in the records, that this administration's records under the leadership of Premier T.C. Douglas will go down in history as one which has done nothing in this province. Now people know better than that, and I thought they would at least have the good grace of saying something nice about the Premier, in a personal way.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition said, 'well he wasn't sure whether he should stay or go' he damned him both ways. He damned him if he was going to stay, and after he damned him because he was going away, his stated reason was 'because I think our political chances will be better now.' That is the height of his statesmanship. I wonder if this is the reason he sought the leadership of the Liberal party, for strictly political purposes, or to give a contribution to better the economy of Saskatchewan. I wonder which is the case, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Thatcher: — Do you want me to tell you, because I figured if we got rid of you . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . and people psychopaths in the rest of the country, stirring up, and I'm not referring to the hon. members opposite as

such, but the kind of person who is always prepared to take a negative viewpoint of everything, particularly when a calamity beyond the human powers of man occurs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal first of all with the drought situation, and to review a bit some of the events that led up to the present situation. As I mentioned, hon. members opposite state over and over nothing has been done. Nothing has been done. That the department hasn't had a single new policy since 1944. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a word that could be used in reply, but I'm afraid it would be unparliamentary if I used it in this House. It must be remembered that this is not the first year that this government or the Department of Agriculture has faced a very serious drought situation in this province. There have been innumerable drought problems on other occasions as well, in recent years as a matter of fact. For example in 1958-59 we paid out over \$400 thousand in transportation assistance. We had also paid transportation assistance before the early snow which came in the fall of 1959. In 1959-60 very substantial financial aid was provided and I can still remember the early snowfall of 1959 and the outburst from the hon. Leader of the Opposition who wasn't concerned about what took place before the snowfall, he didn't seem to realize that we had already made transportation policies and other emergency measures available for our farmers. But without regard to this fact when the snow hit, and the calamity was upon us, what did he say? 'All we can do is run to Ottawa.' That all we can do about an emergency situation is run to Ottawa. But I want to say here right now, Mr. Speaker, is there anything wrong with the national government assisting in situations that are of national emergency proportions? I think he should agree that the national government has some responsibility in these matters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, regarding the contention that nothing has been done: For the fiscal year 1959-60 there was paid out by this administration, that is our share of the financial responsibilities involved about \$3 1/2 million of nothing, of so-called nothing by the opposition — in 1959-60. Despite the calamity-howling of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, throughout this province at that time, that we're going to lose our livestock industry, that the Department of Agriculture was immobilized in the situation — we not only saved our livestock industry, but we had the largest numbers of cattle subsequent to 1959-60 that we've had in our history. We came through and this year 1961 recorded the highest cattle population in our history.

October 19, 1961

Those are the answers, Mr. Speaker. These were the objectives we hoped to and did achieve through our policies.

By contrast, Mr. Speaker, in 1937, and I wouldn't go back, I only do so because the hon. agricultural critic from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley referred to 1937. I know 1937 — I happened to be the reeve of our municipality, I can still remember the wholesale liquidation of livestock that took place. The wholesale liquidation of livestock in 1937 — the records show 350 thousand head of cattle less in the subsequent year 1938. And in 1937 they told the farmers how many head of cattle they could keep, if they didn't have enough fodder, and they also said if you don't sell your cattle, you'll not get direct relief from us.

Mr. McDonald: — Why did you sell yours?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I can still remember . . .

Mr. Foley: — That is not true.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That is true. I know what I'm talking about. The hon. member for Turtleford doesn't know. He was still in short pants at that time, Mr. Speaker, and he's still in short pants in a lot of ways.

Mr. McDonald: — Sept out and let's see what you're wearing Toby.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The hon. members opposite are short of good judgment and a capacity to reason in many instances.

Mr. McDonald: — Why did you sell your cattle Toby?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now, what were cattle selling for in those days? A cent a pound! A cent a pound! I can still see them — thin cattle, and cattle in good shape, leaving the municipalities, as I mentioned at that time. It was most difficult for me at that time to agree with such a policy, and at the same time discharge my responsibility as reeve of a municipality, which states that the reeve shall do such things as will improve the general economic and social conditions of the resident ratepayers. I asked at that time — “What are you going to replace those cattle with — buffalo?” We as a council tried to hold them and we did retain as many cattle as we possibly could because we felt that the farmers

in our particular area were greatly dependent on livestock if they were to have income stability and ability to pay taxes in future years. I have pursued this same policy ever since, Mr. Speaker, on a provincial wide basis, and I believe it has brought good results. The results are illustrated in a year like this and other years when we've had serious crop failures, when the income from our livestock industry saved the agricultural economy to a large measure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the present drought situation didn't start just recently. It started in July 1960 as everyone knows. This has been one of the most prolonged drought periods in the history of this province. I say, and the records bear me out in this. We had good moisture in the spring of 1960 as everyone knows — good moisture in the spring. We previously had a heavy winter snowfall, and as a result of the early rains in the spring of 1960 we had one of the best forage crops in our history in Saskatchewan. Farmers made an excellent job of harvesting all of the forage they could in 1960, and we re-advised to do so consistent with our extension program. As a result our farmers had a pretty good carry-over of fodder reserves for the year 1961. The good summer fallow that was carried on in the summer of 1960 conserved the early soil moisture of that year. This is largely the reason, together with other reasons, better cultural practices, weed chemicals and so on, that we've had such surprisingly good crops on our summer fallow this year.

Now we were aware of the approaching problems as I say, since July 1960 — the rain practically ceased. We began our extension program very early using the only media that we could utilize so early since no one knows what is going to happen, but telling farmers that the prospects don't look good for a crop in 1961. To, therefore, sow summer fallow to oats, to sow low areas which may not be flooded to oats, in other words to do everything to meet, what appeared to be a growing problem. We met, Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1961 with the agricultural officials from the provinces of Alberta, Manitoba and the federal government. We met here in Regina to discuss the pending situation and more than anything else, to discuss policies to meet the situation if it developed. The policies that were discussed at this conference in Regina were the policies that this provincial government had had in effect in previous years. If there is anything we can claim experience for, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan, it is

October 19, 1961

experience in dealing with drought. We are more exposed to these uncertain natural hazards than any other province in Canada. Everyone knows this. So we took action very early, and it was decided at this meeting that we would, and there was a committee set up that in the event that drought came we would adopt uniform policies. The policies that are presently in effect in the prairie provinces are the policies that this provincial administration has utilized over the years, and which policies have, in every case, adequately met the situation. But I must admit the 1961 challenge was the biggest one presented to the Department of Agriculture.

I had reported the outcome of this early meeting to my colleagues and cleared a policy with them as early as June 9, for subsequent implementation in the event that the much-looked-for big rain didn't come. Now everyone knows that during the month of June, almost to the first of July, anything can happen in Saskatchewan to change the situation completely. But the policies were presented very early to cabinet and by June 20 it appeared that the rains weren't going to materialize and the policies were then approved for implementation, which was done immediately thereafter. I'll review events in a bit more detail in connection with general drought and the policies to meet it further on in my address.

I want first to talk about one of the first things we did and that could be done. That is in connection with water shortage. As the hon. members know, the Department of Agriculture, a number of years ago, acquired many miles of pipe and pumping equipment to provide water to urban centres such as Balcarres, Assiniboia, Eston and several other towns. This seemed to be a growing problem and we acquired this equipment to do what we could in this regard. We have an investment of over \$200 thousand in this equipment. Well this spring we in the department felt, why not utilize this equipment to pump water to farm dugouts. We didn't know how it would work out. We knew it would have to be inexpensive and all we wanted was a rental cost for the equipment, sufficient to pay the advance account for the depreciation and so on. We started, Mr. Speaker, with some misgivings. We had the equipment, we thought 'why not use it?' And, Mr. Speaker, we started, and unfortunately we started on the 3rd of May instead of the 1st of May. However, we started just about as quickly as we could when the ice and frost went away so we could pump. We started of course in areas where there were possibilities of pumping from larger bodies of water to dugouts. One of those areas that commended itself to this kind of policy was the area of the hon. member

for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane). We started pumping and I think he got his dugout filled too. Now, what appreciation do I get for this, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley because he knew the date we started to pump, put a question on the order paper asking 'How many pump units did you have in the field before May 1? Why didn't the hon. member ask the date March 1? It would have been frozen then, or February 1? But he picks May 1 as the date and then he states in his speech — why he says! 'They didn't have any pumping units in operation before May 1.' This is the type of criticism we have been getting and these are the people who want a special session of the legislature to deal with drought. They ought to be ashamed of themselves. I would have thought that he would have at least expressed some appreciation for the early action taken, and for the initiative shown by the department and the concern of the department in its efforts to try and help farmers as much as we possibly could. Since then, Mr. Speaker, this program has gone along very well.

The House might be interested in knowing and I know of course this program has limited application because of natural factors — you've got to have the water to pump from and the economic distances of course are a mile and a half for one pump unit. But the farmers gave full commission-operation in laying out the pipes and working with the one man in charge, of each unit, and we progressively put more outfits in the field. We had five units in the field that were engaged in pumping to farm dugouts. We also had to provide several units to pump water for the town of Eston. It required eight pumps in stages to lift the water from the river valley using this kind of light pipes. Every one knows it is not possible to put too much pressure on these light irrigation pipes, because they break out at the joints. This is one of the reasons we can only pump a mile and a half to farm dugouts, and impossible to pump to any high elevation unless more pumps are used to relieve the pressure at the joints of these light pipes.

The following figures are interesting, Mr. Speaker. We pumped water to some four hundred dugouts. By doing some calculating on this — it is interesting to know that this amounted to approximately 150 million gallons of water. We also pumped to several towns — Wakaw, Balcarres, Wolseley, Abernethy and Eston and this will bring our total gallons pumped to these towns plus the farm dugouts to very nearly 200 million gallons of water. I submit, Mr.

October 19, 1961

Speaker, this is enough water to submerge some of the criticism raised by the hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley.

This subject of water development and water pumping was also discussed at a federal-provincial emergency drought conference held in Winnipeg July 2. I proposed at that time that we ought to also share a program for ground water development. This was left in abeyance at that time and I will deal with it a bit further on.

Now — grasshoppers! I've got a file, Mr. Speaker, and I knew pretty well what was going to happen. Based on the past tactics of hon. members, I have a file that says 'drought, grasshoppers' and the other one says 'Thatcher'. I am always sure that if we're going to have a drought, we're also going to have an outburst from Mr. Thatcher. He never warns about these things before they occur. He wasn't concerned much, early in this season, when we in the department were worried, concerned and designing policies for this eventuality — he was thinking at that time of taking a much needed rest, by way of an extensive trip to Europe.

Mr. Thatcher: — He told us all was well then.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I want to inform the House again, no matter how futile it is, but I am going to do it again. As everyone knows grasshopper chemicals came on the market around 1949. In that campaign we were still handling sawdust and the department provided the sawdust free and the mill feed as well. The municipality had to buy the poison, and they had to provide the mixing stations, and, Mr. Speaker, this method was a very inadequate technique for meeting grasshopper infestation. We were never able to control grasshoppers through the old sawdust method, or to save many crops. It was cumbersome, slow — as everyone knows. The residual effect too, of this method, disappeared very quickly. Grasshopper chemicals came on the market about that time and they were costing the farmers approximately \$3.00 an acre. We subsidized private enterprise the first year and paid half of the cost, so it cost the farmers around \$1.50 an acre. With that experience, Mr. Speaker, I decided that we would begin to bulk purchase grasshopper chemicals for two reasons. One — because of the uncertainty regarding an outbreak, you never know even when you have the grasshopper maps as a guide whether you'll have a major outbreak or not. This depends on the weather.

Therefore one reason for bulk purchase was so that someone would assume the responsibility for overcoming the uncertainty of demand and supply for chemicals. The other was to try to bring the price of the chemicals down within reasonable reach, so the farmer could use them. Now in 1949 it was just a question of whether you'd let the grasshoppers have it, or pay \$3.00 an acre to the chemical companies for the insecticide. This was a financial gamble the farmer had to take at that time. We have removed that gamble because over a period of years, we were first able to bring the price down to 86¢ an acre, then as the result of a favourable purchase and different chemicals to 36¢ an acre. Then, Mr. Speaker, for the grasshopper infestations that seemed to be in prospect for 1958 and 1959, we were able to finally bring the price down to 14¢ an acre. This now is just a deterrent fee against over utilization, as people will say. Still the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) suggests that we should provide it free, (for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) pardon me.) I don't want to get these two men mixed up. I will apologize to the hon. member for Redberry.

I want to say that it is practically free now, but I must admit this — where dieldrin is used for cutworms, you must apply five to six times as much. In the winter of 1959 we purchased \$1,155,000 worth of supplies that were stocked in our storage facilities in Moose Jaw, in anticipation of a major outbreak in 1959. We used from those supplies for 1959 and 1960, we also had an infestation then and a cutworm outbreak, as well, and only half of these chemicals were used during 1959 and 1960 as well. This points up my first point that someone ought to take the risk for carrying large inventories of these supplies from year to year because of the uncertainty of outbreaks. Commercial firms don't like to do this and if it were left to the commercial firms, you wouldn't have these large reserve supplies. I noticed the hon. Leader of the Opposition criticized us because we didn't leave this to the trade. I would like him to get up and tell this House, before this session is over, as to whether or not he wants us to turn this back to the commercial interests again. Do you want us to do that? Or do you want us to continue to carry this risk and do everything we possibly can to have the supplies on hand when they are needed. For example, Mr. Speaker, we carried around \$400 thousand of inventory of these chemicals from 1951 to 1958 inclusive without an outbreak occurring at all. Someone should carry this responsibility and this we are trying to do, and this is what we're being criticized for.

October 19, 1961

Mr. Thatcher: — You knew this year there was going to be an outbreak.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . And we were ready for it.

Mr. Thatcher: — You weren't ready for it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — There he goes. This is a perfect example, Mr. Speaker, of what I am saying. No matter how well and carefully you place the facts before these people, they say this is not a fact at all. I will say this to the hon. members. Here is a picture in our annual report of the stockpiles in storage at Moose Jaw. Look at them and see them.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well where were they after the outbreak arrived?

Mr. Snedker: — The planes had to fly it in.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We handle these supplies and distribute them as everyone knows through the municipalities. The municipalities knew the extent of the outbreaks — and someone said the only ones that knew were the Department of Agriculture. Everyone knew the extent of the outbreaks, but as I say, not everyone and no one knows as to what the extent of hatchability is going to be. You can have prolonged wet weather and you may not have any infestation worth speaking about. If the weather continues dry and cold you'll not have the same hatchability, but if you have a combination of dry and very warm weather, then you have an explosion of grasshoppers. Everyone knows this and this is what happened. We had 125 thousand gallons on hand, as I say, to begin the campaign, which looked like a very good supply in view of the forecast. Municipalities started ordering around the middle of May 200 gallons a day, 300 gallons a day to three and then six thousand gallons a day — some days it dropped back to four thousand gallons, and then those hot days came as everyone knows and we had an explosion from a demand of five thousand orders a day when on a Monday and a Tuesday the demand suddenly arose to 30 thousand gallons on Monday, 25 thousand gallons on a Tuesday — a total of 55 thousand gallons for two days and we had still at that time over 60 thousand gallons on hand and had ordered, a week previous, additional supplies from the suppliers in Toronto. They began working around the clock, even then we had no way of knowing that the level of demand would take such a huge jump.

A person I suppose could say, well why didn't the municipalities appraise their needs a little more accurately. This of course can't be done with any degree of accuracy. In order to catch up with this unprecedented demand for those two days, knowing that the supplies wouldn't arrive in time by rail — and that there would be some lag in supplies and some discouragement in the campaign if we didn't keep supplies on hand — we turned to every resort we could to get supplies here quickly. We contacted the commercial airways and this was out of the question. Costs were too great. I called Mr. Harkness the Minister of National Defense and asked him if he would place at our disposal the Royal Canadian Air Force, and he said he would do what he could. The R.C.A.F. contacted us and we told them about our likely demands, and they talked about having two or three flying boxcars immediately available which would only carry a relatively small load. We informed them of our demands and that the supplies would have to come within two or three days to do any good. They responded, Mr. Speaker, in an excellent manner, and I want to take this opportunity of extending my thanks and appreciations first to the Minister of National Defense Mr. Harkness, for making the service of the R.C.A.F. available to us, and secondly to the officers and the air crews who worked practically around the clock to bring the supplies to us. This was excellent commission-operation, Mr. Speaker, and I couldn't see anything wrong with using the Royal Canadian Air Force to help us in an emergency situation within our country.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition says, 'this is going to cost a lot of money.' It isn't going to cost a lot of money, and we did subsidize the price. This cost more, but we absorbed the extra cost, so insofar as the farmer was concerned it was still 14¢ an acre.

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . a lot more though.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — This is the usual, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Thatcher: — Socialist arithmetic again — doesn't cost any more.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I'll say this to the credit of this administration, Mr. Speaker. When I present these situations to my colleagues they go along without asking questions like that, so it is done, and I like speed and maybe they know that I like speed.

Mr. Thatcher: — If you did a little planning you wouldn't have to.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The thing that seemed to worry the Leader of the Opposition more than anything else was the fact that I had my picture taken at the airport when the first plane arrived — that really hurt. He stated all I was doing was getting publicity and getting my picture taken. I would like to him to know it wasn't our public relations men that took those pictures. The Royal Canadian Air Force did that. They were so enthused over the fact of having done something unusual and worthwhile to help us. And they sent me some of these pictures, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to treasure them for a long time too.

Mr. Speaker, we air lifted around 30 thousand gallons in our effort to have an uninterrupted and continuous campaign. Thank heaven it was successful. In a few days we moved by rail and by plane over 48 thousand gallons of chemicals. The personnel at the factory were good enough to work around the clock on several shifts to supply our needs. And they continued to supply our needs throughout the campaign. The total amount used in the campaign in terms of money was \$1,120,000 of nothing. This is enough chemicals to cover five million acres of land for the control of grasshoppers and four hundred thousand for cutworms. The hon. members opposite never mention benefits. They always mention the little things. The little problems that do occur in any good program, Mr. Speaker.

Now I would like to turn again to the major problem that we faced this summer and that is drought. As everyone knows the pasture situation particularly, looked very bad. How we got by with the small movement of livestock to alternative pastures I don't know. I think it was principally because farmers turned their cattle into cereal grain crops that obviously wouldn't make a good commercial cereal crop.

I have mentioned already that our first emergency drought meeting was March 15. Our policies were cleared on June 20. On the 23rd I contacted the federal Minister of Agriculture and they were worried too. Everyone was worried about the pending situation. Copies of our policies were sent to him in the hope that they would share costs with us. He later suggested that we have a meeting in Winnipeg, which was held July 2 with the three prairie ministers to discuss and adopt policies on a uniform basis.

We agreed on certain policies and here they are, Mr. Speaker. These are the policies that were available to farmers. Here are the policies that amounted to nothing according to the opposition and that — nothing was done!

- 1) One hundred per cent of the cost for moving farm machinery and fodder by rail.
- 2) Seventy five per cent of the cost of moving fodder and machinery by licensed commercial trucks, and incidentally in this connection we extended this assistance to truckers who were hauling cattle, either truckers from here going to the States or truckers from the States coming up here for cattle. We said we'll pay you 75 per cent of your trucking costs up to \$12.00 a ton for any hay you bring up. You must assume the responsibility of course for purchasing the hay in the States or wherever it comes from and disposing of it here, which they had no difficulty in doing. This was to give some added encouragement towards acquiring fodder from outside sources of supply.
- 3) Five cents per ton-mile for the movement of fodder by farm truck.
- 4) Fifty cents a mile, one way, for a fully loaded truck moving fodder, harvesting equipment to put up fodder elsewhere.
- 5) Two cents per head per mile for the truck movement of cattle to pastures or to a supply of water where this was necessary.

Now, the next, Mr. Speaker, that I mention is assistance that is provided only by the provincial government. At the Winnipeg conference I asked that we share transportation assistance in the movement of feed grain and seed, oats and barley, particularly. This was refused. I asked some help in carrying the feed and seed storage charges between the provincial government and the federal government for retaining supplies of grain in elevators at shipping points in the drought area. This was refused. So we went ahead on our own.

- 6) (And this is provincially paid entirely and this will be a substantial item.) Seventy-five per cent of commercial trucking costs for transporting oats and barley up to \$12.00 a ton.

- 7) Seventy-five per cent of transportation costs by rail for transporting oats and barley. One of the hon. members was worried about seed oats and I share his concern, and I will say a bit more about it a little later. But this assistance is available for the movement of feed or seed, oats and barley, by truck or by rail anywhere in the province.
- 8) Four cents per ton-mile for moving oats and barley by farm truck beyond the distance of 25 miles in all cases.
- 9) Share with the municipalities 50 per cent of the storage costs on wheat, oats and barley held in elevators for farmer's needs in drought areas.
- 10) On July 14 we advised our agriculture. reps. that we would also pay the expenses of agricultural committee men, municipal officials or anyone who assisted them in meeting the drought problem, either in making local surveys or going out to scout up and find fodder outside the municipality.
- 11) We were concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I began to be concerned in the middle of July as to whether we had enough fodder within the province, and in order to encourage more farmers to harvest cereal grain crops, that is doubtful cereal grain crops for fodder, we proposed to the federal government that we introduce some kind of an incentive plan that would encourage the building up of these extra fodder reserves. As a result this \$45.00 per ton bonus plan was adopted. I should mention too that P.F.A.A. relaxed their regulations previously, and advised farmers that where a farmer cut his cereal grain crop for fodder that the yield would be considered nil as far as P.F.A.A. eligibility was concerned. So these were concessions. This last one, the \$5.00 per ton bonus plan is a pretty good policy, and contrary to what some hon. members said, I think it was the hon. member for Rosthern, (Mr. Boldt) who said that we told farmers to cut cereal grain crops for fodder. We didn't. We told farmers to use their best judgement. We said it will be badly needed. We said further if in your judgment you think that under this plan, you could do better than you could by leaving it for cereal grain, well harvest it for fodder or for cereal grain, whichever you think is best.

I think we will probably get another 50 thousand tons of fodder from this policy. I want to say something

about it. The purpose of this policy, as agreed to with the federal government, from their point of view and I can't disagree with them, was to get some extra fodder reserves. In other provinces and here it was a prime condition that the farmer must harvest it himself, he must bale it, and put it into stacks and in Manitoba he was not to sell it to anyone until a later date. I don't know what the cut-off date is in Manitoba but they are holding it for quite a while for extra reserves. But, we didn't think this particular provision was practical here. We thought that if in a municipality there was someone who needed the fodder and someone else had cut a cereal grain crop for fodder, we shouldn't require this farmer to put it all in a stack and then undergo the uncertainty of sale for it at a much later date, so we said: First of all the farmer must harvest it himself, it must be his crop and an agreement must not be entered into prior to the date of this policy, which was the 19th of July, and that he must make his application to the municipality for the assistance and accept the condition that he will only sell it to someone approved by the municipality, and for not more than \$20.00 a ton, but that after October 1, I believe that is the date, such farmer could then sell it to anyone he wished providing he didn't sell it for more than \$20.00 a ton. This is the way we did it, and it got us into a few little administrative problems in trying to implement this policy in the most practical way possible. I thought I should mention this because some of you may have run into some of the problems involved in the administration of the program.

- 12) On July 17 the provincial government guarantees under the seed grain and supply act were made available to rural municipalities. I might say that we asked the federal government to provide emergency credit, without success. This is, therefore, the only other source of credit that we have available and this method has been used, as everyone knows, over the years. Under this policy, the province guarantees bank loans, negotiated by municipalities and also guarantees 75 per cent of the losses. I think with cattle prices where they are this is not a bad risk or any great risk for any municipal council to take to help ratepayers, particularly smaller farmers who haven't any money immediately on hand to purchase their own feed requirements.
- 13) On October 11, as everyone knows I received a reply from Ottawa approving the community well development program. Someone said to me, 'I supply you'll claim credit for that too Toby.' Well I do! I do!

October 19, 1961

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — There is nothing like being a shrinking violet at times but not all the time, and as everyone knows I didn't step out hurriedly — when we received confirmation from Ottawa, for a lot of publicity and prematurely say, 'Here is the policy.' I let the other boys do it!

During the latter part of August I was very anxious to discuss this program on an actual basis, and other matters with Mr. Hamilton. I was finally able to run him down when he was out here in Saskatchewan. As you know, he's all over the province speaking like other politicians are. I informed him, 'I want to see you, there are some urgent problems here that we better talk about.' So he came to see me. I said: 'Alvin, there is one thing we ought to do, we ought now to start a well development program. Because it isn't long before winter will be here, and soon we will be unable to pump any more water to dugouts, sloughs are drying up. This would be a sound program.' And he agreed with me. He suggested we work out a policy with P.F.R.A. officials and advise him. I wired the policy to him September 5, and I expected we'd get a very quick reply. I don't know what happened; I can't say what happens at the other end or elsewhere, but I kept sending wires to Mr. Hamilton saying this matter was urgent. I can table this correspondence if the hon. members want it for the record, but I don't think it's necessary. I kept sending wires and letters and he kept assuring me he was pushing it all he could. Manitoba objected somewhat to our initial proposal. Our first proposal was that we share these costs with a rural municipality on the basis of 20 per cent for the municipality and the balance 80 per cent shared equally between the two senior governments. Someone took exception to it somewhere along the line, and the next proposal I got back, was 35 per cent for the municipality, and we finally compromised on the basis of 30 per cent for the municipality and the balance of 35 per cent each for the federal and provincial governments. This is the policy in existence now. This includes sharing all of the costs of boring and drilling up to \$1,000. That is the limit in this aspect. The balance of all of the costs of the cribbing or the casing, the pipes the pumps, the motor and everything else is shared as already mentioned. This policy is intended for rural municipalities and must be sponsored by a rural municipal council. This is an emergency policy for well development for community use. This policy is now in effect, and unfortunately we have lost a month and

a half, which I regret, but at the same time I appreciate the fact that the federal government has come in with us. I only wish they had told us sooner that they were coming in or otherwise since we could have gone ahead on our own at an earlier date.

It is very clear, Mr. Speaker, that the policies which I have enumerated are very much more than nothing, and that they have been adequate, because we've met the situation, Mr. Speaker. We've met the situation very well. In support of my contention that we've met the situation I submit facts, Mr. Speaker. I know, again, that they will probably not be accepted by the hon. members opposite, but when you look at cattle marketing for example, Mr. Speaker, we were worried about wholesale liquidation and panic marketing of livestock. This was avoided because farmers had policies under which they could do something and under which they could acquire fodder cheaply. The transportation was paid, the major part of it. Transportation and moving of machinery was paid — this is the only and proper way to do it. We're talking about many millions of acres of land, and we're talking about several million tons of fodder, and it takes thousands of working hands to accomplish the task of getting this much fodder in a limited period of time. You must, therefore, have policies which will stimulate thousands of hands to the task. This is what prevented panic marketing. As the campaign gathered momentum, we could see less and less cattle rushing on the market. I want to at this time, Mr. Speaker, express my very sincere appreciation to all agencies who helped out. I want to especially commend the staff of the Department of Agriculture, the agriculture. reps. and other field staff who didn't take their vacations as planned, who stayed at home and worked. I want also to particularly mention the plan industry branch, and Mr. Holmes, who stayed at his post during the grasshopper campaign.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . Sundays, in the evenings till 12 o'clock taking orders for municipalities, and I want to commend the plant industry branch and the director for having handled this task with a very minimum of staff, and again the agriculture. reps. for a most thorough job well done. The greatest credit of all goes to the agriculture committeemen and municipal councils who did an excellent job, and more specially to the farmers themselves, who really became aroused and responded wholeheartedly to the demands of the situation.

October 19, 1961

The department's function is to provide the policies, to coordinate activity, to develop the organization, and to advise people as to what is going on, getting listings of fodder, locating fodder — this we did, and it has been a wonderful combined commission-operative effort. I want to also extend our thanks to the publicity agencies, the T.V. stations, the radio and the press, all of whom operated in an excellent manner. All of whom, like us, were concerned about a very serious economic situation facing the economy of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we've come through, I must say in good shape. In fact we are going to have a little reserve of fodder. I think when the supplies of fodder are redistributed under our policies that we'll be able to show a little reserve to be carried over to next spring.

Cattle marketing is a good indicator for success or otherwise, Mr. Speaker, to date. Our marketings are 415 thousand adult cattle and 88 thousand calves. Now for the four years previously — we will take 1957-58 when in the neighbourhood of 550 thousand were marked in the 12-month period. We estimated that we might have a 30 per cent increase in marketing which would be normal, considering the fact that people need more money when cereal grain crops fail, and considering the fact that fodder and water are big problems. Now to date there have been 415 thousand adult cattle marketed. We expected under our figures 612 thousand in the full 12-month period for the calendar year. Whether this will occur or not I don't know. If it doesn't occur we'll be marketing in a normal manner. So this is one indicator. The other indicator of success is that at the Moose Jaw feeder show, I don't know if Mr. Thatcher was there this year, I don't know if he had any cattle there or not, but we've had the highest prices paid for a lot of cattle in any year for the past ten years, and the feeder prices paid at this show were generally good — better than last year. These facts provide concrete proof of the success of our policies, Mr. Speaker.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Still the hon. members opposite want to run around the country and try to stir up ill feeling when they know the people are concerned and worried, this is when they go to work with their unsupported statements.

\I see the hon. member for Melville is not in his seat. I have had other letters like this. Here is a letter that I received from the Melville and district

Chamber of Commerce and they say to me:

”Dear Sir:

The Melville and District Chamber of Commerce would like to offer you our thanks and grateful appreciation for the role you have playing in helping the Melville and district farmers in obtaining the necessary feed they needed for their cattle.”

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Maybe I should have said amen with that, Mr. Speaker. But I have a few more things to say.

Mr. Danielson: — Thank God for small mercies.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, and may the Lord also bless you.

It is very clear, Mr. Speaker, that we’ve had a wide range of policies available. This has not been nothing, but it has been something. It is not the shortcomings of these policies that have been worrying the hon. members opposite, it is the success of the policies. We’re not out of the woods, Mr. Speaker, by any means. We are all worried yet. We don’t know what next year will bring. We know we’re still very deficient in moisture supplies, and we will need twice the usual moisture to bring conditions back to normal. This we know.

There is no new legislation required to meet any future possible emergency situation that may develop. We have the necessary legislation on the statute books now, and I can assure the House that we will certainly, as usual, keep very close to future problems and if we need to expand assistance now provided we will certainly use our best endeavours to do so immediately. I think the best guide as to what we might do has been what we’ve already done.

Someone mentioned seed oats, and we’re worried. We have been paying transportation assistance for bulk carload movement of good seed to the Saskatchewan Seed Grain Co-operatives over the past years. We think that we’re going to need seed oats from outside the province. One of the best sources of supply is northern Alberta. We discussed with the Saskatchewan Seed Grain Co-operative very early, the possibility as to whether they might not handle this for us, providing we gave them a guarantee against loss and they would of course do so for a nominal fee for service, because they are not only

experienced in this field but they have the wheat pool organizations in both provinces to work with. It is our hope under this arrangement that they may find some good commercial seed that would be cleaned and stored in Edmonton, then subsequently shipped into areas of need in the province by carload lots. I've asked the federal government — again I ran to Ottawa — ran because I couldn't think of anything myself, according to the hon. Leader of the Opposition and some more members opposite. I asked them if they would share in this program on the basis of sharing 50 per cent of the rail cost. I haven't had a reply as yet, to this request made a month ago. I wrote several letters on other matters as well to which I await replies from the hon. Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa. He shows a great inclination for wanting to do things and as everyone knows he has a great imagination, but I wish he'd stop flitting about like a butterfly and light long enough once in a while to come to some decisions. This worries me a little, because when time is important, delays like this can be worrisome. I should mention one thing further. I don't know when I may hear from Mr. Hamilton, but I hope soon. There are problems in connection with this, as everyone knows. This seed from outside the province has got to go through the wheat board because it is interprovincial trade, and this brings the price of this seed pretty high, and we must therefore give some freight assistance in the movement of it. There is a good deal of seed movement taking place within the province, but our figures indicate that we'll probably have to go outside Saskatchewan to get more seed oats, but as mentioned there is a good movement going on under our existing policy within the province which will be in effect to December 1.

Now a good deal has been said about fodder reserves, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Again.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Again, yes. I would suggest the hon. member from Arm River takes his pencil before I sit down. I have said to this House over and over that we have been developing and encouraging the development of projects for the production of fodder as well as for community pasture development, we have taken the big projects on ourselves. Not only because they were big and beyond the financial means of a local group, but to demonstrate what might be done in reclaiming sub-marginal land for fodder production. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is right next to one of those areas. He knows what goes on, and he knows it has been of great benefit. If he doesn't know, he ought to know, because there has been 35 hundred tons of fodder harvested on that particular project this year. So what the hon. members opposite are actually saying is, that the government ought to

raise these reserves. Well, I'll tell him a little further on how many acres we'd have to socialize in order to do that. It would take quite a bit. But in the course of the development of these projects, during the early stages of development, we harvested some of this fodder, and put it up in stacks and later sold it. As a matter of fact I was criticized in this House because we did this. They said there was too much spoilage and we were losing money on it. Well there was considerable spoilage despite the fact we built mighty good stacks. But this is how we came to have fodder banks on hand as a government, but it would be foolish, Mr. Speaker, for me or anyone else to suggest to the farmers of Saskatchewan that the government itself was going to do this and try to thus meet emergencies such as we've had by having fodder available that we grow on such projects. Preposterous! Mr. Speaker, and this kind of suggestion would be misleading the farmers.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well did you not start out doing that?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Our programs have been mainly directed at the development of fodder reserves on individual farms and on a co-operative and community basis. Now we've had great success in this regard. Over the years we've developed over 72 thousand acres for both dry land and irrigation forage production, 50 thousand acres of which are in dry land fodder projects and the balance under irrigation production, on which all acres are producing fodder. The hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch mentioned irrigation. He should look around a little. There were over 11 thousand tons of fodder produced on these irrigation projects this summer. He should go over some of the projects and see the results and may I suggest to him that instead of beefing in this House, that he should take some initiative locally and get water users to organize. The policies are available for them. We've done our best to convince farmers in potential irrigation areas that they ought to do some irrigation, but this is the farmer's decision. He is the landowner and it is a decision he must make. The policies are there waiting for him. He didn't go to Ponteix for example where there were 35 hundred tons of fodder produced this year, just a little ways from him to the north at Pambrun he would find another successful producing irrigation project. These are things he ought to do, instead of beefing in here and saying 'nothing has been done'. Well here is 72 thousand acres of so-called nothing. Is eleven thousand tons of fodder from irrigation — nothing? Plus five thousand tons from dry land projects including 35 hundred from the Mortlach project alone an indication that nothing has been done.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley says there's been nothing new done in the department. Has he heard of the conservation development branch? He never would have heard of that before 19454, or even before 1948. This is a new branch called the conservation and development branch which undertakes this type of projects, and over the years, since this branch was organized, over \$20 million was expended in this and other kinds of development projects. Twenty million dollars worth of nothing, Mr. Speaker. Nothing, according to them. How can people be so ridiculous?

Mr. Thatcher: — You didn't have one bale of hay ready when the drought hit.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Here, Mr. Speaker, is an excellent example of the point I am trying to make and why it is so futile to try and tell these people, who think only in terms of politics, to tell them anything of a factual nature.

Mr. McDonald: — You're not very convincing Toby.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — There are several new branches if the hon. members want to hear of them, that have been set up in the Department of Agriculture — not only the conservation and development branch. We've more than doubled the agriculture. rep. service. We added livestock specialists to the animal industry branch and new policies. Veterinary services, districts, lab services and grants for veterinary scholarships. Nothing new they say. An extensive forage crop program in the plant industry branch. We're developing new seed varieties of Rambler alfalfa in the states of California and Oregon, because we're very anxious to supply quantities of this seed. It is the only place we can multiply and grow this seed successfully and we do it, and we bring it up here for our farmers. Six thousand orders for forage crop seed are filled most every year, which is enough seed for 150 thousand acres of land for forage crop production. This is how we're building forage project reserves. All right, now the hon. members had a lot to say about fodder reserves. I am going to give them a few figures, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this year. They never mention new things — A.M.A. — Agricultural Machinery Administration testing service — they knocked every one of these things when they were initiated, Mr. Speaker, and then too there is the new family farm improvement branch — nothing new. No new policies. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if anybody, anyone at all would just take the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture now and compare it with 1944's annual report and then let the general

public decide in this way as to whether — nothing new has been added or done.

Mr. McDonald: — Give them a chance.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What are the extents of our fodder requirements in this province, Mr. Speaker? . . . Thanks for the assistance Mr. Premier.

Mr. Thatcher: — You need it Toby.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking of requirements — our requirements for fodder will be from 2 ½ to 3 million tons of fodder a year. This is what is required to feed our stock annually. Our crop correspondence surveys indicate that from 3 to 3 1/2 million acres of cereal crops were cut for fodder this year. Three to 3 1/2 million acres, and if this turned out at one-third of a ton per acre, this would give us 1,160,000 tons of emergency fodder. Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggest that we ought to socialize 3 1/2 million acres of land?

Mr. Thatcher: — No, I certainly don't But I suggest that after all the money you spent you should have some fodder reserves.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . or two million tons of fodder. If we didn't do it on this scale, Mr. Speaker, we would be misleading the farmers of this province. I have made it clear over and over again that we have done everything possible to build up our reserves on this scale.

Mr. McFarlane: — All through the south.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am taking a bit of time but I will guarantee you I'm saying more of a concrete nature than they have said in this debate anyway.

Mr. McDonald: — You've convinced yourself.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — When one is speaking in these fodder reserve dimensions, Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous to suggest that the department itself should produce such huge supplies and the farmers will laugh you out of court if you try to tell them that the government ought to do this . . .

October 19, 1961

Mr. Thatcher: — They may laugh but they . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — This great free enterpriser! The hon. Leader of the Opposition. The one who opposed government activity in every field would now have us socialize a great part of the industry to give the farmers fodder.

Mr. Thatcher: — Like heck I would and don't put words in my mouth.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, he ought to know something of it. He criticizes these policies. I noticed in the public accounts for last year the Thatcher ranch got some benefit from the 1959-60 policy.

Mr. Thatcher: — Very little.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I don't know how badly he needed it, but he is such a free enterpriser I didn't think he would ask the government for anything.

Mr. Thatcher: — I will be a lot worse this year Toby. You perhaps knew it is the same with a lot of people, Mr. Speaker. As long as they're doing well, they're great individualists and private enterprisers by saying — I'll look after myself, but just let a little trouble occur and then they run to governments. Talk about private enterprise contradictions and furthermore so-called free enterprisers run to governments before they ever get into trouble, Mr. Speaker. Not because they need some relief but rather they run to go for help to make more profit, so to talk about the sanctity of private enterprise is just silly and ridiculous because such complete disassociation from governments simply does not exist in modern society.

Mr. Thatcher: — The way you're talking about it, it is.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Another thing, Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that in August 1958, Mr. Diefenbaker announced a five point farm program. Some of them have reduced farm incomes we all know, but there was one point he said was for the purpose of 'building fodder reserves'. Well Mr. Hamilton, the federal minister was in the province recently making political speeches and he said the province hadn't taken advantage of that offer. Well I thought 'gosh they must have a program'. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we did submit proposals on a shared program basis but we never

could find out what their program was. However, I took Mr. Hamilton at his word, and I wrote to him and submitted a definite proposal to share a program for individual fodder reserve development. I received a reply indicating no program existed. I, therefore, in turn sent a very kindly reminder to Mr. Hamilton that he had made this statement, and that I expected he had a program. Well at any rate we're going to discuss this at the coming federal-provincial agricultural conference, and since Alvin's a bit on the griddle we may still get a good point program.

Here is what we have in mind. Not only some additional encouragement to help farmers with hay shelters. This is the big need. This is the great discouragement against building reserves. As I said, we've had the experience that despite the fact we've put up very good stacks, we still experienced very considerable spoilage, and we feel that if we shared a program under which financial assistance would be given to farmers for putting up hay shelters, spoilage would be avoided and encouragement given to individual farm reserves. They don't need to be expensive — financial assistance might be provided on a tonnage basis and we've submitted such a proposal. I think this would help a great deal. It would not solve all the problems but certainly it would prevent a lot of wastage. In good fodder in which the farmers put a lot of work and money weather spoilage often depreciates such fodder to half its value, from this point of view alone such assistance would be justified. What the final answer to our proposal will be I don't know.

The other prospect we have in mind for expanding our existing programs is through A.R.D.A. We have made very definite proposals and we hope that we can incorporate some of the policies and programs we have now in connection with fodder, pasture and general reclamation development into a comprehensive A.R.D.A. program. If this were done we could greatly expand our present activity, particularly in northern Saskatchewan on the fringe of settlement, where farm units are small and where the need for pasture and additional land resources are great. We could do a great deal of good. I don't know if hon. members opposite know of or have seen our fodder and pasture program projects, but we have done an enormous lot of good. This is one of the best programs we have. There are areas like Torch River municipality, also the west of Meadow Lake area, Beacon Hill, Pierceland, Goodsoil, where we must do something of this nature for these people. I must admit that if we don't in many cases there will be continuing social aid problems. It is a case of providing more land resources for these people and this is one way of

doing it. The development of pasture projects, forage projects, and giving them more land resources to improve their economic position. This is what I am fundamentally interested in — that is improving the position of people. In all fields we have got to think of human beings, Mr. Speaker. And I regret the one particular item in the Throne Speech, the medical care plan, has received so much adverse criticism and the issue has been so greatly confused. There has been a great deal of talk about the heavy burden of taxes that this is going to involve. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know of a single project that we have initiated that wasn't criticized, or could be criticized on that basis. But if you don't do these things you stagnate.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition for example said, 'now we should go very carefully'. Some opposition members say we're not going fast enough, others say we're going too fast.

Mr. Thatcher: — Toby, they used that yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Then others say we should go backwards completely, and revert to a local government basis. They all agreed of course, and this is popular with oppositions to always talk about high taxes, this is nothing new. Oppositions talk in this vein no matter where you go. You can go to the United States or Europe, you can in fact go anywhere and they'll tell you 'these darn education costs are too high'. 'Municipal costs etc. are too high.' But the fact is, if a person succumbs to that kind of philosophy you don't go ahead at all. The hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned, 'Well you've got the South Saskatchewan project, you've got the Squaw Rapids project, you've got, (I believe he said,) your gas program, and this is all costing a lot of money. We don't think this is the opportune time to proceed with medical care. You have to consider it in this light.' It is true, you do have to consider these things, and then weigh them against the demand, and the desire of people to have security and to live in terms of modern circumstances. But when he mentioned the South Saskatchewan dam and the Squaw Rapids project, and as you know, Mr. Speaker, over and over this man says that these projects are debt disabilities.

Mr. Thatcher: —I didn't say that. I said you have to pay for them. That's all I said.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — He thinks they are a burden of debt. Mr. Speaker, had we not done these things where would this province be today in terms of economic stability, in terms of encouraging industry to come, and this sort of thing. These are the kind of programs that

bring industry, provide new employment opportunities and provide a base for improved social services.

Mr. Thatcher: — You didn't have much to do with the South Saskatchewan dam anyway. That was the federal government.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition keeps talking about high taxes but never at the same time mentions the great benefits in improved services which taxes provide. Again, Mr. Speaker, that people don't like high taxes is well known and therefore the opposition uses this method to direct the anger and the opposition of people against this administration, by saying we're responsible for a situation that prevails all over Canada — that we're the nigger in the wood pile, that this is the outfit that has caused the high taxes. This is what they're trying to put over, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if that assumption is correct, it would be equally valid for me to say of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, since he's been in the hardware business, that the increased costs of hardware can be attributed to him. That it's his fault that hardware as an item in the total costs index has gone up more than anything else; more than food; more than children's underwear. In fact the price of hardware items has gone up more than anything else. But do I stand up in this House and say it's his fault? Certainly not and he too ought to recognize this simple fact. The same people who pay for high-priced hardware also pay taxes. The only difference, Mr. Speaker, is they get 100 per cent service for the tax dollar. There isn't anyone putting profits in their pocket. That is the big difference, Mr. Speaker. Furthermore the people ask for the services for which tax dollars are paid.

Mr. Thatcher: — What did Clarence put in his pocket?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Although I don't attribute any blame for the increase in hardware prices to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, but it is common knowledge and I think he will agree, he has done pretty well in this business. I wonder sometimes, Mr. Speaker, if this had anything to do with his change of philosophy. I have known him a long time, Mr. Speaker, and if there is anything that I hope to pride myself on, it is that I will remain true to my convictions once I come to a well reasoned conclusion.

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . stay stupid all your life.

October 19, 1961

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition was either hypocritical when he was in the CCF movement or he is hypocritical now, Mr. Speaker. The evidence points clearly to the fact that he is hypocritical now. He has gathered around him by his political tactics resentful and negative minded people. The kind of people who know nothing else but negative criticism, who cut everything to pieces, and who refuse to see anything good in anything that is done by this administration. They have again clearly demonstrated this attitude during this session of the legislature.

Why did this man want a special session of the legislature to deal with the emergency drought situation. To sit in this House and yap for weeks on end, while farmers wait, without attention to their feed and fodder needs and associated problems. I like to get a job done, Mr. Speaker, and this objective has been accomplished as far as my department is concerned.

An Hon. Member: — Watch your blood pressure Toby.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I dropped my notes and raced along ahead of myself . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — You haven't told us anything yet though. What are you going to do?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes I have told the House what has been done, but will they accept facts? No, I'm afraid not. I'm being very careful not to leave anything out because I want to be as correct as I can. I hope some day to be rewarded by at least one of the hon. members opposite getting up to say, 'Well thanks for what the department has done in this or that particular case.' But, they've not only criticized me, but they've criticized the staff of the Department of Agriculture too. I am sure that the members of my staff will appreciate this kind of criticism after the tremendous effort they have put forth this summer. And everyone knows it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough on this occasion . . .

Mr. McDonald: — On a point of order — on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The minister has made the statement . . .

Mr. Speaker: — . . . Will the hon. member please sit down while the point of privilege is being stated?

Mr. McDonald: — The hon. minister has made a statement in this House that is utterly untrue. He has said that the members opposite criticized his staff. I want to ask the minister, what members on this side of the House criticized his staff and when?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In this House, Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) that said that the Department of. . .

Mr. Thatcher: — He is out so you can't accuse him . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . Agriculture hasn't done anything. He made the statement and I made a note of it when he made it. If the hon. members wish to check his address, it may have been . . . but I think it was the hon. member for Rosthern who made this statement — criticized the department officials for not having done anything.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, this statement is not true. On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, this statement is not true.

Premier Douglas: — . . . Sit down.

Mr. McDonald: — I won't sit down for you or anybody else.

Premier Douglas: — You will sit down, the Speaker is on his feet.

Mr. McDonald: — I will not sit down. I am rising on a point of privilege.

Premier Douglas: — You can't rise on a point of privilege while the member is speaking. The Speaker has already ruled that in this date. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McDonald: — I was up before you were.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! What is your point of order.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, you have already ruled that no person can rise on a point of order while the member is speaking.

October 19, 1961

Mr. Speaker: — You are right on that — on a point of order.

Premier Douglas: — He didn't say a point of order, he said a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — He rose on a point of order.

Premier Douglas: — He says now it is a point of privilege.

Mr. McDonald: — I rose on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I have the right in this House the same as you or any other member.

Premier Douglas: — Which is it?

Mr. McDonald: — I said on a point of order. He says I believe the member for Rosthern . . .

Premier Douglas: — State your point of order.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . from the Minister of Agriculture . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member has stated that the statement made by the hon. minister concerning the hon. member from Rosthern was not made by the hon. member from Rosthern. I think that statement should come from the hon. member from Rosthern himself. He is now in his seat.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, is this a point of order?

Mr. Speaker: — I don't really think it is.

Premier Douglas: — It has nothing to do with a point of order. It is a question of privilege.

Mr. Danielson: — Sit down.

Premier Douglas: — You're not running the House, thank goodness.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think this is a matter of misquotation, and if the hon. member feels that he is being misquoted in regard to this he has an opportunity to bring it up at the close of the speech. I think the hon. member from Rosthern, with the permission of

the hon. minister could make the explanation now but if the hon. minister is not prepared to allow that, the hon. member may make it at the close of the hon. minister's speech.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I very carefully noted the remark which I believe was made by the hon. member for Rosthern, which gave the impression that the staff and the Department of Agriculture were negligent in their responsibility or duties in connection with meeting the drought situation. He mentioned officials of the department. I didn't attribute — I didn't . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Toby you're . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No . . . I'll check. I'm going to make a point of checking.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — It is not a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member may ask to make an explanation and with the permission of the member speaking, it may be given at this time.

Mr. Boldt: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have not criticized any member . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wasn't in the House and he doesn't know what was said . . .

Mr. Boldt: — . . . I am quite convinced, Mr. Speaker, that I have not criticized any member of the agriculture department in the address that I gave here on Tuesday last.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I must accept this, but I am going to check his speech regarding this. I am not prone to being misled or taking notes of something that isn't actually said. I have been very careful in documenting anything that I say . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — You wouldn't know it from your speech this morning.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — If I am wrong, I would certainly be glad to withdraw any imputation that the hon. member said that members of the department haven't done their jobs thoroughly and well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from what I have said it becomes quite clear that I am going to vote against the amendment and support the motion. I am going to support the motion for very obvious reasons, because it is a very necessary progressive step forward in providing medical services to everyone in Saskatchewan. This is bound to meet with opportunity, but I think it is going to meet with great public acclaim too. I think a lot of people who are opposing this medical service plan at this time, are going to regret having done so five or ten years hence . . . They'll be taking credit for it. The same opportunity occurred way back some 42 years ago, I believe, when the first municipal doctor scheme was introduced in this province. The same opposition took place, and the funny thing about it, Mr. Speaker, was that the local practitioners at that time opposed the plan, and later on when the plan was established — the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) is shaking his head because he doesn't know — he hasn't anything in it so he can shake it — he doesn't know . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — I was there.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The local doctor opposed the plan at that time. It was put to a vote of the ratepayers and carried by a very small majority. Later on this same doctor was engaged by the municipality, and became the strongest supporter of the first municipal doctor scheme in Saskatchewan. This has expanded, and I recall too and I don't mind saying, this is a matter of record, the college at that time took a very dim view of this approach — for the people to have a medical care plan if they wanted one, or a municipal doctor scheme. The demand rose for this first scheme because of the dire need of the ratepayers in that municipality and their inability to pay their own individual medical bills. At that time the college took a dim view, and suggested that any doctors who would enter into a contract with the municipality, might be debarred from practice. You know, this attitude is undemocratic. This is very undemocratic in my opinion. I mention this first of all to merely illustrate the initial opportunity that you will get to forward steps, on the part of some people, and I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'm awfully sorry as a human being, and as a person who believes that he has some sense of Christian philosophy, and wants to see some application of it, that there are other fellow human beings who take a rather dim view of social progress and bringing security to people. And there has been so little said of people in this debate. I pray that Divine Providence will guide these

people. What is wrong with a municipal doctor scheme? What is wrong with the Swift Current medical care plan? It only has one great shortcoming — it doesn't include everyone. Isn't it about time, after having had all this experience and the great pride we have for the health progress that has been made in Saskatchewan, that we shouldn't take a further step. I would think that everyone would be in agreement with this, because as suggested that because it's a municipal plan, that this would take something away from somebody has not materialized. None of this has happened, and to now suggest that somehow if government does these things, it is dictatorship is sheer nonsense, Mr. Speaker. If I couldn't think of a better opportunity excuse than that, I wouldn't put up any excuse whatever. What the opportunity are doing in fact is, lessening people's faith in the democratic process and confidence in government. That is what they are doing.

I think that this assembly, and the assembly of any parliament, or a municipal council, elected as they are, are the bodies that we must look to as carrying the authority for the welfare of people. This is the function of governments. Governments have no other function than to further the social and economic interests of people. This is a challenge to democracy in the western world, Mr. Speaker. I'm misinterpreted constantly, Mr. Speaker, when I keep saying, that we've got to demonstrate at home that we can make democracy work in the interests of all the people, and if we do that this is the most effective weapon that I know of that we can use against the spread of materialistic communism, and fight profit-seeking materialism at home as well, Mr. Speaker. We have to do this in a modern world if we are going to survive. Can't you see it? This competitive struggle, of trying to compete against one another on the basis of survival of the fittest, has reached the proportions now, that if we don't reconcile our views and commission-operate on the basis of constructive counter proposals, we will destroy ourselves in the process. This is inevitable. And because a person says this nowadays, in some quarters, you're supposed to be some kind of a 'Red', Mr. Speaker. Well if this is being a 'Red' I'm going to be a 'Red' if that is the way some want to put it, but above all else I want to be a practising Christian.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Let's not forget, Mr. Speaker, going to church and practising Christianity is not merely a means of saving one's own individual

soul. It means much more. Those of us who have so little confidence in the general application of our Christian philosophy that we ought to use it only to save ourselves from hell, or accept it because of fear, need to rethink this position because this is not basic Christian philosophy. Christianity is essentially a co-operative philosophy for proper human relationships that was laid down and is necessary for man's survival. And in the present world situation, its application in a practical sense, on the basis of reason, supported by all the scientific and technical know-how we have available to us, and putting it into practice on that basis, means the survival of humanity for a world of great hope and a world without fear. People aren't going to go on forever living in dread and fear. We've got to hold up greater hope for them than that. This goes without saying. We can begin this at home. We can begin this process in the province of Saskatchewan, and I do hope that the medical fraternity, that all people including the members opposite will take this viewpoint in connection with the next progressive step forward in our own province. Remember, whether we like it or not the eyes of Canada are on this province and on this particular session of the legislature. There is little doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Diefenbaker knows of the upsurge of demand on the part of people — rank and file people — for health security. He knows this. He set up a commission to study this situation. There is no doubt that he will have this in his next election program. There is no doubt either, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals will follow suit . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Isn't that good?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . but, Mr. Speaker, a lot of this will be governed by what happens in this particular province. We can set a good pattern here once again, and we don't take any pride in saying 'we have led the way.' I don't. When things are done I give due credit for things being done. I give credit where credit is due, and I must give credit for example to the federal government for helping us in the drought this year. I am thankful for this, despite things they didn't do, I am, however, thankful for it. I am thankful that too they were able to sell more wheat to China. This supports my argument, and proves what could have been done long ago if we had given some real long-term credit to these people. I must give credit, also if Mr. Diefenbaker comes out with a health program for Canada, I will only of course give him credit for it, if he implements it. I can't give the Liberals any

credit because they have talked about it and had it in their program since 1919, but they didn't have the courage to do it, Mr. Speaker. I am wondering if these members here today, so many years later, will have the courage now to assert their rights as elected members and help bring in a medical plan for the people of this program that will give all our people the benefit of it, regardless of ability to pay. I will support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McDonald: — I wonder if I might ask a question of the minister? I didn't want to interrupt him when he was speaking but there are two questions that I would like to ask him. I wonder if he could give the House any idea what the price of oats would be — feed oats in Saskatchewan from the Peace and what varieties of oats are grown in the Peace and if they are accepted varieties for the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We'll get extensive varieties naturally, for the province, I think it would cost \$1.33 a bushel delivered after cleaning etc. I think it is imperative, therefore, that we provide transportation assistance. These oats will come quite high because they have to be purchased through the Wheat Board, plus loading, cleaning, storage, transportation etc.

Mr. McDonald: — I missed the first part of the answer. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker. Did you say that different varieties were available in the Peace that would be . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I said you could be assured we would get variety suitable for conditions here, and this is one of the reasons that we asked the seed grain commission-operatives to do this job for us. They have had a lot of experience in this field and they have contacts with good growers in Alberta and Manitoba. I'll check if that is the correct price, but I think it is.

Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, in joining this debate, I want to say that I feel it has been called for two specific purposes. One, of course, is to take care of the tax legislation, and the other is to bring in a health bill. Had I had my choice, I think there probably should have been something done in order to confine the discussion to these particular things, and let us get home and back to work. A lot has

October 19, 1961

been said about debating many other things, and a lot of other questions have been raised thus far in the Throne Speech debate, and I feel that especially many of the members opposite have contributed to nothing but the length of this session.

Apparently the opposition seems to think that we should be calling a special session in order to change the weather. This of course is impossible as any sensible person knows. I personally farmed through the thirties, the drought years, and I am quite aware of what the policies of the party represented opposite were in those days. I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Agriculture for the terrific job he has done in every field.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Kramer: — I not only want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan, but of Alberta and Manitoba as well, and also our federal Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa the Hon. Alvin Hamilton. These people took immediate and decisive action when the crisis arose, and assured the farmers of western Canada that there would be no mass panic. And there wasn't a mass panic. Cattle marketing has been orderly and we are enjoying a fair price for cattle today. These are things still wrong, and I will say this at a regular session. There are still things wrong in the cattle marketing business, but as far as we are concerned they could have been a great deal worse if it hadn't been for the decisive action that was taken, and the assurance that was given the farmers that a floor price would be placed under these cattle, and there wasn't any panic marketing, and I think that this more than anything else prevented what we had in the thirties. And members opposite despite the eulogising that has been going on from that side of the House, of the wonderful things that were done in the thirties — I sat here and listened to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, (Mr. McFarlane) and I couldn't believe my ears. It is like the old story about the local village drunk who was run over by a truck and he died, and his seven children and widow were at the funeral, and the parson was eulogizing the departed brother, saying what a wonderful citizen he had been; what a wonderful provider; finally Mrs Brown couldn't stand it any longer and she said to her eldest son Johnny — 'slip over and see if that is really father in the coffin.' When I hear the hon. members eulogizing the Liberal party and what it did in the thirties for the farmers, I cannot help be reminded of this particular story.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen some rather unhappy weather conditions this year. We have heard the people opposite blame everything that happened on this government, especially heaping ridicule on the Department of Agriculture, despite the fact that it has been doing a tremendous job in meeting the situation; in commission-operation with the federal government. As I said before I give them both credit. There is no doubt in the world that there will still be a great deal of problems for agriculture, but certainly it has to be recognized that these situations have to be faced by us as individual farmers. Certainly we have to provide a little for ourselves, and we can't expect the government to be setting up bulwarks against every particular thing. One thing I think we can expect of governments, and the one thing that was said by the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman), and I have a great deal of respect for the hon. member for Wilkie, Mr. Speaker, I think that if there is a spirit of liberalism, and if there is any liberalism left on that side of the House, he and two or three others are the people who are holding the old respectable flag of liberalism up for that particular party. As I say I respect my neighbour, the hon. member for Wilkie a great deal, and he said this in this speech. "The farmers are going to have a terrific time meeting the situation. Never had the situation been worse."

Well if it's bad in the Wilkie-Unity area, Mr. Speaker, I think it must be terrible in the rest of the province, and I know it is, because the Wilkie-Unity area was one of the fortunate areas that had a very good crop. There were bad portions, but certainly not anything like the rest of the province had. Providence has been good to us weather-wise for the last ten or twelve years. We have had abundant moisture on the average. Farmers have quite often produced two crops, a crop and a half — well above the average. Then isn't it startling that after ten of the best years weather-wise that this province has ever known, twelve of the best years, average crops, that the farmers of this province are not in a position to withstand one crop failure, or one near crop failure.

It is rather astounding, and I place the finger of responsibility for this, Mr. Speaker, directly on the Liberal party, and its record at Ottawa, and the lack of agricultural policies over the past many years, when they were in power. Now today they are praying, as the Liberal party usually does, that the people of Saskatchewan and of Canada will have short memories. They must pray every day that they have short memories. They must pray that the province of Saskatchewan

October 19, 1961

and the farmers of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada will forget all the times they said 'no' 'impossible' to things that should have been done. And they hope that they will forget too, that many of the things that the Liberal party, which is supposed to be a progressive party and they try to pass themselves off as a progressive party, but the Liberal party said, 'no they couldn't do it' but when the Conservative party got in, they were able to do some of these things, and bring some relief in some small measure to the farmers and to the people of Canada. I must be to the everlasting shame of the Liberal party to be put in that particular position. So no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that they pray that the electorate of Canada have short memories.

They sit here in the House with no responsibility, either federally or provincially, yakking on the sidelines, criticizing everybody, and saying 'we would do better' hoping that the people have forgotten their record. Well I for one, Mr. Speaker, will never let the people of Saskatchewan forget their record, and I think it will be a long time before the record of the Liberal party is forgotten, either provincially or federally in this province.

Now a great deal has been said about this farmer-labour union, and the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) again said that he wondered how this would be possible — that farmers would be able to unite and work with these people. Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that I think it was 40 or 50 per cent of the people of Canada not so long ago, were engaged in agriculture. Since that time they have had to leave, in many cases due to Liberal agricultural policies or the lack of them. They had to leave the farm, give up the farm and go into the labour force. Let us not forget that many of the people who are working in labour unions today, in fact some of the labour leaders, are the sons of farmers. Certainly many of the labour members are sons of farmers, and are very close to the farm. Do they suggest to us that these people would do anything, even if they had the power, that would harm the interests of agriculture? It would be cutting off their nose to spite their face. It would be defeating and working against their own brothers and their fathers.

I said this last winter in moving the Throne Speech debate that in northwestern Saskatchewan we have many, many small farms and large families. Two or three of the sons and daughters of each farm family certainly must find employment off the farm. Is the farmer, in that particular area, is he going to vote and work against the best interests of his sons and daughters in labour and the professional field? I don't think so. Neither are these people who are

in unions going to work against them. This is a group of people who are all Canadians and who will work together as Canadians, and this is exactly what the people opposite, who are trying to pass themselves off as Liberals – liberalism was forgotten by this party many years ago, and it has developed into nothing but a reactionary opportunist group, that is willing to do the bidding of big business as it has always done — as it did with the Trans-Canada pipelines; as it did back in the days of Beauharnois. It has always been the tool, ever since the days of Sir Wilfred Laurier. It has always been the tool of big business and it still unfortunately commends itself to a lot of respectable people who haven't looked beyond the end of their nose. This is the job that the New Democratic Party must do, is to convince people that there is a better way and that they can have a party of their own which will do things for the people, rather than for the interests of a few vested interests.

Mr. Speaker, we are told also by the hon. member for Wilkie that it is wrong, and told by other members too, that it is wrong for union members to contribute to politics. Well, who contributes the money to the Liberal, Tory and Socred parties? Big Business. These are earnings from the people, taken in their mark-up and when big business can have such a good mark-up that they can give \$100 thousand, \$500 thousand to the Liberal or to the Conservative party, or \$50 thousand to buy a leader in the province of Saskatchewan, so they can give him orders afterwards, then I suggest . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — I wish they could.

Mr. Kramer: — Read MacLean's magazine. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is money that has been taken involuntarily from the people as well. It is estimated by the commentators that the 1958 election cost the national Liberal and Conservative parties somewhere in the vicinity of \$8, — \$10 — \$12 million or thereabouts for their national campaigns. When you see full-page ads in some of the leading magazines throughout the nation, and you have a full time T.V. network program, and you know what this costs, you know that there is a tremendous amount of money being spent. I know what the CCF party had to spend in 1958.

Mr. Thatcher: — So do I.

Mr. Kramer: — . . . They had \$250 thousand in the 1958 election, and our books are open, and I challenge you — I challenge the Leader of

October 19, 1961

the Opposition to open his books; then we will be prepared to open ours any day in the week. We'll find out where the contributions come from. We'll find out. We won't find the breweries and one thing and another . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Not much you won't. They're your biggest contributors.

Mr. Kramer: — They had an investigation in Manitoba, and I'm speaking facts, I'm not speaking suppositions.

Mr. Thatcher: — Neither am I. I'm speaking facts.

Mr. Kramer: — They had an investigation in Manitoba, not too long ago, and this investigation showed that the donations from breweries in Manitoba to the Liberal party were substantial. To the Tory party quite substantial. To the social Credit party — not quite so substantial. To the CCF party — nil.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, the breweries are the biggest contributors in this province that the CCF have. It is the truth.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. Leader of the Opposition . . .

Mr. Kramer: — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, when he speaks he should speak the truth. We heard his speech, Mr. Speaker, in the opening session. I would have thought he had made enough of a fool of himself then without continually trying to interrupt.

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to say anything about what the hon. member said in his opening address but he was talking again, the old story about stagnation in the province of Saskatchewan, I thought this old record had been worn out but apparently he still thinks it is going to get him a little credit somewhere even when he has been reprimanded by the Financial Post for trying to sabotage the steel company in Saskatchewan. He still persists in trying to sabotage business and convince the rest of the people in Canada and the United States that they shouldn't invest money in Saskatchewan. You know, if I were a competitor of the steel company here, I couldn't think of a better way to sabotage them than to hire an influential citizen in the province to try and drag it down to bring public interest to a low

level, so that it could probably be bought for 50¢ on the dollar. I am rather surprised that the hon. Leader of the Opposition would do this for nothing. He is probably getting paid for it. It says in the Star Phoenix, June 23, 1961: Editorial note:

“If Ross Thatcher, provincial Liberal leader, would temper the vigour he has shown and is showing with a little more common sense, he would do even better than he is doing. His statement at a recent rally near North Battleford that the potash areas east of Saskatoon would never be developed under the socialist government strikes us as nonsense. The company working this mine has sunk millions upon millions to get a potash mine and has been facing great difficulties, as every company attempting to mine potash in this province. Does Mr. Thatcher believe that these difficulties would not have been met if his own party had been in control in the province. Nonsense.”

The Saskatoon Star Phoenix, June 23, 1961. Even the Liberal press has to come to the rescue of common sense.

Mr. Thatcher: — I didn't say that, and if I said it, it would have been nonsense and I'll admit it, but I didn't say it.

Mr. Kramer: — I am sorry, but again he is welching, but I do appreciate that he feels badly about it.

Mr. Thatcher: — I just didn't say it.

Mr. Kramer: — Another ridiculous statement that was made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition was the quotation, and it has already been brought to the attention of this House, the various things that were said in the Gazette, that these were companies that had changed hands and that they don't simply mean that they are going out of business. It even listed the Thatcher Hardware as going out of business, but I'm sure it only changed hands, and I think that the name Thatcher Hardware was changed in order that they might be able to do a little more business in Moose Jaw. That is good practical business and I certainly wouldn't want to continue business under that particular heading. When he talked about the horse processing plant in Swift Current closing up, this I thought was the pay-off. Apparently the hon. Leader of the Opposition doesn't seem to know that you

October 19, 1961

need horses, whole horses, to run a horse processing plant. The portion of the horse that is epitomized so ably by some doesn't go into a can.

Mr. McDonald: — It would take a big can to fit that one.

Mr. Kramer: — It sure would. Well now we've said enough about that. I guess that possibly if some politicians had their way, for instance Senator Horner was quoted as saying 'the thing to do in Saskatchewan was to go back to the horse and ox cart'. I suppose we could some day reopen the horse processing plant and we could be back in business.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I appreciated most of what the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) said and I think he made a very good contribution to the debate in this House. I think his sincerity is unquestionable. Unfortunately I cannot say that for some of the rest of the speakers that have spoken in this debate. The hon. member for Turtleford, yesterday, rose with a considerable amount of apprehension and for him, I think he delivered what would be a very temperate speech. He chided me for interrupting the hon. Minister of Education. I believe this is my privilege to ask a question and, Mr. Speaker, I did so in the proper manner, and I bow to your ruling if I did not. The hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) suggested that I rudely interrupted the hon. minister yesterday when I posed a question through you, Sir. If you rule that this is true then I will accept the criticism.

Mr. Speaker: — I made the ruling at that time that you were in order.

Mr. Kramer: — I was in order. Thank you very much. This of course proves, as well as many other things that what the hon. member for Turtleford says, has to be taken with a grain of salt. He suggested this was my only contribution thus far. Well I suggest that the only contribution that he has made thus far has been to the length of the session. Number one, there were some things that were so ridiculous, especially for a school principal, that I must make some protest. He raised the question again, and alluded to it as if there was something wrong with it, about the transfer of crown lands, lands belonging to the crown, and the government trading these crown lands for Indian lands to provide for a park at Jackfish Lake. But this school principal, the hon. member for Turtleford, said that we expropriated this land.

Well I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, how could the crown expropriate crown land?

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, if I may rise on a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I refuse to be interrupted. He made his speech yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: — What is the point of privilege?

Mr. Foley: — May I speak to a point of privilege?

Mr. Speaker: — State the point of privilege please.

Mr. Foley: — He said that I stated that they had expropriated crown land.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think that's a point of privilege. I think that is an explanation that could be made with the consent of the member speaking, or at the close of the speech.

Mr. Foley: — I simply wanted to point out . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I cannot accept it as a point of privilege.

Mr. Kramer: — Whether he said expropriation of leases, or expropriation of crown land — it is equally ridiculous. The only privilege that these people had, and I'm sorry they lost it, was to permit this land from year to year. The crown expropriated nothing. They discontinued a policy. That is all. There was no expropriation.

Mr. Foley: — There were no leases.

Mr. Kramer: — There were no leases. You used the word leases and I suggest that he used this in issues to the press, and he was corrected before. He refuses to be corrected and he insists on pursuing a point that has absolutely no truth.

Mr. Foley: — There were leases.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, there was a question also about a road. I would say again, that if the hon. member had given the advice that

was necessary and available, and had known what the proper procedure was, these people may now have a road, because they proceeded to ask for a road through the Department of Indian Affairs, through the Department of Natural Resources when the assistance should have been asked for through the Department of Municipal Affairs, and the hon. member should have known this. The procedure probably could have been started much earlier than it was.

Mr. Foley: — That is nonsense. Is the Department of natural Resources not part of the government of the province?

Mr. Kramer: — The hon. member also gave us a learned discussion on carp. Now nobody should be more of an authority on carp than any member of the opposition. Then he went on to chide the hon. member for Bengough (Mr. Dahlman) for the information he gave this House regarding Sweden. Of course the hon. member for Bengough was quoting an authority, an unquestionable authority, and certainly not a paper that is particularly an ally of democratic socialism or the CCF or the New Democratic Party, but a paper that is dedicated to giving the facts as they see them the 'Financial Post', a respectable Conservative paper, I believe. Now this is what the hon. member from Bengough was quoting from, and I at this time want to congratulate the hon. member from Bengough, on the tremendous contribution that he made to this House in this debate, as well as some of the others.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Kramer: — I've got a little more to say, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition is leaving.

Mr. Thatcher: — You're a long time getting to it.

Mr. Kramer: — After having pointed out, as the hon. member for Bengough did, what a tremendous job Sweden has done in bringing about full employment, in bringing itself into a position where it is ahead of Canada in production, and they certainly are ahead of Canada in social services in every way. I am not proud of this. I am unhappy about it. Here is a country with probably just a fraction of our natural resources, only a little better than one-third of our population, and they are able, with a planned economy through a democratic socialist government, (labour dominated if you wish because certainly there are more labour people in Sweden than anything else)

these are the people that re-elected the government this year with an even greater majority. These people have been able to show the world what can be done with sound economic planning and retaining the freedom of the individual at the same time. This is done. And then the hon. member for Turtleford chose to quote an unknown authority, but he says it must have been so, some chappie that decided to write a letter from Blaine Lake, by the name of Makaroff and this was supposed to prove that the arguments of the hon. member for Bengough were incorrect, and that the social security and the type of government they have was bad in Sweden. He said that they had a very high suicide rate, and the crime rate was going up and so on. This may be true, but when the last president of the United States made this statement, he was corrected very quickly by Adlai Stevenson, a well-known Democrat, who said that the United States, not Sweden has the highest suicide and crime rate of anywhere in the world. It might be interesting to note in this House today that one church periodical that I read just recently stated from statistics that the time costs in the United States today were between \$400 and \$500 per capita. The hon. member chooses to talk about Sweden in a derisive manner, as this democratic socialist . . .

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member give us the name of the church publication that made that statement and the date.

Mr. Kramer: — It was the Liberty. I am quoting from memory, but I will produce this paper, Mr. Speaker, and I will table it.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask for another point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member has risen on a point of privilege.

Mr. Foley: — I neglected to mention yesterday that the authority for the statements on Sweden that were quoted in this letter were made by Dr . . . of Great Britain.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I must remind hon. members that they may make these explanations at the close of the debate, or with the permission of the hon. member speaking.

Mr. Foley: — I'm sorry, I thought I had his consent.

October 19, 1961

Mr. Kramer: — The hon. member made his speech yesterday and unless he has a point of privilege or a point of order, I choose to proceed as I would like to get through by closing time.

We have these particular things that have been said, and a great deal more that could be said about the statements that have been made, but I think they have been more than ably answered in the debate thus far.

There is one thing I will mention. There has been a great cry about water and derisive statements were made by the opposition about the hon. Minister of Agriculture not doing enough about the water question. There again, we have had P.F.R.A. operating in most of this province for many years, and in those areas where the P.F.R.A. does not operate, the provincial government under the able leadership of the Minister of Agriculture, have taken over and given very good service. I congratulate both these offices. Again the Liberal party and any member of it are the last ones that should be talking about a water shortage. If they had done something more besides talk about the South Saskatchewan river dam for the last thirty or thirty-five years, and used it as an election football, we could have had this dam today. If they had proceeded with this type of thing the way they did in the United States, under the new deal — under Roosevelt, when people were needing jobs back in the thirties, and when we had mass unemployment, we could have had that dam and there would have been a green spot this year in the heart of Saskatchewan, and we would have had ample water supplied in a great portion of this province that is now dry and crying for water and crying for fodder. Again I lay the blame for this situation — the shortage of water, squarely on the shoulders of the Liberal party and its inactivity and absolute laissez-faire throughout the years. They are the people who are responsible for this and no one else.

Now there is another thing I can't let go by and that was the statement made regarding this plea for help for a certain section of the population — the Mennonites in Rosthern. Now I have a lot of friends among the Mennonites, a lot of personal friends and I respect them very much, but I have never known any of these people to ever beg for help. They'll pay their way the same as everyone else and take the same chances along with everyone else, and I am rather surprised that the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) should be putting the Mennonites in a position where it might be suggested that they are begging. I am certain these people do not beg and never want to beg, and they are some of the

best farmers and the best settlers that we have in this province.

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

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

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying before we called it 12:30, a great deal has been said that probably was just as well not said by the opposition, since this session was called. I want to make a few more remarks about some of the wild statements that were made by the opposition, in a great clamour for instance, about the grasshopper situation. I want to say a little bit more about that. Apparently these wise people across the way seem to think that the Minister of Agriculture is even more farseeing and wiser than they think they are. I wonder if anyone could have foreseen the extreme hot weather — the un-seasonal hot weather we had in June which created this perfect hatch — a 100 per cent of grasshoppers, according to entomologists. They sprung from places in numbers that no one would have foreseen, and no one could have foreseen the weather. They criticized us for not having enough poison on hand. Well, when all is said and done the minister outlined very thoroughly the tremendous saving that had been made to farmers in the purchase of this, and I think they did a very good job, according to the long-term use. If we had had the same amount or even a little worse, we would have had plenty of grasshopper poison this year — we would have been overstocked.

I think there were complaints across the floor that we were overstocked a couple of years ago; spending too much money on this. But there is another factor in this, as far as being prepared is concerned. If some of the R.M.'s including R.M.'s in my constituency had put their orders in a bit earlier, so that we would have had some idea as to what the situation was, if they hadn't waited until the last minute as they did in the affected municipalities in my area — the farmers are well aware of this; so are the municipalities. They accept the full responsibility for it. We, the Minister of Agriculture and the department officials would certainly have known in advance and could have put in probably some more advance orders. They had no carry-over; actually no carry-over in many municipalities with which I am acquainted. I think they have to accept some of the responsibility if there was any lack of preparation, which I don't think there was.

October 19, 1961

If we had had normal Saskatchewan weather, damp and cool in June, we would never have had the grasshopper outbreak to the extent that we did. I think it is very unfair and simply unethical to try and heap abuse on a department that has done a tremendous amount to meet the situation head on. Along with the commission-operation of national defence, we got the supplies in here and I think they did a tremendous job and deserve tremendous credit. I certainly think there are a lot of municipalities that will agree with me — in fact all of them that had grasshopper infestation.

This whole drought question, as I said before lunch, and I reiterate, is certainly a far cry from the way the Liberal government of the late 'thirties met the situation at that time. I wonder what we would say today, and what they would be saying across the floor if we ordered the liquidation of livestock down to so many head before you could get a bit of assistance. Or if we were to order the liquidation of entire herds right down to eight or nine head. This happened all over the province, and the records show it. They are right here in the books, where one of the ministers at that time was complaining because the Premier, who at that time was a federal member — he claimed he told the people in his constituency not to liquidate their livestock; that the government should provide feed for them.

Registered herds were liquidated at one cent a pound and less. In fact, there were people who sold their cattle (including myself) and some of my neighbours who actually got bills for freight from Winnipeg after the cattle went down there. This was the agricultural policy of the Liberals in the 'thirties, Mr. Speaker, and this is the thing they are trying to whitewash and hope people will forget today. I want to put this on the record once again, so that it will not be forgotten.

Then there is this continual digging and jibing away at people who have been active politically, getting political jobs. I suggest that simply because a man has been active in politics, if he has been defeated or has stepped out of politics, he is just as eligible — if he has the qualifications, he is entitled to take a job with the government as well as any other Saskatchewan citizen, Mr. Speaker. I hate this digging of good public servants, good citizens that have happened to be fortunate enough, or happened to have chosen government services as their vocation after they have stepped out of politics. I think it is entirely unfair, and certainly a Liberal party has done this many, many times.

The former Minister of Agriculture worked as a deputy minister down at Ottawa as a public servant for a number of years, and I think he was a pretty good deputy minister of agriculture, too. Scads of people that have been named, that I could name, that were former Liberal and former Conservative members that are working now and still working, both for provincial and federal governments. In fact, I think we have had better luck with some of the former CCF members and politicians that we have hired than we have had with some of the former Liberal candidates which I could name, and which we ran into considerable difficulty with, in one case. It caused one department a considerable amount of embarrassment.

Then there is all this talk about giving jobs to political friends. We, Mr. Speaker, when there is a job to be done, contracting, road-building, in practically all cases the policy is to call for contracts. What was the situation in a couple of instances in the Saskatchewan legislature, session 1937 — I will refer to a couple of questions that were asked. As the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Brockelbank) suggested, old books are wonderful things. They are. The question was asked in the legislature concerning J.W. Miller of Edmonton regarding a certain contract for work at the Saskatchewan Hospital. “Has J.W. Miller (and everybody at North Battleford at least knows that Mr. Miller — formerly know as ‘Big Jim’ Miller was a very good Liberal and a very active Liberal supporter — he’s a big wheel) — of Edmonton, Alberta, or any company with which he is connected, done any work for the government since July 18, 1934?” The second part of the question: “If so, what nature?” Third part, “How much was paid to J.W. Miller or his company by the government?” The fourth part of the question, “Were tenders called for by the government for such work?” Let’s see what the answers are.

The first part of the question, did he get work? — “Yes. Western Construction and Lumber Company of Edmonton, Alta.” The second, — “If so, what nature? Construction of a water gallery under the river to service the Mental Hospital at North Battleford.” “How much was paid? \$21,342,000.” “Were tenders called for such work? The work was of such nature it was not possible to call for tenders.”

Then we have another firm of well-known plumbers — Mr. Titerle, campaign manager at one time for the Liberal candidate, as I remember. “How much was paid to Jack Titerle of North Battleford by the government? \$14,152.78. How much owing? \$2,000.00. What did he do? Plant alterations and repairs, trenching, laying water pipelines at Battleford

Mental Hospital. Were contracts let by tender? No.” And right in between these two things — “Is Allan D. Pickel (Allan D. Pickel was a former Liberal provincial member representing the same seat that I have the honour to represent before he retired) of North Battleford in the employ of the government? Yes. If so, what capacity — what are his duties? Grounds constable and guide, Battleford Mental Hospital.” You know, folks, there is one thing that startles me a bit. He was employed at \$105 per month, and I think my only criticism of this is that they probably could have done better for such an able gentleman — they could have found a better job for him.

Mr. Speaker, I think this sanctimonious preaching and digging and slighting is not becoming of this House at all. I think we have a Public Service Commission in this province that is beyond reproach. In order to get a job with the government you first of all have to prove that you have the qualifications. You’re hired because of what you know, not who you know, and that was certainly not the case prior to 1944.

If a man has the qualifications, especially in jobs that call for the interpretation of policy — if I have to make my choice, if I should be the one who has the choice of a man who can interpret the policy of this government if he has the qualifications, opposed to one who is not in sympathy, he would certainly get the nod — after he had proven he has the qualifications, Mr. Speaker, and I make no apologies for that.

So let’s give the charges and the statements of the opposition the amount of attention they deserve. I think I have placed on the records a number of things that are in the public interest, straightened out a considerable amount of misinformation that was laid before this House, and I am prepared to back up everything I have said.

I want to thank the Provincial Treasurer before I sit down, too, for prompt action —it was only a little thing, but one of my constituents when this tremendous rush for feed was on, came in. This was in early July, and suggested he was going to have to employ trucks that he did not normally use until harvest time and he thought this would be the case with a lot of others as well. I got in touch with the Provincial Treasurer, and asked him if the harvest license could be released earlier — the special harvest license which permits a farmer to get an extra license for older trucks and extra trucks for \$5.00, including insurance.

I want to thank him for seeing to it that this was done in this year when certainly harvest came on much earlier, and with all the transportation of hay, these extra trucks and cheaper licenses were a great saving to the farmer.

In closing, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Foley: — What about the gasoline in the northern part of the province?

Mr. Kramer: — I suggest gasoline in the northern part of the province is the same as it is anywhere else. They have price wars, and the law of supply and demand seems to be taking its usual course. Mr. Speaker, I was a bit sad but proud, and a bit humble when I listened to the Premier's contribution which will be the last one in this House on the throne Speech debate. I am sure that many other members on both sides of the House felt much the same. I want to, for my part, wish him well and God-speed in the new field that he is now fleeing to — if this was fleeing, I think the Premier would probably say with the job that he has at hand, "It's a hell of a way to flee".

I think, Mr. Speaker, that when the history of this province is written, that the hon. Premier T.C. Douglas will be recognized as the architect of the best 20 years that Saskatchewan has ever know to date, and I am sure that future generations will remember and honour things that were done under his leadership. I am old enough to know the difference. It is unfortunate that an entire generation has grown up that has not had first-hand experience with the method of government that we had prior to the 1940's. This is why we have to be ever more watchful, to keep people from taking all these good things that we have had for granted. We certainly will have to work very hard in order to keep them convinced, because apparently there are some people who think — they must have read Hitler's Mein Kamff — in which he said quite blatantly and quite boldly that if you tell a lie often enough, big enough and hard enough, the majority of the people will believe it. This is apparently the attitude of some members of the opposition, certainly the Leader of the Opposition — I'm not saying all the members of the opposition — I'm just referring to some. This apparently is the method they choose, and think is the best method of gaining power in Saskatchewan.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think, having said that, you will realize I am against the amendment and will certainly support the motion.

October 19, 1961

Mr. G. Herman Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I was thinking this morning when I sat here and listened to the strenuous effort that was put forth by the Minister of Agriculture to justify his decisions and the actions of his government, what a politician told me many years ago — he said if your case is weak yell loud and hard, and that will help you out. That was what he attempted to do this morning.

First of all I would like to say a few words about the member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer). Speaking about the price of cattle; when they were one cent a pound compared to what they are now. Does he know that the drought started in 1929, and that was in 1935-36-37, and there was no feed in this province for six or seven years? Dr. Anderson had two and one-half years of drought before he left office. There is no credit given to him. He battled with this thing. It is no government's fault that you have a drought, but time passes by and it is hard to forget some of the things. After seven or eight years, after you came into office all you did until this time — for two or three or four years was to damn the Liberal government, and your fodder bank was one of the things you advocated. You plugged it home, and knocked and knocked the old government, and that you were going to do those things they had neglected to do. Why haven't you done it? You haven't had more than one year's drought. Where are your promises; what is your policy that you tried to advise the other fellows to follow? You haven't done anything. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, all we have to do is go back to 1947 — 300 cattle froze to death in the southern part of the province on account of this government not being able to assist them with the feed situation.

The member for that constituency . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Would the hon. member inform the House whose cattle these were, and under what circumstances? I know all about it . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Why ask, then?

Mr. Danielson: — If you know all about it, that makes it worse. That makes it more serious than ever. The member for that constituency, Mr. Speaker, was Dr. Hause — I always called him my Conservative friend, because he was a Conservative; he wasn't a C.C.F.'er. He came into my place one Sunday night in my room at the hotel, and he gave me all the information, and he said this, "When you get up on your feet you let him have

it — I can't do it because I sit on that side of the House.” He told me the whole story, and then in 1945 Mr. Bentley made a statement — March, 1948 and he said: “Feed and fodder assistance during the last four years at total expense to the government was \$76,000.” Just imagine for four years, \$76,000. Then 300 cattle were frozen to death.

I think that a government that has that kind of a record should just sit quietly and not say anything that would at least bring on a discussion about these things, because after all, talk about relief. There was a question asked in the House from this government and the answer was given by the Minister of Social Welfare, who said this: In 1937-38 the welfare and direct relief expenditure by the government was \$23,121,126. That was all human relief, Mr. Speaker. There was nothing for livestock; there was nothing for fodder; there was nothing for seed and nothing for gas and oil for the farmers at that point. When we got through in the spring and fall of 1938, the total relief stood at \$56 million.

I saw an answer to a question here this session — I don't know how much more you've been dishing out, but it says here that feed and fodder up to October 1 was \$12,588.34, and then you paid for transportation of farmers' cattle to pasture, \$3,760 — a total of \$16,347.78. Right after that, Mr. Speaker, the question was asked, “How much money has been collected from farmers for pumping water?” and he said, \$29,620.00. Here the total was \$16,000 for helping the farmers, and then you collected \$29,620 — that was the cost of the water that you have been pumping. So you must be a pretty good businessman. I don't see how in the world you could operate your department that way.

Mr. Speaker, I have been here for 17 years since this government took office, and I hear from the member for Battleford (Mr. Kramer) that it is too bad for us Liberals to talk about the deplorable things the CCF have done. That it is really a bad thing for us to do. These fellows have been sitting here for 17 years, and all they have ever talked about was the dirty 'thirties.' That's all we ever heard from any man on that side of the House. Then they have been comparing the financial condition of the province with the dirty 'thirties, with what it has been during the last few years. The total revenue, Mr. Speaker, the first year of office of the Liberal government in 1934 was \$11,700,000 . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Which you tried to make the farmer pay.

October 19, 1961

Mr. Danielson: — Now how far did you get? This government has six times the revenue over the last 17 years that we had previous to that time — every year we got \$2 million from the federal government; later we got as much as \$4 million, and during the last two we got \$8 million, and this government is now getting \$69 million from the federal government this fiscal year. The federal member from Moose Jaw said they get \$72 million; Mr. Diefenbaker set a figure at \$69 million, and I take his figure in preference to the other gentleman's. Nevertheless, they are not very far apart.

There was also something said this morning by the Minister of Agriculture when he was telling them all about how wonderful he had been conducting the affairs of agriculture, when he started talking about this medical plan. He made some reference to the fact that so far as the doctors' attitude to this plan was concerned, there wasn't very much difference, as I understood him, from what happened in the earlier days when the municipalities engaged doctors to take care of their ratepayers and the people in their municipalities. There was a certain amount of hostility then. Well, I have been here since 1904, Mr. Speaker, — that's a long time, and I was in municipal work at the time. I was here when they started the sanatorium in this province. I was on the council at the time. I have been following this thing up pretty closely, but there is just one difference between that plan and the plan that is proposed by this government. The doctors in those days did not have to hire out to a municipality, or accept a contract with the municipality — they could do what they wanted. They didn't have to — they were all willing to do it. They rendered wonderful service. By the way, there are many of them working right today, Mr. Speaker. There are still a great many of these doctors inside these municipalities, carrying on the great work that they have done all these years.

So there is no comparison, and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if it hadn't been for the fact that the municipal plan of health services had commission-operation from the medical men all over the province to carry it out, this province wouldn't be in the forefront, for all provinces in the world in the year 1934-35. That is what Dr. Sigerist says, and he was hired by this government to come here to condemn the government, but he stayed here to praise the plan that we had here in Saskatchewan.

Let me just tell you something here. Before the CCF government took office a large proportion of the rural municipalities, and a goodly number of towns and villages had in operation plans of prepaid medical and hospital services. They were similar to the present hospitalisation plan, but were administered by local authorities. Let me say this to my friend, the Minister of Public Health. I think he is probably as good a man as you have in the government — I have had a lot to do with him, and I have had good service from him. I want to point out to him that I think the day is coming pretty soon when you will do a good stroke of work if you return to the municipal hospital, or to the local hospital board, the authority to take care of and operate the institution without too much interference like it is at the present time, from the Department of Public Health.

Now then, at that time, Mr. Speaker, out of 300 rural municipalities, 106 had a prepaid hospital service, and this was under a Liberal government — which you say had never done anything. And 159 municipalities had a prepaid medical service as well. Twenty-nine towns and villages had a prepaid hospitalisation, and 71 had a prepaid medical service. That was quite an advance, wasn't it, Mr. Speaker, — in spite of the drought, in spite of the primary conditions under which we operated in those days. Many of us were thirty or forty miles from a railroad, but still we commission-operated as people should do, in those days and we built this province of Saskatchewan to what it is today. So don't let it be told any place, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province, — I'm going to give the credit to the people of the province — not the politicians. They are the ones that wanted this thing, and they went to the government and said, "This is what we want, certain legislation and certain rights to do certain things" and we gave it to them. There was no man who had more sympathy for this system than the late Dr. Uhrich.

I understood (I wasn't in the House) that the Minister of Agriculture mentioned certain figures with regard to the amount that had been spent for hopper poison. The whole amount is \$3,900,000. Don't let it be understood by any person in this House that this government has given the 'farmers that \$3,900,000. The farmers and the municipalities have paid that — it was not given by the government, it is not an outlay or any gift from the CCF government to the farmers of Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, they are not used to it, because they never got any . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No one said it was.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to take up any more time with this agricultural problem. I think it has been pretty well discussed. I just wanted to check over this thing and correct some of these impressions that have been spread about. Once again let me tell the Minister of Agriculture that the only thing that he did this summer to help the farmers (and he didn't stretch that point very much) was that they held lots of conferences and lots of meetings, to talk the thing over. That is practically all they have done, Mr. Speaker, — talk the thing over. If it hadn't been for the federal government coming in here — I imagine they will probably take credit for this \$16,000 on freight and shipping cattle from one pasture to the other, from pasture to feed, but the federal government is also paying part of that. So if it hadn't been for that I think we would have been much worse off than we are today.

There is one thing — and he mentioned something about that — you haven't seen anything yet of the drought since you came into power; not a thing. This is the beginning; not the end as the indications point today. It is the 30-year cycle which history tells us is visiting this triangle of western Canada and part of the United States every 30 years, and don't forget this — there is more coming. I don't care what you do. If you don't have a rain next June to keep the hoppers down and kill them off, you're not going to get a crop even if you get some rain during the season, because according to your own department — and I think that is where they have probably done more work to benefit the farmer than anywhere else — and that is they had a survey last year. You said a little while ago you wouldn't know where this grasshopper outbreak was going to be; you couldn't tell. Well, what have you got this survey for? You made a good job out of that last year. I have a map, two or three of them, as a matter of fact, every place in my district where we spotted these infested small spots here and there, and larger areas in some places, they certainly were right, because they were just alive with hoppers last summer. There were two hatches. One was early in some places in April during those few hot days; then we had two weeks or 15 days of cool, damp weather without any moisture, and the last hatch was delayed until about the second week in June. That is when the big hatch appeared. Today the whole part of Saskatchewan, in this part of the country that I know of is seeded with grasshopper eggs, and think what is going to happen next year.

If you haven't done anything this year, you don't know anything about it and you will get to find out what

drought periods really mean to the farmer and to the people who have to put up with it.

Another thing, you're also going to find out what is going to happen to your cities. This CCF government has been preaching — the last few years “Oh, we don't need the farmers so much now. The economy has shifted from the farm to the industrial sphere and we are no longer dependent upon the farmer.” But let me tell you this, that the economy that depends upon the industrial part of Saskatchewan does not amount to a darn when the drought comes on; when the farmer fails.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I agree with you.

Mr. Danielson: — Most of them sell their businesses and they take their money out of here, and God knows they need it because they put in three or four times as much as they ever had taken out, and they probably will never get it out. But I'm not complaining of that. But don't forget this, that immediately the farmers fail, the businesses are failing. Last week when I was home some servicemen said to me, “What in the world is happening? We're not selling any gas.” We are not selling enough to pay our board. In my place, the commission-opposition up there, which I am connected with — we find that the gas sales are going down by 67 per cent during the last two or three weeks. That is the situation. Why? The farmers have no money. Another thing — if a man has money it is a sort of psychological effect on that fellow too, and he doesn't spend it if he has it, and that makes it all the worse. So you're up against that condition and you're not going to have recovery; you are going to have more acute conditions in the days to come than it is at the present time. You and the rest of us will find out this, that when the farm economy of Saskatchewan fails, the cities and the towns fail with it.

I was listening just this morning to the Minister of Education and I had hoped he would be in the House to listen to what I am going to say. He had to do his little bit of a stunt — he's a new man here — he had to do a little bit of a stunt to throw dirt — to insinuate that everything that was done in this province has all been done by the CCF government. He was just simple-minded enough to repeat talk that had been taught him and every new member that comes in here, what happened in the early days. He said that the cancer commission and all cancer clinics, etc., were that of the CCF. There has never been a bigger false

October 19, 1961

story told in the world. What did he say then? He just repeated what someone else told him. He hasn't read up or checked up on the statutes, or anything on the records of this House to know where they come from. As a matter of fact, wouldn't it be a nice thing if for once this was said: "Dr. Anderson's government started the cancer clinic." No — you're not that generous. We — We are the whole thing. Dr. Anderson started this, and Dr. Munroe should have the credit for that, also. He's dead now, but he is the man who started the cancer clinic in this province. We came in in 1934 and they were operating. There was a feeling in the province that cancer clinics and cancer treatment should be free in this province. I just told you, Mr. Speaker, that our total revenue in 1934-35 was \$11,700,000. The next year it was \$14 million and it crept up to \$22 million. Our education tax has been so much abused — that stinking tax that this CCF government was going to do away with; it is between \$2 ½ million and \$3 million. The gasoline tax in those days brought us in far, far less than \$2 million. That's what we operated on. So that after we had inquired into the health conditions of this province through a committee of this House, Mr. Patterson, or Dr. Uhrich brought in the free cancer clinic bill. That was in the session of 1934, and of course many members of this House, Mr. Speaker, never knew that the legislation that is the basis of the hospitalization bill, and all the things which have been done over the last few years — is based on the legislation that was passed by the Liberal governments — every bit of it. When this hospital bill was before the House, I said to the Premier one day. "What does this mean?" (We were in committee). "Oh, the member for Arm River should know", he said. "You passed the bill." Of course it was a slip of the tongue, but after all it did come out.

So when he comes into this House and says that the cancer, hospitalization, and free treatment of cancer was put into effect by the CCF government, well, there's never been anything like that at all. That is absolutely false; the whole thing is false. I'm going to say something here before I go into what I am really going to say — that in 1960, June 23, the present Minister of Public Health, (and I am surprised at this) he spoke to the CCF Ladies' Club in the city of Regina at the King's Hotel, and I could read a lot of his speech, but here is what he said:

"Another aspect of the provincial health program, the cancer service program was also outlined by Mr. Erb, just prior to the election of the CCF government in 1943. The Liberal government passed a cancer service act which was never implemented.

“In 1944 the Cancer Control Act was passed by the CCF government, and the Cancer Commission set up. He said there is now two cancer clinics.”

“Dr. Munroe established two cancer clinics before the Liberals ever came in here.”

Now then, you see in order to make these people believe, they must be gullible, after all, that they had established a cancer clinic — he said, “We, the Liberals passed a bill in 1943”. We didn’t do any such thing. Then they come in and pass a Cancer Control Act in 1944. It is certainly something that I am extremely surprised at, that the Minister of Public Health would say a thing like that. But that shows how desperate they were to claim the credit for what the Liberal government did May 1, 1944, before the election the free cancer act was put into operation, Mr. Speaker. It was from that day on that all hospitals were notified to send all hospital bills to the Cancer Commission, Department of Public Health. They did not pay, or could not pay the operating bills, the medical bills, for this simple reason, that Dr. Uhrich, in his work, he told me himself — he said, “We have done our best to get a working agreement with the medical profession, but they tell us that they won’t do this now because some of our best men are in the armed forces, and for that reason they don’t like to sign any agreement until the men come back.” That is what he said to me. But that doesn’t mean the government was not prepared to pay the medical expenses, not by any means.

Sometime in June, around the 16th, an election came up. We went to the people and this CCF government came in. They called a special session in the fall of 1944, and they also hired a man from the John Hopkins University in the United States to come up here and check up on the health conditions of the province of Saskatchewan; to recommend any services in addition to those already in existence, which he thought might be necessary. This gentleman came up here, and he worked here for about — I don’t know how many days — but he was here for a much shorter time than any other investigator or expert, but the CCF got rid of him as quickly as they could because they didn’t get the report from him that they expected or wanted.

Then one day at a luncheon meeting at the Kiwanis Club, he said this:

“A fine ground-work in health services has been laid in Saskatchewan. Dr. Henry E. Sigerist,

October 19, 1961

Chairman of the Provincial Health Survey committee told the Kiwanis Club Monday at a luncheon meeting.

“The province has a fine health record, Dr. Sigerist said, who is Dean of Medicine, John Hopkins University. Dr. Sigerist said that Saskatchewan’s survey was one of the most pleasant he had ever undertaken during his career. He had many similar assignments, but this one in Saskatchewan differed from those in South Africa and the Balkans, as it was one in which services did not start from scratch.

“In Saskatchewan, Dr. Sigerist said, it was a case of bringing this existing facilities into more service for more people.”

Then on page two — I cannot resist raising this — the Premier has come in and sat down — March 3, 1945 — almost a year later the Premier said:

“All hospitals which were bona fide hospitals received a grant of 50 cents per day per patient. This grant is one of the highest paid in Canada. It speaks well for the previous administration of this province and for the people in taking such an interest in health matters.”

Well, now, fifty cents health grant does not sound very much for these days, but the hospital rate, Mr. Speaker, that we could charge was \$2.50 per day. The, due to the drought for several years there was an emergency grant that brought our total grant up to \$1.46 to \$1.85. So that wasn’t too bad on a \$2.50 fee for patient per day. But that was the Liberal government.

They called a special session in the fall of 1944, and certain legislation was passed. In 1945 the regular session came along on February 20, and when the Premier spoke on that Speech from the Throne he said this: “We are now giving free cancer treatment, not only diagnostic and X-ray treatment, but also . . .” I remember that the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. Proctor) insisted at the last session — (that was the special session in the fall of 1944,) that money had been voted in last year’s estimates for surgery in cancer cases. He said: “True, my department — that \$5,000 was provided, but that was to set up the clinical roster; \$5,000 would never begin to pay for surgical treatment, which my hon. friend must admit.” That was the Premier’s

statement then. Well, Mr. Speaker, according to these statements and he has made these statements on numerous occasions, he couldn't find any money that had been voted by the Liberal government to carry on the free cancer services; he couldn't find it, and there was nothing there. Well, coming into the House later on, in 1943, Mr. McCormack, the member for Estevan asked the government the following question, which was answered by the hon. Mr. Bentley, the Minister of Public Health. "How much was provided for cancer services in estimates (a) 1943-44; (b) 1944-45?" This is clear enough. Here is the answer by the minister: (a) for 1943-44, \$76,760.00; (b) \$215,000 for 1944-45. The Premier said there was only "\$5,000 or \$10,000.

Here we have the Premier and his Minister of Public Health — one of these two is lying, and I repeat it again — one of the two is lying because the former Minister of Finance in this province, the man that 'flew the coop' came up to Davidson and told his audience there before the election in 1936 and 1952 both, that I was lying when I said that the cancer clinic was financed and money was voted to carry on the cancer treatment, during the years 1944-45. Who is lying?

The minister said that \$215,000 had been voted, and you said there was none. I will go a little farther.

Premier Douglas: — Will the hon. friend allow me to make a statement?

Mr. Danielson: — You give me an answer to my question. Did you tell the truth when you said that? That's what I want to know, because you're trying to make a liar out of me.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, no one is trying to make a liar out of the hon. member.

Mr. Danielson: — Your minister, Mr. Fines, came up there and tried to do that on two occasions. I have had some experience with this thing. I have lived in the community since 1904; I'm not going to stand for that.

Premier Douglas: — The hon. gentleman asked me to answer a question. I was going to answer that.

October 19, 1961

Mr. Danielson: — All right, but he's not going to make a speech.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Would the hon. member kindly refrain from using a word which I do not think is parliamentary language and should be used in this House.

Mr. Danielson: — That's the only language they understand, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I think it is time that we started trying to draw a halt to this sort of . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Well, we can call it an absolute untruth.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked me if I would answer the question. I would like to do this if I may. It will only take a moment. I have never, at any time, called in question the veracity of the hon. member. The statement I made was true; the hon. member and I are talking about two entirely different things. There was a vote for the diagnostic clinic of the sum which he mentioned. What I was talking about was the money to provide for surgery. These are the facts, if the hon. member will check them. No one ever denied that diagnostic clinics had been in existence for years, and their work had been greatly extended. We were talking about providing money for surgical services.

Mr. Danielson: — That doesn't change the position at all then. In your Speech from the Throne in 1945, and here it is:

“We are now giving free treatment to the mentally incompetent. We are now giving free treatment to not only diagnostic and X-ray treatment, but also surgery.

“I remember that the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. Proctor) insisting at the last session that money was voted in last year's estimates for surgery in cancer cases, ‘while no one in my department can find it, it is true that \$5,000 was provided but that was to set up a clinical roster. Five thousand would never begin to pay for special treatment.’

Even my hon. friend must admit this. Now, if anyone comes in they got free treatment. Mr. Speaker, he has insisted on that; and not only him but all of them — the lady member from Regina (she quit the last two years, but previous to that) — in every speech she made, she told them that we voted against the hospitalization, and at the same time we didn't provide any money for cancer clinics.

Just to finish this thing — and someone wonders why I am suspicious of the Premier. Well, I have told this House before, and I am going to repeat it; you can call me crude; you can call me anything he likes, but I wouldn't believe him under oath and if he tells the truth it's an accident. Here it is: I'm going to take the report of the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission for the calendar year 1957, Page No. 9, and here it is, from 1934-54 — the amount of money voted and the amount of money spent. We come to the year 1944-45. This fiscal year May 1, 1944 to April 30, 1945 — voted \$215,000, and spent \$158,614 — they spent \$158,614. That's all they spent, and they were in control for nine and a half months. We didn't spend hardly anything before we went out, because we couldn't pay medical bills; and we could only pay the hospital bills and we only had some 30 odd days between the time when we had to get out and the CCF came in.

Not only was more money voted, but this CCF government, according to its own report had \$57,000 balance, April 30, 1945. But for the next year the only increase for 1945-46 was by \$78,000 — the prices were going up and there was reason for it. I am not questioning that at all. But what I want to tell this House is that it is too bad that my friend the Minister of Education is not here so that he could learn something about the history of this province from these estimates. These are the things that have been repeated, no matter what the Premier has to say. This thing has been repeated several times during the last few years, but every time a new member comes into the House who doesn't know and you listen to the old familiar tale of this government — then they believe it and they go out and say that these are the facts — these are the statistics. The Premier spoke about means tests. Well, that's not a very nice word, Mr. Speaker. It means that somebody is getting checked up; somebody is questioning about what he does with the money, or whether he really needs it or not. There is no government in the dominion of Canada that has applied the means test more ruthlessly and more often than this government has done. This government took \$614,000 off the old-age pensioners' payments paid in 1947 into

this government in that fall, and stuck it in their own pockets. They stole that money from the old-age pensioners. There was some \$676,000, the Minister of Public Welfare in this province himself sat down, and he said, “You’re wrong in your figures” and he figured out that the amount was only \$640,000. I can read you from McLean’s magazine and their comments on this thing. I could stay here all afternoon and prove to you that that is a fact. The fact of the matter is this, that the dominion government increased the old age pension and their share of the old age pension — I’m going to read you this; the whole thing is right here: It won’t take very long. Some of those fellows over there stood up and read for three hours, and some of them one hour, and that’s all they did: ‘Supplementary Pension Paid by the CCF Since May, 1945’:

“Douglas promised that if the government decided to pay it, it would be \$5.00 per month.”

That is what he promised in 1944 at the special fall session.

“We have decided to increase the old-age pension, and if we do it would be to \$5.00.”

Well, they squeezed it down to \$3.00, but even that was appreciated.

“In April 1st, 1947 the supplementary pension of \$3.00 per month was increased to \$5.00 per month. During the 1947 session of the federal parliament the Liberal government increased the basic pension from \$25 to \$30 per month. During the period April 1st, 1947 to August 31, 1947, the CCF government paid one-quarter share of the basic \$25 pension. That is \$25 per month. A total of \$11.25 subject to the means test; that is including the increase of \$5.00.

“On September 1st, 1947 the federal government proclaimed an increase of \$25 to \$30, but in doing so they made the payment retroactive to May 1st, 1947.”

Or they gave the provincial government money enough to pay for the old-age pension in Saskatchewan that could qualify for \$3.75 per month, back to May 1, 1947 — for four months for \$15 per month. That is the increase of the old-age pension — \$3.75 increase; the \$15 difference was the dominion’s share because the increase in pension of \$30 a month was raised so their contribution was \$15 a month.

What did the CCF government do? Did they pay it to the old-age pensioners? Not by any means. The CCF humanitarian — the first, Christianity-applied government — they took the money to recoup themselves, to pay themselves for supplementary pensions paid; pensions they had paid since 1947. That was not all, Mr. Speaker, in this legislature that increase in pensions from April 1947 was nothing but just a straight increase in the old-age supplementary pension.

The amount of money kept from the pensioner, according to Mr. Valleau's own statement, was \$614,700. What does this all mean? It means this, that from April 1, 1947 to March 1, 1948, the CCF government paid a supplementary pension of \$5 per month, for one month only. That comes in there, Mr. Speaker, because they had to pay the \$5 per month for one month only, and the dominion made that payment retroactive. That increase was made in April, 1947 by this government and was a straight increase on the part of this government, and the increase that the dominion government paid which they paid back before that, belonged to the people that were drawing the pensions — the pensioners of the province of Saskatchewan, and this government stuck it in their pocket and thought they were smart.

I happened to see the Saskatchewan Gazette, and I have it here. I started digging into this think and there was an Order-in-Council issued, and I took it into this House. I moved an amendment in the Speech from the Throne at that time, and I had the whole House up on their toes here. Mr. Valleau came over to me on this side of the House, and he was ripping made. He said, "You did an awful thing. I was ready to go to Ottawa over that" I said, "You can go; I'll wait for you to come back". No, he wasn't going. Well, I have the McLean's magazine here. I could read you that, what they say about it, and I am sure my leader, Mr. Thatcher here — he was in Ottawa at the time, and the McLean's magazine says that the CCF members of the House were wrought up over the publicity. They were trying to criticize and belittle the federal government for what they did, and in the meantime this government was copping off the money that they should be paying to the old-age pensioners. Let's confess — they will never come back.

There was another man — Jake Benson in this House here, and he may never come back. The CCF have a number of victims of their disciplinary methods all over this province; there are four or five of them — they'll never come back. But, that's what they did. They are the last group on the face of the earth that should never criticize any other government — I don't give a darn whether it's in

October 19, 1961

Canada or any place else. There's no government on the face of the earth that I know of that pulls off a stunt like that. It's despicable and no one can describe it otherwise than inhuman and despicable as the action was.

The poor old-age pensioners of the province of Saskatchewan lost that \$416,614.00 that rightly belonged to them.

I have a few odds and ends that I might say a few things about. I was very much interested — (but all the members I am interested in go out of the House) — I wanted to talk to the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum). She was telling us the other day, and I must say I sympathize with her, Mr. Speaker, — I know how hard she is working; how they have been trying to impress on the ruling nation; particularly Canada and the United States, that they should desist and try to quit manufacturing and exploding bombs — atomic bombs. I think they are right. She was kind of downhearted, I understood, because they hadn't met with success that I think, and that she thought they should meet with. I suppose they just said, "Well, it's not all in our hands. We can't tell you what the other fellow is going to do." So I was just going to suggest to her, Mr. Speaker, that she talk to some of her friends, Mr. Khrushchev — turn her attention to Mr. Khrushchev. She has been to Ottawa and talked with Mr. Diefenbaker, and I'm sure Mr. Diefenbaker is a peaceful man, and so is Canada — and they would do anything in the world to be able to do what she wants him to do — she has been to the United States — but she should go and see Mr. Khrushchev; seeing that they are such good friends with him, why don't they go direct to him. That is just a suggestion I want to make, and you might pass it on to your Premier.

Mr. Thatcher: — They're too timid to do that!

Mr. Danielson: — That's true, too, but they've got a leader here and I was going to suggest to him that after all, if they are frightened of Khrushchev, they might take some of the courage from the Premier. He says that Canada is a nation who should be able to tell Mr. Kennedy to take the troops out of Cuba and he should tell Mr. Khrushchev to keep his tanks off the streets of Budapest. You know, that's courage itself, and carry that out with a good effect, probably.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard during this session and in every session — I don't think there has been a session

here for the last 17 years without the Premier telling the House how in 1919 the health proposal was brought in by the federal government under MacKenzie King. That's a long time ago. It has been delayed. It's partly in operation now. It was up when the Liberal government passed an Act assuming half the hospitalization costs. It might not be half according to some people's figures, but it is at least a long ways towards that. But when these people got that from the dominion government, what did you do? You threw the Cancer Commission into that; you threw the geriatric centre in there and you threw in everything else except the sanatorium, so you had a bigger figure. But it is really 50 per cent so far as the actual hospitalization is concerned.

Premier Douglas: — We never got a nickel from the Liberal government.

Mr. Danielson: — Not including the tremendous overhead — that's where you can save a lot of money.

Premier Douglas: — It wasn't until the Tories came in that we got anything.

Mr. Danielson: — I don't attempt to be very well informed, but I think so far as hospitalization, I am better informed than the Premier is. I have been in hospital work for the last 40 years, and am still in it. But this has been held up. It is a slight, and a degrading item so far as the Liberal party is concerned. Mr. Fines didn't look at it just that way. He confessed just about two years ago now that he said he understood, (I have the clipping here) that the action of the government in assuming part of the hospitalization cost — but he said this: He understood that it could not probably have been done any quicker because they must carry it — the provincial government, the nation as a whole, before they could branch out and distribute that money. That is the reason for this. So you see, all the ballyhoo and all the propaganda about the Liberal government was just so much hot air, so far as Mr. Fines was concerned — just so much hot air. So much slander on somebody else. But the Premier went up to Hanley in 1952, and he told the audience there that if the federal government would not come through with medical services in the next year or two, he was prepared to march in and assume the responsibility for putting it into operation. He went across Saskatchewan and made just exactly that same statement in 1952, Mr. Speaker, and this is 1961 — that's ten years ago, now. It's ten years ago and it is only now that he is trying it, so he's not very quick on the draw, either.

October 19, 1961

Mr. MacKenzie King didn't say it would be in the next year or two — he knows that he would have to carry the provinces. He said it was going to be between that election and the next and that was in 1952, and that is all he promised. So that is all his promises are worth. It wouldn't be today, Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't to give him a send-off with a crown on his small head, to go out and preach all over Canada "Look at what I did in the province of Saskatchewan". And you're not through yet.

A federal exemption-member for Dauphin, Manitoba in the federal government helped with an election last year. He went out and started spreading all over the newspapers in western Canada, saying that the medical men of this province are opposed to this thing because for the first time they will be compelled to make an honest income tax return, and then you wonder what is wrong with the medical profession; that they don't smile . . .

Any man or any party who would be responsible for that sort of thing, they are pretty darn low, Mr. Speaker. They are lower than I want to associate with, that's a cinch, but that's what he said. You'll go a long time before you'll live that down.

We hear over and over again, and the member for Bengough was talking about socialism, and he talked about Sweden. Well, I'm not going to talk about Sweden — they're getting along over there; they're blundering along like any other nation. They make mistakes, but all you hear from these politicians isn't so. Some of those fellows go over there and tell you what they are doing here, and they magnify it. Sweden is a country with about 8 million people; she has natural resources. They have an immense amount of iron ore, and all that sort of thing. Here's where the CCF defrauds the people'; they fool the people. They say that socialism is social services. Well, anyone that knows anything in the world knows that there isn't a country in the world that doesn't have social services — at least nowhere on the western hemisphere, and practically every place now. In the last few years they have been expanding by leaps and bounds. Some of the countries that are the highest capitalistic ones have more social services than you have ever had. Go back and read the Regina Manifesto. Nationalization of industries; nationalization of finances, banks, etc., and manufacturers controlled by the government and manufacture all they want — this is socialism.

What are you going to do about nationalizing land? It was Mr. Coldwell, I think — or maybe it was the wise man —

maybe it was this little boy over here, or was it Mr. Coldwell — running down there as a Social Credit? I think he was. He said this, that the present owner will retain title to the land, but anyone who sells out or moves out, the government will take it over. That was socialism. Then you talk about the power commission. Well, good Lord, the power commission was there before you came. That wasn't a socialist act that was a public utility and so was the telephones. But you go and peddle that because you have a hospitalisation scheme. Why, there was hospitalisation in this province before you ever saw it. So what is pure bunk, that is pure dishonesty for anyone to try and go out and convince the people because they have provided themselves with social services, that that is socialism. That's what they do when they talk about Sweden over here.

They had that a number of years ago, but we had a hospital and doctor care plan. In the rural districts, they paid to operate the hospitals. We had two doctors in the place where I came from and they assessed the people before the service was rendered. Every post-office had what we called a savings branch; that was a savings institution operated by the government and the postmaster operated it. He has a very important position in the present administration in any country. But the services for the people have been extended and enlarged, but no socialist — they have as much free enterprise in Sweden as they have in the United States. If the government had gone into anything so have they done in the United States. So don't swallow all this stuff you hear — no matter whether it comes from the member from Bengough (Mr. Dahlman), or anybody else, because they are just trying to fool you, that's all.

I was very much interested in the 'swan-song' of the Premier when he was speaking here the other day and he said this would be the last time. All very sad, indeed. I was a little muddled on this thing myself, because there are hundreds of people around the country who thought he left a long time ago. That's the truth. I can say I have met people in my own hometown who would stop and say hello, and talk a little, and then they would ask, "Did you listen to the radio last night?" Or, "Did you see the newspaper?" There were different headlines, and one thing and another. Well, he's gone now, isn't he? That is invariably what they ask. I say no. Then I came home one day and picked up the newspaper, and here was the heading which said "Douglas Visits Regina". You can't blame me for believing that I have been fooled — there was the newspaper. One day he is at Port Arthur and the next day he's gone to the labour

October 19, 1961

unions down there; then he's out in B.C., and back on the west side of the province. Sometimes he goes some other place — Fort William and so on. Then sometimes he comes into Regina and that is what the press said, "Douglas Visits Regina", and I think that is quite fair — that is what I thought. I found he is here, and I think he will be here for sometime. I don't think you can bank on whether you're going to get away at all or not, in the next election — and it could be that you will be left at home. You see, nothing is impossible in this world. Nobody could have told that the Tory party had slipped out in 1934. Nobody could tell that the Liberal party and the CCF and all the Social Credit would be cleaned out in 1958. You tried for years now to expand your empire in this country — for 18 years and you haven't been able to do it and you've been going downhill and you lost out in every other place. So don't be too sure . . .

You see, when you look back, you know history repeats itself. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago we had a gentleman by the name of Henry Wallace in the United States. He was an outlaw, but he was preaching the New Jerusalem just like you are. A good living — an abundant living; it was the New Jerusalem on the face of the earth. He ran first in the United States, and he was going to combine labour and farmers. He did, too, but they snowed him under and you never hear of him any more, Mr. Speaker. There wasn't a chance in the world of him every coming back. I think such fate can befall you. I am sure it will. So you see, human minds work in a peculiar way. The fact that you have strived and strived for years to try and expand some of your activities, and to win the conquer more and more, and eventually do like Khrushchev over there — control all . . . It doesn't mean anything, except that it proves one thing, that you have not been able to do so.

For that reason there is the possibility that your rosy outlook at the present time may not turn out to be as rosy as you think it is. I can't help but say a few words about the chastisement that was given the Leader of the Opposition, when he drew attention to this House that he had once been a CCF'er. When a man has brains enough, ability enough and courage enough to see he is in wrong, to right his way and do what he thinks is right, that should be something to his credit. I wonder how many thousands of Tories have voted for you in 1944 that have never voted anything else before? They were the fellows that elected you. They were the ones that elected you. They did that because they wanted to get even with the Liberals. If they

had gone back and nominated their own candidates and built up their party, they would have been a party to be reckoned with the first in Canada today, but after all, if this is a disgrace at all (which it isn't) — and we are proud of our leader for that reason, for that courage.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — What about the holy man that sits down there? He ran as a Tory with the consent of the Tories, and the Communists were pushing on the back of that. So then he had the CCF on one side and the Social Credit on the other — he had the four parties. He ran for four parties at one time. He is the greatest political acrobat on the face of the earth! So we don't need to apologize for our leader. But I know you don't like him, but that is proof that he's a good man. It's not that he isn't good. You'd never chastise anybody that you thought was no good. You could try to eliminate anyone that stands up and talks back.

Now then, this new party — they are just as old as the hills. There's no new party — nothing new about it. I, Mr. Speaker, am a farmer. These fellows are going to unite the farmer and the labourer. Well, it has been tried and tried over and over again, and it has never worked. You know, the labourer is so much brainier — they're too intelligent. Look at the House of Commons today. Who sits and represents the most industrialized part in eastern Canada? Who are the representatives of parliament today? The Liberals, not the CCF. Every one of them.

There was another thing — I look at these things in many ways from the standpoint of the farmer. The New Democratic set-up has been dealt with, but I have a clipping here which says: (October 10/61)

“Niagara Falls, Ont. — The New Democratic Party of Ontario, dominated numerically by labour unionists, and the CCF members Monday overwhelmingly endorsed a farm policy that calls for removal of restrictive measures in provincial marketing legislation and provides for long-term credit on favourable terms . . .”

What is this restriction of labour-farm legislation that they are calling for removal of? That is legislation that the farmers of Ontario have fought for years and years to get on the statute books, and some of it couldn't replace it

October 19, 1961

without the consent and agreement of the federal government — this is the legislation. It says too:

“Len Laventure of Glasgow Station said collective bargaining for labour and farm marketing for farmers are the same thing.”

Well, I think it is darn hard to convince a farmer of that.

“You labour people have collective bargaining, but how would you like it if you had to go to a government appointed board before you could do anything, he said.”

Is that a clear indication that the CCF or the Labour Union — you can call them what you like — I don't think labour is — that's the CCF — their idea is to eliminate the commission-operative legislation and the marketing legislation on the statute books in the province of Ontario, and they wouldn't be any different in the province of Saskatchewan.

The farmers of this province have carried no part in this government. The farmers have been a convenience to this government; nothing else. This government is dominated by, and controlled by the labour unions and the small left wing of the commission-operative movement in this province. Listen to the speech by the member from Bengough (Mr. Dahlman) last year, when he told the truth, and he was put on the carpet for it, too. For telling the truth. I'm going to repeat that he told the truth. The farmers of this province have never had anything, and they don't own you a darn thing except forgiveness for your sins. And they are many — they are many. They have been the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for this government for 17 years. You haven't done a thing for the farmer, except heap more and more taxes on them, and you're not through yet — you're just commencing.

But it is a long, long road that has no turning, and you're coming towards that pretty soon. I am interested in the fact that this government or this party was elected as a CCF government, and now they are going to at the next convention, switch over just like a change of their colours, and they are going to be what they call a new democracy. Well, it is a peculiar name for an old socialist party. They don't fool the people, and you won't fool them any more.

I predict, from what little connection I have had with labour in the province of Saskatchewan, and this

is not too much — but there has been three or four real good sane men — that you are going to get a shock when you think you will get all of labour. They're not going to vote for you because they are responsible men. They are well informed. They have watched this government and have seen what has taken place in this province. All they want is work and peace and contentment, so they can raise their families and earn a living and be good citizens. That's all they want. Strife of any kind is foreign to their make-up.

I'm just going to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, in regard to a matter that affects our hospitals. I'm not going to quarrel with the minister — not a bit. He knows my feeling on that — I had a chat with him one time in his office, and that is, that you saw fit, about a year ago to interfere with the debentures issued in the province of Saskatchewan that had been issued before the building of hospitals and the carrying on of hospital services. When the hospital districts were organized, the first thing you do is get an architect. He draws up the plans, under the direction of the department, because the site of the hospital is determined, and the district it is supposed to serve — if it is going to have 15 beds or 20 beds, or what. He draws this up and gives you an estimate of the cost. Grants have been given by both federal and provincial governments towards these buildings, and at the present time I think they stand at about \$2,000. They we are called on first of all to go to our council and discuss this. Under your regulations we got to prepare a by-law, but first of all before that we have to go to the local government board. I see the Provincial Treasurer is smiling. He should know all about this thing, but I'm going to get to the point I am talking about. It is not only me — the Hospital Association of Saskatchewan — every hospital board chairman that I have met (and I have met at least a dozen of them) is bitterly opposed to this thing. I say we have to go to the local government board and submit the plan to him; he will then reject it or cut it down, or increase it. The thing that guided him so far is that the debenture issue should not exceed two mills on the dollar for each year to pay your interest and the capital payments on the debentures, which will be liquidated in 20 years. That is the basis on which this has been figured. There's nothing wrong with that at all.

Then we go up and prepare a by-law and we get a vote on that by-law and then we are ready to go, if that is carried. Then we sell this debenture, and when we do that it

October 19, 1961

results in the municipality, whether rural, town or village, bringing in a hospital bill. Generally there are three or four rural municipalities and a number of villages and towns. We enter into a legal contract for the sale of our debentures. Our tax ability is the guarantee for payment of this bond. That's correct and nobody in this House can deny that statement; it's a fact. It is the duty of local governments to collect and pay into the trust fund of the hospital board to collect and pay into the trust fund of the hospital board at the bank every year, and the bank pays the debentures.

Now the government comes along and you say — that is, the government members and the Premier say, "We will take over the principal payments on your debenture indebtedness; if that applies to one it will apply to the whole province." I will say this (and I have talked this over with two or three lawyers); they maintain and I maintain that this action on the part of the government is illegal. You are ruining the contract and obligations that exist between the debenture holders and the local government board. That's what you're doing. You have butted your nose in there. I'm going to give you figures — I don't know whether they are exactly correct or not but I got them from these people who are engaged in hospitalisation, and I think they should know. This was done for one purpose, and that was to settle more liability on the local ratepayers. It is estimated you gained \$1 million a year and some say it is \$1.5 million. Look here — the first ten years of any hospital debenture, the principal payment is the small part and the interest is the big part. Then they equalize it, and it's the other way. You take all the hospital debentures that this is by far the largest part of hospital debentures in the province of Saskatchewan. But in our case, because I was finance chairman of our hospital and nurses' home, and I know that you have gained from us by a substantial sum every year. Now, then, what was the reason for it? We have never been able to get this government to state to the people why this contract was upset by the government effecting the hospitals of the municipalities, towns and villages and their relation with the bond debenture — the debenture holders were going to be thrown out. Which is as today.

I would like the minister, Mr. Speaker, to tell us what the reason was. We should be entitled to know that. We are the men that are responsible. On the 11th day April last spring when we had an obligation to pay, we were in a position where we had the money to pay it; we were fortunate, but we didn't get your payment until just a

few days ago. What was the reason for doing this? It upsets the whole thing. Here's another thing — financing is a peculiar thing; one thing affects the other. By doing this you have on the whole shoved at least \$1 million expense on to the rural municipalities, towns, villages and cities. You have done that. But you have advertised (and it is advertising) — the ratepayers in the municipalities now confess that the government is now paying the debentures. Well, that is only half true. Here is the exact position. When you did this thing you reduced our income from the hospital services plan by many thousands of dollars. You said: "We're not going to allow you any depreciation on your buildings." So you took about \$6,000 away from us and then you go around saying, "Look what the government is paying". You haven't paid anything — not a cent. You left it all to the municipalities and they don't know why you did this thing. Let us hear from you now, because they say now that you have probably \$6,000 more a year than you need to. All you need to do is pay the interest, and that's a little more than half the debt.

But here's what happened. Just about a year ago, last January or February, first of all in some mysterious way there came to the hospital board a salary list — all we know it had been approved by the department. Then he goes to the association, then comes down to us with a very nice salary increase. I'm not opposed to good wages, but immediately that had been settled; immediately we have committed ourselves for the 12 months of 1960-61, then the minister comes down and says, "Step on it boys, we're going to cut you down and we're going to hole you down — no increases any more." And here we are. The fact is this, that we are now sitting here with no depreciation payments on buildings and equipment; we pay more money now than we did before when we paid our own debentures, and we got depreciation.

What is this hospital board going to use to pay all the expenses that you don't pay, and you're contracting them every year. For instance, you have a bunch of mathematicians up there in that building — no doubt you need them sometimes, but they sit there and they come out and say — "You're overstaffed for \$4,000; you had so many patients, etc.; you are three-quarters overstaffed with nurses." That's right. You know that's right, don't you? But that is absolutely ridiculous. How in the world would you expect a small hospital board or a matron of the hospital to overcome this — that might work possibly to some extent in a city hospital — where you have a number of nurses, and probably

October 19, 1961

some extras that you can turn them out any time you like, and then call them back anytime you like. but it won't work in a rural hospital. Consequently there is \$4,000 that is taken added to our deficit.

There is something else. I could run up a list here, but I am not going to do it. But there have been accusations — we're not in any worse shape than anybody else; as a matter of fact we're not in bad shape because we had the foresight and prepared for the future, but I can see this thing. I attended a meeting in your museum last June, I think it was, of the hospital association and that thing was up for discussion, and it was a very clear statement that was made by some of the members that were present, who know more about hospitalization than I do. But I want to point out that at least we should have been told why this action was taken. I don't think that it is an unreasonable thing to expect.

I want to say a few words on this tax agreement. This tax agreement is not very good — I was very much interested in the Minister of Education who devoted some time yesterday morning to this matter. He is supposed to be a brilliant man; highly educated, but I didn't get the impression that he knows very much of what he is talking about. Nevertheless, the Premier's definition, if I happened to get it right, is that the controlling factor — the deciding thing for any adjustment or division of taxes is centred on the general revenue of the dominion of Canada and should be based on fiscal need. I think that the Rowell-Sirois report stated that while the government at that time didn't see fit to carry that out, and I think they did the right thing. I don't see how in the world that with ten provinces in the dominion, that you can have indefinitely something hanging in the air — something that can go up or down, and it lends itself to bargaining, to bull-dozing and bargaining and haranguing, and even hard feelings. They, rightly, therefore said that the base for the division of this national revenue over Canada as a whole shall be that, based on the population of the two richest provinces of the dominion of Canada, and that is Ontario and British Columbia. That has worked out very well.

When this thing was discussed in the House of Commons, Mr. Fleming advocated — that the division be based on fiscal need — the same as the Premier of this province — “The principle of equalization is that out of federal revenues, provision should be made with a view to helping those provinces that have fiscal need.” That's what Mr.

Fleming said. I was surprised to hear Premier Douglas — the champion of provincial rights, agree with Mr. Fleming — the fiscal shysters in the province and in the dominion of Canada.

Mr. Diefenbaker took another look. Here is what he said: (Not in this debate, but in a previous debate he said this):

“The definition of equalization has been as the Prime Minister put it, to bring the revenues from the three taxes in all the provinces up to the level of those of the highest two.”

There you have a definite base to go by and to stand by. There’s no squabbling, no arguments or anything else. You have the base right there and it has worked very, very satisfactorily. I hope that Mr. Diefenbaker will go back to what he said previously and put that base into operation once again. I think that’s just about all there is to it, except the quibbling, the haranguing and the back-biting, and I should say fiscal blackmailing, by this government of the government of the dominion of Canada, regardless of who that government was — whether it was Conservative or Liberal. It doesn’t make any difference, Mr. Speaker, what they get; how much the increase; or what they did. In the fiscal conference preceding the last one, Premier Douglas was on there; he was a great agitator and has a pretty slick tongue. He agitated and agitated, and when he got through and got the thing organized, he demanded an increase from the federal government of \$2 billions, and he was the instigator of that request.

You can shake your head all you like — that doesn’t change my idea of it.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Fleming’s statement.

Mr. Danielson: — He was the chief agitator at that time. I don’t blame Mr. Diefenbaker one bit if he said to you. He said, “All right, we’ll fix this thing up so the people who pay the taxes will see who spends the money.” That’s all the changes that are in the bill. I don’t blame them. I think that should have been done from the very beginning. Both the Liberal and the Conservative governments should have done this — it should be set out on your income tax to show exactly how much money goes to the dominion government and what they are handing back to the provinces, and then there would be no quibbling about it.

October 19, 1961

I think when you commence to agitate for having these taxes, which are probably in the bill now, that fiscal need should be the basic consideration in determining the amount to each province; it's the wrong thing; it lends itself to hard feelings and arguments of various kinds. Today as I see it, what Mr. Diefenbaker said, and he was then really speaking what St. Laurent said, that "The definition of equalization has been as the Prime Minister put it, to bring revenues from the three taxes in all the provinces up to the level of those of the highest two." There you have a base that you can solve, and there is no need for anybody to think that he can swindle out of it, and get any more than he is entitled to.

We have this bill before us, setting up this medical scheme. I don't think there is much to say about that bill because there's nothing in it except to give power to the government to do almost anything they like. I don't blame the medical association when they said they don't want anything to do with it. I believe that you will find that this thing will have to come in from an entirely different angle. I believe what they state now is the administration of public health in this province — it should be set out more clearly, because when you get practically unanimous opposition by the medical profession that they will not accept this bill of bargaining, or as a chart for their operation in this province of Saskatchewan, I think it should be looked at very carefully. It is necessary. I think you should have the municipalities, your organizations come in. I agree that you should divide up the province into certain health centres, and a lot more . . . to each one. You have a private plan up in Swift Current. The Premier has spoken of that many times in this House, and no doubt, with a few changes which experience has taught them were necessary, that plan has worked satisfactorily. Why shouldn't it work satisfactorily? Why shouldn't that system be spread all over the province of Saskatchewan, and leave as much as possible of the economy of operating these services in the hands of the local administration?

You have as good men out in the country as you have in the city of Regina. You didn't think so when you appointed this continuing committee, but I can tell you that this province has been well, well represented in the last 30 or 40 years with the splendid character and ability of the men who have conducted the municipal affairs . . .

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — He has been disregarded by this government . They have been neglected by this government; they have been pushed aside for political appointments — and they haven't forgotten that. The time has come when, because we paid the shot we should have something to say about who is going to call the tune.

Mr. Speaker, from what you heard me say I don't think I need to tell you I shall vote for the amendment, but I shall not vote for the motion.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with others who have congratulated the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply. I want, too, to associate myself with those who, on behalf of their constituents, have said words of appreciation to the Minister of Agriculture and his department for the action which they have taken and are taking in the face of the very difficult and severe conditions facing the agricultural industry. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many people in the province who are exceedingly happy that when a crisis of this kind does occur, the government does not need to and does not wait for a meeting of the legislature to deal with it, but proceeds to deal with it on the basis of policies already established.

The member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) who just took his seat has reminded us in the course of his speech that history repeats itself. He demonstrated it in a number of ways in a number of the things he said, and which he has said before in this legislature. I think that the opposition as a whole, those who have spoken, have given quite a bit of evidence during this last week and one day, of just how history does repeat itself. One is inclined to remember that Liberals may come and Liberals may go, but the party line seems to go on forever. I would just like to give some examples of this evidence of repetition of history which has been put before us during this last week.

It began with the address of the Leader of the Opposition, when he spoke immediately following the mover and seconder. After he had spoken, I looked up a press statement which is noted as 1946, and which has to do with a radio address made by the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Tucker. Mr. Tucker, like the Leader of the Opposition here the other day, quoted from 1944 statements, 1943 statements, 1942 statement, 1941 statements and he went on

October 19, 1961

to attempt to illustrate how these statements had not been carried out.

That was in 1946. We have heard practically the same address in every session of this legislature, and we know it has been repeated untold times throughout the country. It seems to me that the Liberal party ought to take stock of the effect of playing this tune so continually; that they ought to measure it in the one kind of measurement to which it seems to me they are relatively sensitive, and that is in terms of votes. Before they started making this speech in 1944, they got in that election 35 per cent of the total provincial vote. After making it for 16 years in a row, there was an election in which they got 33 per cent of the total vote. It seems to me they ought to take note of the effect of repeating the same speech so many times in this, very effectively it seems, means of measuring its effect.

Then the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) contributed his proof of how history repeats itself, too. You may remember, Mr. Speaker, that in discussing the report of the advisory committee and the proposals for medical care, he used the phrase that this was the 'greatest joke ever perpetrated on the Saskatchewan people'. Now, Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been in the House for a number of years will remember another Liberal member, the former member from Moosomin who used almost the same kind of language in talking about the automobile accident insurance, when it was first introduced. He labelled it as 'the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan'. We have a relatively similar kind of statement and a relatively similar kind of attitude being shown here, but we know the Liberal party has changed its tune considerably about automobile insurance since that time, but that was their initial reaction to it.

The reaction to medical care as well smacks of the reaction to the Saskatchewan hospitalization plan when it was first introduced into this legislature. They have tried to persuade us that the time for this plan is not now; the time is never now so far as the Liberal opposition is concerned; that it would be much better if it were done in little bits and pieces on a local basis; that it is going to cost too much. Well, this same sort of a statement was made by Liberals at the time the hospitalization plan was introduced into this legislature. One of them made the statement that this was just another scheme for extracting money from the people of the province — that we were going to make a lot of money out of it. Mr. Tucker, speaking in

1946 said that there were no adequate assurances that the promised services could be provided; they claimed there was no prospects of providing them between now and the end of 1946. He went on to state that much more money was going to be needed. At a meeting of the Liberal women here in Regina reported on October 26, 1946, there were five of them who dealt with various health agencies, and the conclusion of each speaker was against the government plan.

So again we have the same kind of attitude with regard to the medical care plan that was taken to the Saskatchewan Hospital Services plan when it was introduced. Now of course they are all for it.

Then we had too the statements repeated again by the member for Melville, with regard to the population trends in Saskatchewan over a period of years. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that he said in 1929 we had more people in Saskatchewan than there are at the present time. Then he went on to say that no province had a record to equal this as this one of people leaving.

Mr. Speaker, I can go to a statement from Hansard in order to get a comment on this — a statement made February 23, 1951, page 624 which says:

“In 1939 Saskatchewan had 906,000 people. By 1945 our population dropped to 845,000 people.”

Mr. Danielson: — How many were in the services?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: —

“A net loss of 61,000. It’s only within the last few years that these people have come back and we have recovered our population.”

I am quoting, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, when he was a member of the House of Commons from Saskatchewan. Let me deal a bit further with this statement. You recall the member for Melville said first of all in 1929 we had more people in Saskatchewan than at the present time. Mr. Speaker, the statement is incorrect to begin with. In 1929, June 1, we had 803,000 people in the province of Saskatchewan. On March 1, 1961 we had 914,000 and that is not less than 803,000. Let’s look just a little bit at the trend. From 1929 to 1934 we had 914,000 and that is not less than 803,000. Let’s look just a little bit at the trend. From 1929 to 1934 the population of the province increased by 45,000 — it wasn’t a Liberal government. In 1934 to 1944 the population went down 92,000 people. There was a Liberal government in the province at that time. From

1944-61 it went up 78,000 people. Again this is a statement that has been repeated too often. I think, Mr. Speaker, that everybody will realize that in describing a loss of population of 92,000 for the years 1934-44 it would be quite unfair to say this was all due to the government of the day. It was due to certain developments and trends in our agricultural industry, in particular — the same kind of trends and development which have influenced population since that particular time.

Then we have the usual kind of statements with regard to crown corporations. Again I want to draw on some information from Hansard of a number of years ago to indicate that maybe these crown corporations' records aren't so bad as we are sometimes lead to believe. It is a statement of inter-change that took place when Dr. McCusker was the M.P. for the city of Regina, and was speaking on May 2, 1952. Some of the comments are interesting. Dr. McCusker referred to the fact that "transportation is a monopoly and should be made a profitable one, yet he says they have made no money."

“Mr. Thatcher: — Certainly they have made money.”

“Mr. McCusker: — Then there is the box factory in Prince Albert: It's a failure.”

“Mr. Thatcher: — It was not a failure.”

“Mr. McCusker: — The Fish Marketing Board has practically ruined the fishing industry in northern Saskatchewan.”

“Mr. Thatcher: — It is doing very well.”

“Mr. McCusker: — . . . as to the sodium sulphate plant, they sank a million dollars into that.”

“Mr. Thatcher: — Look at the production of that plant.”

“Mr. McCusker: — Then they bought the woollen mill.”

“Mr. Thatcher: — It employed 125 people.”

“Mr. McCusker: — Then comes the insurance company and they lost heavily in that venture.”

“Mr. Thatcher: — The lowest insurance rates in Canada.”

“Mr. McCusker: — Yes, but the company is practically broke as a result.”

“Mr. Thatcher: — It is not.”

“Mr. McCusker: — There are two public utilities listed here — power and telephones which were established in the old days by a Liberal government.”

“Mr. Thatcher: — They were always losing money in those days.”

“Mr. McCusker: — Private enterprise was driven from the province. It would be rather nice to have them stay in Saskatchewan.”

“Mr. Thatcher: — How much oil was discovered under the Liberals in the province of Saskatchewan?”

The major record of the crown corporation has been touched on by the Minister of Mineral Resources, and others. I am not going to deal further with that at this time.

Then we have, too, that repetition — a sort of a little pause when we say, “Now let’s all praise famous Liberals and famous Liberal governments.” There was reference made in the speeches and asides that were tossed across the House, (if that is what one does with asides) about Quebec and about New Brunswick where there are Liberal governments, and supposedly where things are much better. The quotations which I make here, Mr. Speaker, are quotations taken from the reports of the proceedings of the dominion-provincial conference, July, 1960. I quote them not to be derogatory, but simply to point out that perhaps things aren’t quite as rosy in these provinces where they have Liberal governments, as some members opposite would like to have us believe. For example, here is Mr. Lesage, of Quebec, speaking about unemployment. He said:

“The situation is particularly alarming in the province of Quebec, where we have about 40 per cent of the unemployed of the whole country.”

Quebec has about 30 per cent of the total population of the whole country but about 40 per cent of the unemployed in the whole country.

October 19, 1961

Then we have Mr. Smallwood speaking of the extremely difficult situation in Newfoundland, and all of us can appreciate some real reasons for this, pointing out that it was the highest taxed province. I think he could perhaps see that New Brunswick may have been higher, but something to that effect.

We have Mr. Robichaud, Premier of New Brunswick, speaking of taxation in New Brunswick and saying: "Is there another province which levies a personal property tax on automobiles ranging from \$65 to \$200 each year? Is there a province other than New Brunswick that levies a municipal poll tax, ranging from \$10 to \$45?"

I would conclude from these remarks that perhaps everything isn't quite as rosy in these provinces where they have Liberal governments, as the opposition might like us to believe.

Then we have, too, the certain repetition of history in the theme that all the services, after all, were started by Liberals. This we have heard before. An attempt to illustrate this was by the member for Melville, (Mr. Gardiner), I think, who said the lady member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) talked a lot about health regions and about how this government had started the organization of health regions in the province. He said, "This isn't true. The first health region in the province was started in Gravelbourg in 1930 something and was discontinued in 1940 something." This was their record of establishing health regions in the province.

The Leader of the Opposition put in a little aside at this time, and he said: "They put on an act' (they referring to the previous Liberal governments). The fact is, of course, that they put on a great many acts about health and about other things. The fact is that the curtain came down on their acts in 1944, and there has been no request from the audience for a repetition, of those particular acts.

Secondly, I want to deal with some of the contradictions which are so apparent in what has been stated by various members of the opposition. We have, for example, the member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) asking for an easing of conditions under which people obtained social aid and other kinds of assistance, and we had the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) just a little while before that referring to social aid in the province, using such words as 'the biggest scandal in the province'; using such words as 'robbery' in connection with social aid.

We have also the urge from the other side of the House that there should be a program to give work, to provide more employment to alleviate some of the hardships. At the same time they persist in criticizing the carrying on of the various projects which do give work. An example is the building of the head office for the power corporation; they have criticized, Mr. Speaker, the fact that money has been borrowed for such projects as power and telephones, which have created employment and which are creating employment right now. One can think of the Squaw Rapids River Dam; one can think of construction of the South Saskatchewan River Dam. We are criticized for having borrowed money to finance developments of that kind, and at the same time they say we should be doing more to create employment opportunities.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, they cannot have it both ways. The lesson is a pretty elemental one, but it seems necessary to repeat it because of the stand which the opposition takes.

There are a number of projects under way which provide employment, and I have mentioned several of them. A large construction project here in the city of Regina; a large construction project on the Saskatchewan River in the northern part of the province; a large construction project, costs of which are shared by the federal government on the South Saskatchewan River; the announcement made by the Minister of Education yesterday, which will provide additional work opportunities in the three centres in the province.

I turn now to the call which has been made by the opposition with regard to the fall session, and the fact that there was nothing in the Throne Speech with regard to agriculture; the fact that the government is not putting any proposals before the legislature at this time with regard to agriculture. The reason as to why a session of the legislature was not called to deal with agriculture is the reason I stated at the beginning of my remarks. The government didn't wait — the government didn't need to wait; to call a special session in order to deal with the emergency problems facing the people of the province. Instead of waiting, it acted instead, and we had from the Minister of Agriculture this morning, a detailed record of the action that has been taken. We point this out that we did not, however, just begin to act when the emergency was upon us, that a great many of the things which have been done over a period of years, have been or have served to alleviate a situation which we would otherwise have had.

Let me just recount some of the developments in the province which, if they hadn't occurred, conditions would have been much more serious than they are. One of the kind of developments to which I refer is the diversification of industry in the province; and the diversification within the agricultural industry. Saskatchewan, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, went into the 1950's with approximately 25 per cent of our production non-agricultural in nature. We came out of the 1950's with over 50 per cent of our production non-agricultural in nature.

This has served to give us a better tax base; this has served to provide employment and generally stabilize our economy. Let me break this non-agricultural development down into several groups. First of all, let us look at the increase in the gross value of mineral production. The Minister of Mineral Affairs reminded us when he was speaking the other day, that Saskatchewan now occupies fourth place in the provinces of Canada insofar as mineral production is concerned. From 1959-59 in all of Canada the average annual increase in mineral production was one of then per cent. For the prairies during that period the average annual increase was 14 per cent. For Saskatchewan during the same period the average annual increase in the gross value of mineral production was 23 ½ per cent, an increase which exceeded the rate of increase on the prairies and in Canada as a whole.

So when you look at the rate of growth of the net value of non-agricultural production in Canada, the prairies and Saskatchewan — take the period from 1950-58, the average annual change for all of Canada was 1.9 per cent. For the prairies it was 12.4 per cent and for Saskatchewan it was 16.4 per cent. Let me take still a third indicator, and that being the consumption of power for the years 1950-59 — a particularly good indicator, I should think, as to what is happening within an area. The average annual increase in the consumption of power across all of Canada during those years was 7 ½ per cent. The average annual increase in the consumption of power on the prairies was 5.3 per cent; the average annual increase for consumption of power for the province of Saskatchewan was 14.8 per cent — nearly twice the increase in all of Canada.

Looking at it from another direction, in 1950, Saskatchewan consumption of power was 10 per cent of that in the three prairie provinces; in 1959 it had increased to 17 per cent of the consumption of the three prairie provinces.

Mr. Speaker, that is some indication of this diversification of the economy which has gone along; which has given us this better tax base; which has given us more employment; more revenue from resource development. If this had not happened, then the problems facing our farm people and all the province would have been much more severe than they are.

Secondly, may I just mention for the sake of the record again the diversification which has taken place in the agricultural industry. Here again the Minister of Agriculture has outlined this this morning, and a good deal of the credit for diversification in agriculture goes to the persistent and effective leadership on the part of the minister and his department.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Sometimes we have piles of scorn from across the floor heaped on the idea of having meetings with people, of persons such as agriculture. reps. and other specialists going out and meeting, and getting the people together and talking about things. This extension work is extremely necessary, and most people realize that it has had an emphasis which has assisted in the diversification of our agricultural economy. The emphasis which has been placed on the development of community pastures; assistance to northern dug-outs at a time when the P.F.R.A. was not doing work in northern Saskatchewan; leadership in helping municipalities organize veterinary districts; grants to help them to obtain the services of veterinarians in these districts; scholarships to students wishing to take the training of veterinarians; the work of the agriculture. reps., the livestock specialists and others in the department — all of this has assisted in this diversification of the agricultural industry. This too is something which has made our position better than it would otherwise have been.

Thirdly, let me refer to the development of a number of programs which effect farm people and which are being turned out by departments of government other than agriculture. Sometimes one gets the impression, listening to members of the opposition at least, that the only thing important for farmers is that which happens through the Department of Agriculture. Many things that are done through other departments are a part of an agricultural program. I am going to mention first of all the program of hospitalisation. I think there is no one in the House who will deny the fact that it is precisely in a year of this kind

October 19, 1961

that a program of provincial hospitalisation does mean a great deal to people. It means a great deal in any year, but it is in years of this kind that its value is certainly emphasized.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — We refer to the steady increase in assistance that has been given to the schools of the province; an increase which in the last decade has meant that grants have gone up from about \$6 million to about \$31.6 million in that ten-year period. If it had not been for the increases in grants, and the changes in organization — changes which haven't always received much support, to put it mildly, from the members across the way, Mr. Speaker, then there would have been many more educational problems facing the people on the farms and in the small urban centres than there presently are.

In regard to education too, I had the privilege and pleasure I may say, a couple of weeks ago, one day when the Minister of Education (Mr. Blakeney) happened to be absent from the city, of signing some of the forms which provide for payment of non-interest bearing loans to students at universities, or teachers' college, or the technical institute, or who are taking training as nurses. This kind of assistance, together with the scholarship plan has meant a great deal — particularly in a year like this, there would have been literally some thousand people, I would say, not able to continue with education had it not been for the existence of assistance of that kind.

Certainly it is important to remember, too, that it is many years ago since this government began to deliberately shift the burden of social welfare from the municipalities, and when the federal government finally came into the picture to take part of the cost for unemployment relief, more of that shifting was done.

If one goes back not ago when the municipalities carried 50 per cent of the cost — one can find in the middle 'fifties that this had been changed and the municipalities were paying only 25 per cent of the cost, and today the situation is that the municipalities pay only about 7 per cent of the cost; the remainder being paid by the provincial and federal governments.

May I say this, that since 1956-57 this changing in the distribution of costs of social aid have saved the

municipalities of the province about \$3 million. If it had not been for this conscious decision to relieve them of some of this burden, they would have paid out in those years, over \$3 million more than they did pay out in social welfare. In 1950-51, the municipalities paid \$420,000 out of a total bill of \$1,400,000; in 1959-60 they paid out \$310,000 out of a total bill of \$4 million. This change means much this year, as it has in the past, but more this year, because there will likely be much more paid out — a great deal of it to the municipalities.

I want to turn to one other program about which a great deal of mention has been made in this legislature, and that is water — the development and use of water as a resource. This government, Mr. Speaker, has recognized, the importance of water as a resource — both for rural and urban people, for farm living and for industry. Since 1959 in locating water and developing its use, in other words in the development of the resource generally, we have spent in excess of \$5 1/2 million since 1959, in conserving and helping to make good use of our water resource. The South Saskatchewan River development project, \$2 1/2 million, the Saskatchewan Research Council has spent something in excess of one-half a million dollars. The Family Farm Improvement Branch, Department of Agriculture has spent about \$800,000 — this is not only in using water; it has resulted in improvement in quality of water in many cases. It has resulted certainly in farm people being able to enjoy more of the amenities of life and it is having an effect on the production of the farm, particularly as far as milk and eggs are concerned.

The Municipal Water Assistance Board has spent almost \$1 million, and the current year's drought assistance program has amounted to about \$700,000. A total since 1959 of about \$5 1/2 million.

In addition to that, services by the Department of Agriculture, and goods supplied by them, have amounted to very sizeable amounts of money — probably in the neighbourhood of \$1 million. Services by way of their pumping assistance; services of the Family Farm Improvement Branch. So since 1959 we have some \$6 1/2 million which has been spent in the development and use of this important resource — water. This, Mr. Speaker, doesn't include any of the expenditure which is being met on the Saskatchewan River and the Squaw Rapids Dam, where the water is being impounded for the purposes of power, but which, when it is completed, will provide a large body of water in that part of the province.

October 19, 1961

We can look further at some of these ways in which we have been improving the dependability and quality of this particular resource in the province. There's the South Saskatchewan River, for example. This has already been mentioned in this House several times during this debate, and it does not need to be belaboured at this point. But I think it is worthwhile to remind ourselves that if this project had been begun when Liberals said it was going to be begun, it would have been in use at this time. If this had been done, then there would have been thousands of acres producing tens of thousands of tons of fodder available to meet the situation here in Saskatchewan.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Hon. members will recall a statement made by the then federal Minister of Agriculture in 1945 election, saying that “work on this project will begin as soon as men and materials are available.” It wasn't, as we know.

May I suggest this is a good example of the Liberal attitude of getting things done. You see, they couldn't do it because the time wasn't 'right' then to do it; they didn't do it because it hadn't been demonstrated to be a “prudent” expenditure at that time. They didn't suggest having a vote on it, but that was about the only one of the tactics they did not employ.

Now to say a bit more about the Saskatchewan Research Council program with regard to water. This is a program which was initiated in 1958 and about one-third of the budget of the Saskatchewan Research Council has gone on each year. It is concerned with underground water, with surface water and with atmospheric water. The Saskatchewan Research Council program, Mr. Speaker, may not cover from the cradle to the grave, but it does go from away down in the earth to away up in the sky.

The program has been broken up into a number of parts. First of all some valuable research was done in order to improve the techniques of locating water and of measuring and analysing water. It is a particularly valuable field of research. Still one of the big questions is, “How to find water?”

Secondly a geological survey has been undertaken with regard to the 100,000 some square miles in the southern part of Saskatchewan. This is now about half done. Two reports have been published; water probability maps have

been prepared covering some 30 rural municipalities and are being used. Some are being used by some of the urban communities and some being used by well drillers throughout the province. There have been drilling programs in some four or five areas of the province. There has been experimentation with regard to the pure possibility of purification of salt and brackish water, because a considerable amount of the underground supplies that we have are not good for human or animal consumption, because of their salt content. This is being researched into.

Finally, there have been experiments as well, to discover better methods of reducing the evaporation of supplies of surface water. Everybody is familiar with the fact that we lose a great deal of our water by surface evaporation and that if a method to reduce this can be found, it would be good.

I want to deal also in regard to water with some of the activities under the Ground Water Conservation Act passed a few years ago by the government, and administered by the Department of Agriculture. This is an act which provides for control of water with regard to drilled wells particularly, and which provides for the collection of certain data. The water rights branch of that department, as a result of data which it has obtained from the well drillers, the research council, from the Department of Mineral Resources who have it from the petroleum companies, produce something like 700 written reports on ground water. There has been a rather interesting and fortunate increase in the number of people looking for water. Maybe it would interest the legislature, Mr. Speaker, to note that from March, 1960 to September, 1961 there was an increase of some 65 well-drilling rigs in operation in the province. Since July, 1959, more than 3,000 wells have been drilled; over 2,000 of them producing water.

The staff of the Department of Agriculture, through a short course at the university and through field trips, sought to improve the techniques of those people who are drilling for water.

These are just some of the programs which have been advanced, and which are tending to remove some of the difficulty which would otherwise be prevalent in this position in Saskatchewan.

I should mention too, Mr. Speaker, the winter works program which municipalities are taking advantage of in greater numbers this year, and which costs are shared

between the province and the dominion and the municipalities. It is a good program so far as it goes; we are happy with it, but we wish there were more of it and that it were not quite so restricted in its application.

I am sure that one thing that must have particularly struck all members of the legislature as they listened to the opposition was the fact that they refrained from mentioning the real — the big problem facing Saskatchewan agriculture. It has been mentioned by several people on this side of the House — I need only mention it again. The big problem doesn't arise out of the fact that we have had a drought this year. The big problem arises out of the fact of income deficiency which has gone back over a period of years insofar as Saskatchewan is concerned.

It may or may not have been accidental that the opposition didn't mention this — I don't know, because I don't know how long it takes a leopard to change his spots, or I don't know whether a leopard can change his spots. I say that because I have here a statement from the Prince Albert Herald, September 18, 1956 — not very long ago. It is by one Mr. Patrick Nicholson, who was speaking about Mr. Thatcher urging the government of that day to abolish or deduce subsidies, especially those paid to wheat farmers, cattlemen, the dairy industry and — he also mentioned the C.B.C. and coal-mines, just to make it complete.

I don't know whether this feeling on the part of the Leader of the Opposition at that time that there was no case for any assistance to this particular industry carries over to his present position or not, and whether or not this accounts for the fact there has been so little explanation of this particular point there.

Mr. Thatcher: — I don't know what particular speech that Mr. Nicholson is referring to, but I could certainly say I have never made a speech on any suggestion that subsidies be taken off of wheat — I think he was talking about a butter subsidy. I certainly opposed it then, and I would oppose it today.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think that is a point of order . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — If the Leader of the Opposition wants to make two or three extra little speeches I don't think we should object too much probably, Mr. Speaker. He is credited with it on

September 18, 1956. They say that the records of his position in the House of Commons with regard to matters of this kind — butter subsidy is one that is particularly one . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — That is still the same.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Now then, with regard to the fact of income deficiency, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to suggest that it is necessary to take our word for the fact that the position of the farmer with regard to getting an adequate price has been deteriorating, or to take our word for it that this is something new. I refer briefly to the submission of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to the House of Commons Committee on Agriculture and Colonization on Farm Machinery prices. They point out among other things that from 1956-60 the indices for the purchase of the commodities and services used by the farmers went up by 26 per cent, and the price received by the farmer went down by 25 per cent. Up 26 per cent in costs; down 25 per cent in price. The important thing here is that this period from 1950-60 is a period during which we had, for the most part, a federal Liberal government. The Liberals in power in Ottawa ignored those deteriorating cost-price relationships, and in general the Liberals in Saskatchewan defended this ignoring of those cost-price relationships. But I know they have had a change of heart, Mr. Speaker. I know that since 1957 they all feel much differently about all these things now.

All of us will realize that the main economic problems of the farmer are going to be solved only if appropriate action was taken at the federal level. If the income deficiency had been corrected, then this year's crop would not have been such a severe blow to the farmers of this province.

I am going to say only a word about two other topics, Mr. Speaker. The tax sharing and the medical care. I will only say a word about them because later on, in connection with other bills I shall be speaking at greater length with regard to them. But the statement that has been made by several members of the opposition that what has been asked for by this province had somehow had something to do with the decision of the federal government, needs only a little bit more comment.

I can imagine what the members of the opposition would have said if we hadn't asked for what was considered to be adequate to the needs of the province.

October 19, 1961

May I refer just briefly to what some of the other Premiers asked for. The report of the proceedings, for example, would indicate that Mr. Frost, the premier of Ontario, suggested that the three taxes, income, personal income, corporation and succession duties ought to be divided 50-50-50. The report will show that Mr. Lesage suggested they ought to be divided 25-25-100; that the provinces ought to get 25 per cent of the personal income tax instead of 13; that they ought to get 25 per cent of corporation tax instead of 9; that they ought to get 100 per cent of succession duties in place of the 50 per cent which they now get.

The report will indicate that the premier of New Brunswick, the Liberal premier of New Brunswick, suggested a very considerable increase which ought to be given to the province.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that every provincial government was unanimous in saying that if they were going to be able to finance their own services; that if they were going to be able to provide for local governments adequate assistance to their services, then it was essential that the figure percentage of these three shared tax fields find their way back to provincial governments. That is all this government said, that is all the other governments said. If the opposition want to attempt to get some political kudos out of suggesting that we have — I think the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) used the word 'fiscal blackmail' on the federal government, then I guess they are welcome to do it.

Mr. Speaker, the point here is this, I think. We are concerned not with the principle, because we seem to be agreed on it; we will be concerned later on with the level of taxation which is to be imposed under these acts. All of us should be concerned with the purposes to which the taxes are put; we should be concerned with the kind of distribution. Much has been said about Canada's position and Saskatchewan's position, too, with regard to taxation and other countries. There has been some suggestion that we in Saskatchewan, perhaps we in Canada, are highly taxes in relationship to other countries and as a result are not getting the kind of productivity which we would otherwise get.

I think it is important to remember, Mr. Speaker, that productivity is not the function of just the tax-load. Productivity is also a function of the health and well being of people and the services which they provide for themselves. If one just takes a brief look at various tax-loads in different countries of the world, United

Nations statistics indicate that Canada stands twelfth in terms of the relationship which the taxes she imposes bears to the gross national product of the country. In other words, there are 11 other countries which impose relatively greater taxes than does Canada, and these countries in general give more social services than we do.

I want to make one more reference. It is a table which is quoted in the publication 'Merit News', an article by Mr. H.D.G. Young, the President of Canada's Productivity Council. He points out that in seven countries, Japan, Germany, Italy, France, the Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom and Canada, the growth in productivity from 1950-60 has been greater in these other countries than it has in Canada. Most of those countries which have had this greater growth are also the countries which have been taxing themselves higher in order to provide more social services for their people. I submit it is important in dealing with this that we realize that the productivity and the prosperity and the standard of living of the country is more than just a function of tax load; it is also the function of health and well-being of the people and the services which they provide for themselves.

With regard to medical care, again it seems to me that the Liberal position on this is pretty clear. It is clear because of its lack of clarity. That is the best I can say on it. I am sure that nobody can say at this moment just what it is that they really think about medical care. I have suggested they have said the same things almost the same in this debate about medical care as they said in the debate when hospitalization was introduced in this province. So their stand is consistent only because of its inconsistency. It is the kind of stand they have taken on hospitalization; the kind of stand they took on government insurance; the kind of stand they took on larger school units, and I could go on and on and on. Some day they will come back to this House, Mr. Speaker, and claim that they started it. It seems to me almost certain that the footprints left on the sands of time by the Liberals in Saskatchewan are going to be distinctive for one reason; they tend to point in all directions at once.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne brought before this legislature two important issues; one of them with regard to tax agreements with the federal government. In this we have little discretion other than the right to determine the tax rates which will be imposed. The other one

October 19, 1961

is a bill which will establish the framework for a comprehensive, publicly supported and publicly administered medical care pro in the province of Saskatchewan. This bill introduces an opportunity for the people of the province, an opportunity for the medical profession of the province to make come true, in the best tradition of medicine, the functions of that great profession. There are many people who have waited a long time for just such a moment, and many people who will applaud heartily a legislature which brings this moment into being.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the amendment; I will support the motion.

Mr. Gallagher: —Mr. Speaker, just before the 5:30 adjournment . . .

Premier Douglas: — Will the hon. member permit me to raise a question to the House. He may not wish to speak for five minutes; he may want to confine his speech until after the supply hour. If that is agreeable to him we could deal with Motions for Returns and get them out of the way.

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

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

Mr. Bernard D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, before I start to say anything about the Throne Speech, I might comment on some of the things that were said by the last speaker, the hon. Provincial Treasurer. He still seems, after sitting here since last Wednesday, not to be understood the position of the Liberal party and the opposition in regard to medical care in this province.

I can only say that the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) and the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) having spent some three hours dealing with medical care and still not having enlightened the Provincial Treasurer's mind to date, I am sure I will not be able to in the time I am going to devote to the Throne Speech this evening.

There were many comments that he made that were said by members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that I could discuss but I don't think I will waste too much time. He seems to get a big bang out of Dr. McCusker, Mr. Thatcher,

Dr. McCuster, Mr. Thatcher, etc. so I hope he enjoyed himself. Anyway, I will say this much about our leader, Mr. Speaker. There is one thing that he possibly inherited as a socialist was a thick skin, and that's one thing he has held onto, so you're not going to bother him too much, but as far as his socialistic tendencies are concerned, Mr. Speaker, he was a man of courage and when he decided he was going along the wrong road, the crooked road, he departed and straightened himself out. I'm glad that he has hung on to that one socialistic characteristic that he is still thick enough skinned that it won't hurt his feelings, as to what the Provincial Treasurer or anybody on the other side of the House might say.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I will waste too much time in commenting on what the Provincial Treasurer had to say. There was one item he did mention while he was talking on taxation and the legislation that was going to be brought into this assembly. He said they were going to be concerned with the level of taxation, and I am very glad to hear that from the Provincial Treasurer, because in the last 17 years they have not been too concerned about how high taxation went in this province.

Going on to deal with what the Throne Speech contained, Mr. Speaker, I must say that anything I might say this evening has probably been said three or four and half a dozen times before tonight. It is the first Throne Speech for many years that this government has had the Lieutenant Governor read a speech that wasn't full of praises of this government. It is quite understandable, Mr. Speaker, why this is so. It is the first time since the socialists were elected in 1944 that they ever had to stand up in a time of a real crisis, and instead of standing up to the crisis, and facing things as they are today, they are acting like the ostrich with his head in the sand. Rather than dealing with the problems that confront the people of this province at this time, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech contained only the two items, the medical care plan and the taxation question.

I am not criticizing the government for calling the session at this time. I think it was very necessary; it was the duty of the government to call a session at this time, but I am going to say this, that I don't think the people of this province will look too favourably upon a government that is calling a session, practically simply and solely to give the Premier a glorious send-off into the federal arena. I know that medical care is important. I

October 19, 1961

think all members of this House agree that medical care is important; but it is no more important in October, 1961 than it was in October, 1960, and in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the government did go to the trouble of setting up the advisory committee on medical care, you would think they would have at least given this advisory committee time to get not only an interim report out, but to get out a final report before they tried to pass any legislation that was going to give us a medical care plan. I say it is an insult to the intelligence of the people of this province that the elected representatives of the people be called into session at a time like this, and instead of dealing with the real problems that face the people of this province today, they are called in here to satisfy the whims of the NDP leader in this country. It is just another publicity stunt as far as I am concerned, to give him a good send-off.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it would be only right that I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion. I must say that I could not agree with everything that was said by the hon. member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper). I, too, would like to show my appreciation to the members of the advisory committee on medical care. One of its members, namely Dr. C.J. Houston, who incidentally is my own personal physician whom I know very well is a man who even though he possibly has one of the largest general practices in this province, has always been willing to give public service when he was called upon to do so. His contribution, along with the work done by his committee, is something that members of this assembly and people all over this province, should be very grateful for.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, this interim report was sent to us about two weeks ago. I believe I got mine a week ago last Saturday and have tried to digest it once, and gone over parts of it the second and third time. But I think the government should consider very seriously giving this interim report a good deal of consideration before they make their final decisions on what type of medical care plan they intend to institute in this province. It seems interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, that a minority report was submitted by the members of this committee who are supposed to represent the people of this province who are going to provide medical care service, and I am going to suggest to this assembly this evening that it is my view if we are going to have a medical care plan which is going to work in this province, that this minority report must be considered very seriously. I am going to

remind this House that if the medical profession is ignored, then the people of Saskatchewan not only won't have a medical care plan; they won't have medical care period.

It would seem from the remarks by the mover of the Throne Speech that she is inclined to agree with the member of the advisory committee who cast a dissenting vote, and although she may take exception to me saying this, most people on this side of the House think that after she had finished speaking, she agreed almost wholeheartedly with Mr. Smishek. I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, that she probably things she is getting herself in good with the labour voter in the city of Regina by agreeing with Mr. Smishek, but as far as I am concerned, he does not represent the working people of this province. She might have summarized her remarks by reading from a newspaper advertisement of the Leader-Post, dated October 4, 1961, which I will read:

“Let Saskatchewan's health scheme serve the people. We oppose creation of a medical care insurance commission; fee-for-service charge; deterrent charges; direct personal premium. We support health services to be administered by the department of health; doctors paid on salary basis; no deterrent fee; financing through corporation and personal income tax.”

Then there is a place to put your name, address, sign this ad, and send to the Communist Party of Canada, Saskatchewan Committee, 100 Northern Crown Building, Regina.

Sure, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the lady member from Regina would align herself with a radical group such as the Communist Party of Canada, but I don't think the people who are working people in this province or any others, want to be associated with the kind of thinking that comes from a group who inserted this ad in the Leader-Post.

I said that I did not think Mr. Smishek's suggestion, as far as I was concerned, represented the feeling of the working people of this province. He may be speaking for a small percentage of working people in the province, but the vast majority of workers in Saskatchewan who want a medical care plan want to have to pay for a medical care plan, and they also want to do nothing, Mr. Speaker, that would deter doctors from coming into this province, or do anything that might antagonize doctors that they would leave the province.

October 19, 1961

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the government that whatever type of plan is set up, it should be kept in mind that the people of Saskatchewan should have the best medical care that we can afford, and do everything possible to acquire and retain the best medical personnel that is humanly possible. And while I am still on the subject of medical care, I would like to quote from a story carried by the Winnipeg Free Press, September 16, 1961. This story is entitled "How Health Plan Works Done Under," written by Mr. Dean Walker: (I will quote from parts of this story):

" . . . when law-makers want proof that these things do work out in the end, they can always point to the experience of the country that has the oldest such scheme, New Zealand.

"In New Zealand a radical labour government first declared in the 1930's that the community as a whole, and not the unfortunate individual, should carry the cost of sickness and accident."

Then it goes on to talk about the opposition that this government got from the doctors before this plan was set up.

"Labour's first suggested legislation, however, seemed deadly to the doctors. When the government started collecting social security taxes, they threatened a medical strike. The government was non-plussed. for two years it collected tax money for a service it could not offer. Finally it bowed to the main wishes of the profession and drew up a scheme which the British Medical Association approved. It was operating by 1941, and it was not significantly changed since."

It goes on to say how the medical plan works in New Zealand, but here is a paragraph on the costs of the New Zealand medical plan:

"The taxpayer is happy enough about the cost of the scheme, because he is used to paying high taxes anyway. The health scheme in New Zealand costs approximately 4 or 5 per cent of the countries' gross national product each year. Taxation is weighted to the middle-income family man at the expense of richer men, with fewer dependents. For example, a married man with three children, earning the average wage of \$2,250 a year will pay only \$150 a year in direct tax. A

single man earning \$5,000 a year will pay over \$1,100.”

The closing paragraph of the story might be interesting to some members of this House:

“Although doctors are happy enough with the scheme, they watch its implications closely. They have one great fear that the large public hospitals may start to resemble Russian-styled clinics where all the medical care in the community emanates from the one centre, and a state-controlled one at that. Should it move in that direction in New Zealand, doctors will once again down stethoscopes and leave them to politics as enthusiastically as they have done in the past, and perhaps more effectively.”

So you see, Mr. Speaker, from the story which I have just read there are many pitfalls we can run into in the setting up of a medical care plan in this province. I think the government should be very careful to institute and develop a medical care plan with all caution, so that when we have this plan set up, we know it is not only going to give service to the people, but will be a plan that is welcomed by the people of this province.

The other point, of course, in the Throne Speech was the tax question. I, too, sympathize with the member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and the Premier that we find ourselves in this tax jungle today. I noticed for once in his speech the Premier gave some credit to the Liberal party. I guess he has decided by now it was better to be the government of this province when we've got a Liberal government at Ottawa, than when we have a Tory government at Ottawa.

He was accused, Mr. Speaker, and rightly so, of helping to scuttle this tax-rental agreement. As long as there was a Liberal government in power at Ottawa, a government that had the welfare of the people of Canada at heart above politics, the Premier of this province could get away with what he was doing. But Mr. Diefenbaker, after he took over, decided to show our Premier and our Provincial Treasurer that he is now the boss. I'm going to say right now it is not only the demands this government has been making, at dominion-provincial conferences — not only the demands that have helped to scuttle this agreement. The Premier has gone up and down this country for the last 12

October 19, 1961

or 15 years, and he has boasted about all the accomplishments of this government and he never gave any credit to anybody for the accomplishments of this government except himself until John Diefenbaker decided, if you're going to do all the blowing about what services you are getting in Saskatchewan, you can take the blame for collecting the tax. But I'm going to say this, Mr. Speaker, that when he leaves this province and the Premier's chair for one of his colleagues, there is going to be one thing he will be able to boast about after he's left. He's going to be able to go out from this chamber and say, "Well, I helped to scuttle the tax-rental agreement that helped Saskatchewan for the last 16 or 18 years." These, Mr. Speaker, were the two items contained in the Throne Speech, and now that I have covered them briefly I intend to deal with a few more items which the Throne Speech did not contain, and I wish it had.

I was elected to the House by the people of the Yorkton constituency. I am very proud of those people and am very glad to be able to represent them. It makes me feel much better when I think that 65 per cent of the people of Yorkton constituency voted anti-Socialist, when they wanted to be represented by a member on this side of the House. Although all of the 65 per cent of the people of the Yorkton constituency did not vote for me, I know that every one of them who voted against this government voted against it because they don't want any socialist running their business.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very proud, after listening to some of the explosions from the other side of the House about how that party, the CCF, or New Democratic Party represents labour, that a majority of the working people in the city of Yorkton supported me. After listening to some people on the other side of the House, and especially some of the members from the cities you would think they were the only defenders of the worker in this country. But in view of what has taken place during the past two years in the formation of this supposed-to-be new party, I am going to say at this time that the time has come for some political party to take the case of the working man and save him from being dragged into a den from which there is no return, and that, Mr. Speaker, is what is happening to the working people of this country since the formation of the New Democratic Party.

They can gloat all they like over their big convention down in Ottawa. Sure, labour was well represented, but did the working people of Canada organize that convention?

No. That convention was organized by the Claude Jodoin and the Stanley Knowles and the David Lewises.

Mr. Speaker, the union members were not even consulted — not only as to whether or not they should contribute to this new party, but as to whether or not they should join this new party. I am going to tell you right now that — and I hope the Premier is listening. I have a good many friends who are members of labour unions, and not one of them was ever consulted as to whether or not he wanted to be part and parcel of any new party, or any political party in this country. The working people in Canada have voted Liberal consistently from 1935 to 1957, and because they voted Liberal, because the working people in Canada were in the main, electing Liberal governments for years, the Premier and some of his cohorts decided there was only one way to try and get the working people to vote CCF, and that was to try and grab off their union leaders, whom they felt could deliver the vote.

I would like to inform the hon. Premier that I think my guess will be pretty close when I say that after four or five years of Tory rule, the working class of Canada will be glad to vote Liberal once again.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gallagher: — The average working man and woman in Canada wants to have the right to work. They want to earn his or her own living, and not be told by the New Democratic leader or some greedy union leader what he must do and when he must do it. You know, Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier of this province is going to be in for a shock. Labour in this country has earned the right to organize, and they earned it under a Liberal government. They have the right to collective bargaining; they got that under a Liberal government; they have the right to strike, if need be, and they earned that under a Liberal government. Practically all the labour legislation that has helped the working people of Canada for the last 25 or 30 years has been under a Liberal government at Ottawa. And now that the working people in Canada have made progress, the Liberal party is going to have to save the working people of Canada from destruction by their own union leaders.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that some of the socialists and trade union bosses are trying to drag the working people

of Canada into a socialist political net, but I am sure the working people of Canada are not that easily led. I said a moment ago I think the Premier is in for a shock. I believe that he is, because you know Canadians are pretty easily led people, but they are pretty hard to push.

Then the New Democratic Party leader tries to sell the socialist philosophy of production for use and not for profit for working people of this country. He is going to be in for a surprise on that account, too. Working people are the same as farmers or storekeepers, or professional people or anybody else. They want a profit on their day's work, and I don't think the Premier of this province, or any socialist politician is going to convince workers that they should work just for use any more than they can convince business men or farmers or professional people, that they should work just for the use of working. Whatever they over what they can use, they should give to the planners. I think, Mr. Speaker, the Premier, even though he was delegated to lead this new party, is going to have a pretty hard time selling the working people of this country on this kind of philosophy.

Premier Douglas: — Let me worry about that — no sense of you worrying about it.

Mr. Gallagher: — We have heard some CCF speakers for years talking about this philosophy; they have talked about production for use and not for profit; price control and all the rest. But your philosophy contains more than price control. When you go to speak to the working people of this country in Hamilton, Windsor, or Montreal or Toronto, you don't suggest you have to have price control or profit control, or wage control, production control and every other kind of control you can think of. That is your philosophy. I don't think, as I said a moment ago, that you're going to be able to sell that philosophy to the working people of this country any more than you can sell it to the farmer. You found out that after you had been in office here for 17 or 18 years that you weren't getting very much past the border of Saskatchewan, so you are trying to enlarge your field — so I have heard several members on the other side of this House say. Because of the fact that your party has a new leader, and a new name, it doesn't necessarily say that the philosophies of this party have changed. As far as I am concerned their philosophies are as old as the hills; they date back to the time of Karl Marx.

I heard mention made the other day — I believe it was the member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) — he got hold of a little piece of paper that was handed around at the Yorkton federal nominating convention several weeks ago, and was reading off a lot of things about Farmer John. Of course, the point he was trying to make was that Farmer John was rejected by the Liberals of the Yorkton constituency. They wouldn't nominate a farmer. Well, I should inform my friend, the member from Wadena, that there was Farmer John, Farmer Bill and Farmer Lou who got the most votes. There was businessman Pat too, but he didn't get very far. Anyway we still got a farmer. We picked the youngest farmer because we knew he would give you the worst time.

Premier Douglas: — That's what we like.

Mr. Gallagher: — I would like to turn now to some of the problems of my own constituency. Our area, as you are probably aware, is one of the most densely populated farm areas of this province. We have been most fortunate in the past that we have very seldom had a crop failure. This year, unfortunately we have had one of the worst crop failures in the history of that part of the province. I would like to remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that it is an area where the farms are small; the people on those farms cannot stand a crop failure as well as where the farms are larger. Most of these people make just a very meagre living, and when a calamity hits such as this year, they are going to feel it more than the people in areas where farms are larger. But I'm not going to blame this government for the drought, although I think I could safely blame them for almost anything else. I would like to remind the Premier that the farmers in my constituency are still wondering where this 'more abundant living' is going to come from.

There are a good many farmers in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, who are not going to be able to pay their power bills. I don't see the minister in charge of the power corporation in his seat but I wish he were, because I wonder if he is going to cut off their power. Because there have been a few of them who have come to me and told me they have been served notice that, if their power bills are not paid forthwith, their power is going to be disconnected. I am going to suggest to the minister in charge of the power corporation, that we might have a long dark winter ahead of us, and I hate to see those people sitting in the dark until next fall, when they can get a crop harvested — if we get a crop. I think, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the

October 19, 1961

light of the problem, if the government can borrow enough money to build Cass Beggs a castle down town in Regina, they can extend the farmers of Saskatchewan credit until next fall, so that they can pay their power bills and not have their power discontinued.

It won't be too long, Mr. Speaker, before the hospitalisation tax is going to be coming due, and I am going to tell the Minister of Health that there are a good many people in my constituency that are going to find it pretty tough to pay the \$48 hospitalisation tax. I wonder if this government is considering refusing giving these people hospital care, or if they are going to extend their credit until such time as they have their \$48 to pay their hospital premium. I wonder what steps the government has taken to protect the farmer who, through no fault of his own, might be a few years behind in his taxes. With the municipal and school taxes as high as they are today, Mr. Speaker, if a man misses a year or two of taxes it amounts to quite a bit of money. Some of the people on the other side of the House seem to talk quite glibly about taxes not being too high, but during the past few months I have seen five letters, no less, informing farmers in my part of the country that if their taxes were not paid within 30 days, the municipality is going to apply for their title. I heard the member from Wadena (no — I shouldn't accuse him of it), but it was one of the members from the other side of the House talking about the Farm Security Act. I wonder what kind of an act you are going to pass to keep the municipalities from getting title to some of the farmers' land if the farmers can't pay their taxes this fall.

I said that some of the people on that side of the House have been pretty glib about talking of taxes not being too high — or that there wasn't anything wrong with the taxes. The Minister of Mineral Resources the other day seemed to think it was a big joke. I am going to say that taxes are high, Mr. Speaker, as a direct result of policies followed by this government. If they don't think the taxes are too high; if they don't think that local government has had any trouble in this province, just to put it on the record I am going to read the answers to some returns which I asked for last winter at the winter sitting of the House. One of these was the total combined debenture debt plus capital loans from the provincial government of all the school units in the province as of December 31, 1959, and the figure given was \$11,674,202.85. The combined total of debenture indebtedness of all the R.M.'s in the province as at December 31, for each year from 1959-59

inclusive — for the first year, 1950 was \$74,824; 1959, \$255,317 — or just tripled to what it was nine years before. On December 31, 1959 the cities in this province owed \$82,713.846 — the towns owed \$11,644,535.00.

I also asked for a return showing the capital loan and debenture indebtedness of all the school units around Yorkton for each year from the time these units were formed, up until December 31, 1959. I am just going to read the first and last figures for each five-school units, to give the Minister of Education, the Provincial Treasurer, and some of the others who might not be concerned, an idea as to whether or not local government is having its worries. In the Canora school unit in 1954 the year after it was formed, the total capital loan and debenture indebtedness was \$115,964.62; in 1959, five years later, \$203,307.82. Sturgis School Unit, 1946, \$14,590; 1959, \$100,657; the Foam Lake-Wynyard school unit, 1945, \$26,561; in 1959, \$197,963. The Kamsack School unit in 1947 when it was formed, nil; 1959, \$103,630. Yorkton school unit, \$48,658.86 in 1953; \$286,985 in 1959.

Mr. Speaker, I know what the figure was for the year before 1953, when the unit was formed in Yorkton. We had in Yorkton \$12,000 cash assets over all liabilities. In 1959 we only owed \$286,985, but I got the answer to a question I submitted the other day, and now I see the Yorkton school unit instead of owing \$286,985, they owe \$415,478.44. Surely, Mr. Speaker, members of the government to your right are not foolish enough to state that local government in this province is not having trouble, or that taxes are not too high in this province. Taxes are high, and the reason school units and municipalities are in debt is because they dare not tax the land any higher than it is already taxed, because they know the people on the land couldn't pay the tax and I think maybe there are some people on the other side of this House who don't seem to care.

You know, there are people who came to this country or this province many years ago, worked hard on a small farm; and in their retiring years have rented that farm and hoped to make a living from rent of their farm and their old-age security pension. Those people in a year like this won't be able to pay their taxes out of a third of the crop if they got nine bushels to the acre. I am renting two half-sections. This year the crop yielded 9 or 10 bushels to the acre, and one-third of the crop won't pay the taxes on those two half-sections of land.

October 19, 1961

In fact, I would go so far as to say, Mr. Speaker, that on a year like this there would be a good many farmers in this province who would be hungry if it were not for legislation passed by the federal Liberal government in 1938 to see them through for the next six or eight months, and when I say that I am referring to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

I remember in a speech made a few years ago by the former Provincial Treasurer, the Hon. C.M. Fines, and I believe the new Provincial Treasurer made some such remark this afternoon. Anyway, Mr. Fines was telling us how the economy of this province had changed from an agricultural economy when they took office to an industrial economy today. I believe the Provincial Treasurer this afternoon suggested that the tax base in this province was widened now, because Saskatchewan is industrialized. So, I suppose they take it from that when there is a crop failure in Saskatchewan that the province can get along quite nicely anyway, because we are a highly industrialized province. That's the meaning they are trying to convey, Mr. Speaker. I suggest some of the members opposite ask some of the store keepers, some of the implement dealers or service station operators, or fuel dealers or anybody else that is in business, if they are not feeling the pinch of it. Every one of them will tell you they are. All the talk that comes from the other side of this House is not going to fool anybody into believing that Saskatchewan's economy has changed any appreciable amount from the time this government took office until today.

Before I go on any further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on several things that were said the other day by members on the other side of this House. One of the things that was said — of course this is old socialist talk, that the Liberals represent the corporations. I have a copy of the speech made by the Premier, and I believe he called them the cat's paw for the insurance underwriters and mortgage companies. Somebody else said they represented the corporations and banks, and mortgage companies, and I would just like to make a few comments on these remarks. First of all, maybe some of the people in the back rows on the other side of the House don't know what corporations are. I think the gentlemen in the front row, if they have any business brains, are probably investing money in the corporations. Many of them should know that the majority of corporations in this country have a majority of their shares held by the middle-income people whom they are supposed to be representing.

Farmers, workers and professional people and business men that have a little savings invested in these corporations — they might not necessarily invest in Canada Packers, or Massey Ferguson, or Ford of Canada, but they invest through an investment dealer — you find them in every city of this province, because they not only help to develop this province but by investing their money, if they have \$500 a year to invest, they will get a higher rate of interest on it than if they put it in the bank, or if they bought Canada Savings Bonds.

I think some of the cabinet ministers who must be making enough that they could invest \$500 or \$1,000 a year must be investing in corporations. Or if they are not, I would advise them that they should. But these people on the other side of this House have been crying about the Liberal party representing the corporations. I don't know how foolish they can get. Sure; there are corporations that are controlled by several rich shareholders, but the majority of corporations in this country have the majority of their shares held by small shareholders — farmers and business men, working and professional people, and why they always try to suggest to this legislature and all over this province and this country, that we were a party that was defending a pack of wolves, is more than I can figure out. But you know what a corporation is, and to suggest that we are the big brother of the corporation or friends of the corporation, is kind of a ridiculous suggestion to make.

You know, the Liberal party or Liberal governments down through the years, realized that corporations, even though they might be controlled by small investors, are better able to pay taxes than individuals, and because of that Liberal governments imposed the 50 per cent corporation tax on the corporations. But we are supposed to be the good friends of the corporation; we represent the corporations, and as the Premier said, we are the cat's paw for the mortgage companies and the insurance underwriters. Well, it's a funny kind of a big brother that would impose a 50 per cent corporation tax.

I suppose that the mortgage companies asked the Liberal government in the past to set up the Debt Adjustment Board, to try and take some of their money — they were the big brother of the mortgage companies, so the Debt Adjustment Board was set up by the Liberal government to take some of that money away from the little brother. I suppose the line elevator companies asked the Liberals to help establish the co-operative elevator system in this province — the

forerunner to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. I suppose the mortgage companies asked the Liberal government of this country to set up the Farm Loan Board, and reduce interest rates from 8 ½ per cent to 6 per cent. It seems kind of a queer friend to have if he does things like that. Do you remember back in the First World War, any one of you who are older should — when the Conservative government was in office and they rescinded the Crows' Nest Pass Agreement. I suppose some of the members on the other side of this House think that the C.P.R. went to MacKenzie King or Sir Wilfred Laurier to reinstate the Crow's Nest Pass rates. That would be a very friendly gesture, wouldn't it, if it was your good friend that you were doing it for.

I suppose the farm implement companies, being friends of the Liberal party asked the Liberal government in Ottawa, to take the 27 ½ per cent tariff off farm machinery and cream separators, and reduce it to nil. Some of this talk on the other side of the House is absolutely ridiculous. The automobile manufacturers, I suppose went and asked the Liberal party to reduce the tariff on automobiles from 42 per cent to 17 ½ per cent.

Just for the record, Mr. Speaker, I think these are some of the things the members on the other side of this House should be thinking about before they get up and spout off this line about the Liberal party representing the vested interests — we hear that — the vested interests, the mortgage companies, insurance underwriters, banks, the line elevator companies, machine companies and all this talk. Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. members on the other side of the House should be bright enough to realize that if we represented the corporations whom they claim not to represent, then we didn't use the corporations too well after some of the things I have stated to you were done by Liberal governments when they were in office in this country.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment about something that has been said by several members on the other side of the House regarding statements made by the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) the other day. They seem to take exception to him saying anything about the Premier, or suggesting anything about the Premier. I know the Premier has been in politics long enough that he knows the expression, "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth", and that if he engages in a little mud-slinging he can expect to get back a little of the mud that he throws. Some of the members of the government have forgotten how their leader and others on your right, during the past

17 years have tried to defame leaders on this side of the House. They have done this continuously, and they are still doing it.

I have some quotations here made by the Premier. I'm not going to read them all, but I am going to read one or two. They think that it was an insult to say what the member for Melville said about the Premier. I wonder what they would think about what the Premier said about the former member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) who used to sit on this side of the House, and here are the words of the Premier:

“When I am shooting grizzlies I never want to take a shot at a weasel.”

Well, now, if he thought the member from Redberry resembled a weasel I suppose that's all right for him, but then I don't think that members on the other side of the House should take any exception to people on this side of the House doing the same thing as he is doing. He has been in politics a long time and he should expect it. I have heard him, time after time on public platforms, running provincial Liberal leaders down. I remember the time he said to one former leader that if he swallowed him, “the Premier”, that he would have more brains in his stomach than he has in his head. He told the last provincial leader that he wasn't dry behind the ears.

I know the Premier has been pretty glib about making remarks about leaders on this side of the House, and one of the leaders — a former premier of this province, and federal Minister of Agriculture, seemed to me to be his pet, and I have heard him on many occasions at public meetings, try to belittle the former Premier of this province and a former Minister of Agriculture. I am going to say this, Mr. Speaker, that after the Premier has been in public office, if he should live as long to be in public office as long as the Rt. Hon. James G. Gardiner was in office, elected by the people of this province — after he has been in office as long as that and can look back and say that he has done as much for the people of this province as the former Premier and Minister of Agriculture, then he can be a very proud man.

During the past few days, Mr. Speaker, we have heard quite a few definitions of socialism — or the word socialism, and I cannot agree with the definition given by the Minister of Education and several other members on the other side of the House. That's why I am not sitting over on that side of the House.

Premier Douglas: — That's not the only reason.

Mr. Gallagher: — As far as I am concerned, socialism stands for control and stands for regimentation and it stands for compulsion; it stands for the muffling of individual thoughts. In every country in the world that has a socialist government, although there may be things enacted by those governments that might seem progressive, under socialism private initiative is destroyed. Individualism is a forgotten thing, initiative is killed and people tend to lean on the government for their existence.

It has been said during this debate, Mr. Speaker, that liberty and freedom are on trial in the world today, and I believe that all members in this House will agree that they are on trial today. I for one, am not willing to sacrifice a dollar's worth of my freedom for the kind of security that we get from a socialist government. For that reason, and because this government has no policies, or no hope of having policies that will help the rural people of this province, and because during the last 17 years they have done nothing, absolutely nothing, to provide work — to create industry, to bring industry into this province that would give the native sons and daughters, and the people of this province jobs, I shall not support the motion. I will support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull (Minister of Co-operatives): — Would the hon. member permit a question? I believe the member for Yorkton said that he rented two half-sections of land, and if he had a nine bushel quota, the amount that would be due as rent which would be one-third of this, I took it, three bushels wouldn't pay the taxes.

Mr. Gallagher: — I said a nine-bushel crop. I said one-third of a nine bushel to the acre crop would not pay the taxes on those two half-sections of land.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — That would be three bushels, right?

Mr. Gallagher: — Three bushels per acre, yes.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — I wonder if the hon. member would give the assessment of this land, and give the rate of taxation, because the way I work it out, it would have to be more than 50 mills and it would have to be assessed at . . .

Mr. Gallagher: — Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member that on one section — this other half I am not sure what the taxes are, but on one section the taxes are approximately \$820; half of that would be \$410.

Mr. Speaker: — We do not want too much comment on the question.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Would the member give the assessment of this section?

Mr. Gallagher: — I wouldn't be sure, Mr. Speaker, but I can tell him that I know what the assessment of the highest quarter is, it is \$3,600 and I think the lowest quarter is about \$3,100 — I'm not just sure, but I know the highest quarter is \$3,600.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Would the member be able to give us the rate of taxation?

Mr. Gallagher: — I can tell you that our school tax has jumped to more than double in the last eight years.

Mr. Ed Whelan (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, as have members on both sides of the House, I am very pleased to offer my congratulations to you for having ably represented us at the parliamentary conference of the Commonwealth Nations in Great Britain. A photograph of Your Honour, reproduced on the front page of the Western Producer of October 5, 1961, (I hold it up in order that the House may see it) is a fine advertisement, I think, for the type of democratic associations that are developing between representatives within the Commonwealth. The picture tells a story and establishes a bond of association in the minds of Saskatchewan residents. I am pleased of course that the Western Producer recognized this fact and reproduced the picture on their front page.

The motion, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Speech from the Throne was moved very ably by my colleague, one of the members for Regina city. Her presentation was, in my opinion, courageous and objective. I am proud as a fellow member from Regina city that she was chosen to move a motion on the Speech from the Throne which proposed the most advanced health legislation ever introduced in a legislature in the dominion of Canada.

October 19, 1961

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Whelan: — The seconder of the motion was described by my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, as the genial member from Touchwood. The hon. member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) is not only a genial member, but as his presentation indicated he is well informed and capable of making a clear, logical, objective presentation.

Mr. Speaker, in making a contribution to this debate there are three items I should like to cover. First — programs that might directly benefit the people of Regina and Saskatchewan. Second — some comments on the statements made by my hon. friends opposite. Third — a concise statement of my own position regarding the medical care bill.

In speaking of the operation of businesses, government industry and transportation, this has certainly increased and helped my constituency. The population of my constituency, according to the last census has now reached 110 thousand. Recently, as a Trans-Canada Air Lines plane came in for a landing at the Regina terminal, two men who were seated close to me were discussing the city of Regina, and the provincial government located here. Needless to say, if I'm going to repeat it, I was very pleased with what I heard. One fellow said that Regina was his favourite western city, and he visited all of them quite often. About the legislative buildings he said — 'I don't always agree with these people.' Then my ears were really standing up. But he said 'we must admit the people of Saskatchewan have the most courageous government in Canada, the people who lead it and handle the departments of government are very able and have plenty of courage.' Needless to say my wife introduced herself to the gentlemen as we left the plane.

Those of us who represent Regina were very pleased to hear the announcement that the university site and adjacent areas will be developed as part of a program to celebrate Canada's hundredth birthday. Aside from providing necessary employment, there could be no more fitting cultural tribute to the people of Saskatchewan than a program of this kind.

Something else that comes to my mind each day that I come to the buildings, and it is this. I am sure all of you have noticed the condition of Wascana Lake and the fact that (I was going to say puddles) there are small

pools of water lying on the parched bed of Wascana Lake. I sincerely hope that a dredging program can be undertaken, jointly by the city, the province, the federal government, perhaps as a winter works project, because of the water shortage and because it would also provide employment. I was pleased to learn from the Minister of Education, who was working on the university program that careful negotiations are proceeding regarding this project.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation left their annual report on our desks. This publicly owned corporation has been under fire from some of the federal government members at Ottawa. I remind the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, at a cost of \$57 million to the Canadian people each year, or approximately this amount, the CBC provides many hours of entertainment weekly. Special features such as Close-up, News Magazine, national sporting events, all of these valuable programs being offered and presented to the people of Canada. The CBC at the \$57 million figure costs the Canadian people one cent per day per capita. I remind the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that no other form of entertainment comes to Canadians at such a low figure. There is a gap however. There is a gap in the CBC television in Canada. The CBC has no T.V. station in the province of Saskatchewan. Recently a CBC T.V. station was completed in Edmonton, and there has been a CBC T.V. station in Winnipeg for some time. I suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, that entertainment, education, opportunity for training, opportunities for employment for Saskatchewan people could be made available by the establishment of a CBC television station in our province.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, a steel plant has been established in our community, due in large measures to the assistance of the provincial government. The industry is here, the future development of its facilities, making use of iron ore deposits in the province, will guarantee employment . . . the hon. Leader of the Opposition says we are “hostile to business”, and although the steel plant certainly comes under the heading of, and I quote the hon. member again “responsible enterprise” — political criticism, particularly by the Leader of the Opposition must annoy investors who put their money into the plant, employees who were doing their level best to produce the produce, and citizens of this province who understand the need for industry. I am pleased, Mr.

Speaker, that this industry is located in Regina city. It is here to stay, and I predict that it will operate successfully and expand. I wish it well.

I would like to spend a little time, Mr. Speaker, if the House will allow, in answering some of the irresponsible comments and criticisms that have been emanating from the members of the benches opposite. My friend, the hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch, (Mr. Klein) I see he is not in his seat, criticized the Premier of this province, quoting the 'Financial Post', and I am sure all of the hon. members heard it. It was October 14, 1961, the 'Financial Post' headed up 'More Eloquence Than Sense' and on and on he went.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, it was the member for Athabasca, not the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch.

Mr. Whelan: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that it was made because I heard it in detail, and I recognized it because I read the 'Financial Post' very carefully. I am a subscriber to the 'Financial Post' and I read the 'Financial Post' very carefully because it is a well-organized and well-written paper. I am sure that most of the hon. members know that Jack Schreiner who sat in the gallery here last year, who was quite an able representative of one of the local papers is now a feature writer of theirs. I recommend that you read the 'Financial Post' to keep track of Jack Schreiner, if for no other reason. But this paper is the organ of the business world and presents news on behalf of the business organizations. And to use the vernacular, when you are reading the 'Financial Post' you discover that the business world 'lets it hair down.' Their praise and admiration for us on this side of the House is very limited, and we seldom get a line. You may be sure, therefore, that the following quotation regarding the Premier is an understatement, and that it would not have been used unless it was well deserved. I suggest to members of this House that it comes much closer to describing the Premier in an unprejudiced manner than does the criticism quoted by my hon. friend the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). And I quote: November 7, 1959. Page 17 'Financial Post' under the heading 'Letter from London'.

“Let us praise a Canadian visitor to England. The Premier of Saskatchewan, the Hon. T.C. Douglas, made a splendid impression when he addressed the Canada group of the Conservative Commonwealth Council in a committee room in the House of Commons. Without flamboyancy or false

modesty he gave a picture of his province which was admirable in its clarity, nor did he try to hide the shadows which darken the scene in the great west. It is hard to remember any recent Canadian visitor to Westminster who has made so good an impression with so little effort.”

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Those of us in the CCF know, and even some of our opponents grudgingly admit that Premier T.C. Douglas has the qualifications to be the Prime-Minister of Canada.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Whelan: — The hon. Leader of the Opposition, my friend the member from Morse, in his opening remarks in this debate referred to the scrapping of the dominion-provincial agreements. On page thirty of the records of this House for Wednesday, October 11, 1961, he said and I quote:

“One of the major reasons probably why the Prime-Minister and others felt it necessary to scrap these agreements was the nagging criticism year after year, from governments like this one that they were not getting enough.”

First, let me ask the hon. members opposite this. Are they suggesting — is their leader suggesting that we should say to the federal government that we are getting enough, and that all the provinces should do likewise? Is this their version of how to bargain, how to obtain a better deal for the province? How can the hon. members associate this reason with the responsibility of making representations and we have made strong representations, and I think that we must continue to do this. I remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that we have never hung crepe over the parliament buildings as did Newfoundland. We have never gone to the people of this province on this kind of an issue, and on this issue alone, as did the Premier of Newfoundland.

I wish to make it very clear, I have no criticism of the Premier of Newfoundland for doing this. No criticism whatever. But this may come under the heading of nagging, and I suggest that if Mr. Smallwood, the Premier of Newfoundland is going to discharge his responsibilities as an elected representative, even though I disagree with him on a good many things, I commend him for making representations

October 19, 1961

on behalf of the people of Newfoundland. Let me quote what he said in 1960 at the dominion-provincial conference in Ottawa. This is the quotation from the statement made by the Premier of the province of Newfoundland, and I quote:

“I do not desire to trouble my fellow Premiers, and the Prime-Minister and his colleagues too much with other problems of Newfoundland. I am well aware that every province has its own problems. I think, however, that I should remind my fellow Canadians, here today, that Newfoundland still, after 12 years of union with Canada, has an unstable economy and a very low standard of living. We have the lowest per capita income of any Canadian province, lower even than little P.E.I., lower even than that, and that is not funny. That is not funny either to Prince Edward Island or to Newfoundland. We have the lowest standard of living of any part of the Canadian provinces. We have by far the lowest standard of public services in Canada. The earning power of our people is the lowest — by far the lowest, while the capacity to pay our people is the lowest in Canada, yet the rate of taxation is the highest in Canada. We have the lowest earning power. We have the lowest wealth production. We have the lowest standard of personal living, yet we have the highest taxes in Canada, and this is 12 years after confederation.”

Let me ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition this. In my humble estimation the statement made by Mr. Smallwood was on a particularly with statements made by some of the other provinces, with this information on hand and with this knowledge, does the hon. member for Morse, Mr. Speaker, think Mr. Smallwood should have said to the Prime-Minister as follows — something like this:

“If I am really nice and promise not to do any nagging will you promise not to scrap these agreements?”

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the comedy of such representation? Over and over again from the benches opposite, suggestions have been made that the New Democratic Party is connected with Jimmy Hoffa. the name of Hoffa has been tossed back and forth across the House, again and again. I am sure the hon. members opposite know that the teamster's union is not a part of the Canadian Labour Congress. Their friends in the press and in the news media have tried again

and again to use Jimmy Hoffa as a club to discredit union organization and to discredit all working people. Mr. Speaker, on one occasion Mr. Hoffa was quoted favourably by their friends in the press, and on that occasion his statement received an excellent location on the front page of the 'Leader Post' September 30, 1960. The heading — New Party under Fire. I quote:

“Teamster’s president Jimmy Hoffa predicted Thursday night that workers will rebel against the proposed CCF-labour alliance in Canada. (on and on he goes and he says)

“The alliance backed by the same Canadian Labour Congress that had expelled the teamsters for raiding — was never the intention when they elected leaders, Hoffa said.”

Mr. McDonald: — I think he’s right; the workers will rebel.

Mr. Whelan: — Yet, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite toss the word Hoffa to us. He agrees with their thinking regarding political action. His views coincide with theirs. He is their political pal in this instance, and that is why this was on the front page of the local press.

During the Throne Speech debate, the hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to the commitment that the government had made, and I quote one of these. I could hardly believe it, and I read it again and here it is — something like this:

“As near as I can gather we have committed ourselves on the South Saskatchewan dam, the provinces’ share to roughly \$135 million.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, the tone of voice and the manner of delivery and the emphatic presentation, left the impression with me (I am going to use this, left the impression) that the hon. member for Morse was criticizing the government for making this commitment. Now after advocating the dam for many years, and after sending surveyors to the site just prior to each federal election, and we all saw them, and the hon. member for Morse made speeches about it in the House of Commons — after using it as election bait for years and after telling the people of our province that

it would provide a source of feed and fodder and water for the communities and for the farm people of Saskatchewan; the hon. Leader of the Opposition now has the audacity to criticize the government for this commitment. And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, and in almost the same breath, introduce an amendment in this House which asks for a no-confidence vote because we are doing nothing — nothing and I quote “to solve the problems confronting our rural people.” Let me say this, if the dam had been undertaken when we saw the surveyors on the South Saskatchewan River just prior to the 1949 election, and if the then federal Liberal government had entered into an arrangement with the province of Saskatchewan that year, I submit that feed, fodder, and water would have been available now, but not in five years from now as will be the case when the dam is completed, Mr. Speaker. In summing up this expenditure, how can the hon. members criticize this commitment on behalf of feed and fodder and water and at the same time insist that the government is doing nothing “to solve the problems confronting our rural people.”

The whole transcription isn't ready yet, but it is my impression that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley in his speech said ‘the only agricultural programs of other government had was a carry over from previous agricultural programs of other governments.’ For some time I worked in a department of the government that handled legislation effecting agriculture, and some of the legislation on the statute books which we administered had been introduced by the previous administration. The provincial Mediation Board Act, Mr. Speaker, and the Moratorium Act. The Moratorium Act, I concede was a piece of legislation introduced and passed by a Liberal government. And I contend that it was necessary. It was a true expression in legal terms of social machinery to meet an economic situation. This legislation was used sparingly, but it was effective when negotiations on behalf of farmers became difficult. It was also a thorn in the side of some of the financial interests, and these interests represented a small group, and most were fair and reasonable, and representations made by them were straightforward and accurate.

But now to return to my point, the Moratorium Act, by its very nature, was bound to be challenged and challenged it was, I think in the year 1954, if I am correct, and to the credit of the Court of Appeal in Saskatchewan, when it was referred to them, they ruled that the act was valid. However, Mr. Speaker, when the act was referred to the Supreme Court of Canada, and our legal representatives

appeared in support of the legislation, those challenging its validity also appeared. Who were they? The mortgage companies, and their organizations; the banks; and to the everlasting discredit of the Liberal party, for they had put this act on the statute books, a legal representative acting under instructions from the federal Liberal government at Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. On a split decision the legislation was thrown out by the court.

I remind the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) that this particular piece of legislation was not carried over, and in my opinion, the Liberal government at Ottawa was partly to blame that it wasn't carried over. This legislation is needed at the present time, and I am thinking now in terms of the hon. member for Yorkton's speech. It would be most useful right at this particular time — most helpful in negotiating extensions and in protecting the farmer from creditors. But it has been destroyed, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, going back to the statement that was rolled over and over again in his talk, I question now, who would appear in this instance, to be the cat's paw for the mortgage companies?

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Now the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) in his speech in this House, spoke in a very derogatory manner and I have heard him on other occasions when he spoke in a derogatory manner of the services supplied and granted to the commission-operatives by this government. On many occasions I have heard him reiterate this charge. Well let me tell him this, Mr. Speaker. For many years I have been closely associated with the commission-operative movement. Some of the people I know, leaders of the commission-operative movement in other parts of Canada have said to me many times that they wish they had a department of commission-operation like Saskatchewan, to assist them. A very good friend of mine in Ontario, each time that I see him, says that he doesn't agree with the CCF, but he thinks that they should have a department of commission-operation like ours in Ontario. This man is impulsive and I don't always agree with his judgment, but he is most vocal and insistent on this point. He is on the board of the united commission-operatives of Ontario and this man was a Liberal candidate. He's been with the commission-operative movement since he was 15 years of age, yet he wants a department of commission-operation in his province, like they have in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now the hon. member for Yorkton, (Mr. Gallagher) in his comments read an advertisement in the paper and suggested that the hon. lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) agreed with this advertisement that was inserted by the Communist party. Well he may say this, and he may also say that Walter Smishek doesn't represent the working people. He may think too, Mr. Speaker, that this will stop the hon. lady member for Regina and Walter Smishek from making courageous representations. Well let me tell you this, he is wrong, and the people of Regina and the members of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour will not be influenced by such irresponsible statements.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Now the members opposite seem very interested in who is going to be the next Premier of Saskatchewan. I am sure all people of Saskatchewan will be following our convention with interest. Let me assure the hon. members opposite that since my friend the Leader of the Opposition has said he is going to put his leadership on the line when the Liberals hold their convention, we are very, very interested in their convention too. You bet we are, we are interested in the convention for a number of reasons.

First — someone might run against him, and they might defeat him, and where would we get another helpful Liberal leader. And the second reason we are interested, Mr. Speaker, we are anxious to see if some of the noises of dissatisfaction emanating from the Liberal ranks will be backed up by active opposition. And the third reason we're interested is that if they do pick someone else, will he be a Liberal this time. It will be interesting to see whether a municipal figure in the north-east or a municipal figure in the hub city can be persuaded to lead the revolt that is already brewing behind the scenes.

I should like to place on record now in this House, Mr. Speaker, my complete approval of the medial care legislation for the following reasons. First I think it will give universal care to all who need it. Second it will help to develop on a provincial basis and later on a national basis a full-fledged preventative care program. And I believe it will eventually provide publicly owned research facilities that will solve some of the chronic illnesses that we're faced with at the present time. And fourth because of this legislation, I feel that facilities and finances for training will develop medical personnel

until the demand has been met. Fifth, under the legislation I believe that the medical profession will have a choice as to the type of compensation they might want. I say in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that when the social history of Canada is written that this legislature will have the distinction of having led the way toward introducing a federal health plan.

In summary I have tried to bring to the attention of the House some suggestions regarding projects which would benefit Regina and Saskatchewan. I have tried to express my opinion regarding some of the arguments by the opposition, and also to place on the record my approval of the medical care plan.

Now in yesterday's 'Leader Post' there is an account of a statement made by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) suggesting that the Minister of Agriculture, and I quote:

“The minister should have asked for wisdom and guidance from above.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, knowing the minister as a capable and God-fearing man, he would probably be a good agent for us, but after the speeches and comments by the members opposite, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the majority of the people in this House will agree that the guidance and advice we're getting from the members opposite, and particularly from the amendment is a very poor substitute. Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose the amendment, and I shall support the motion.

the debate continuing on the motion and amendment, and the question being put on the amendment, it was negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 16
Messieurs

Thatcher
Batten(Mrs.)
McCarthy
McDonald
Danielson
Cameron

McFarlane
Foley
Guy
Boldt
Klein

Horsman
Coderre
MacDougall
Snedker
Gallagher

NAYS — 34
Messieurs

Douglas	Brown	Meakes
Dewhurst	Thurston	Thiessen
Williams	Blakeney	Snyder
McIntosh	Erb	Stevens
Brockelbank	Nicholson	Kluzak
Lloyd	Turnbull	Dahlman
Nollet	Stone	Michayluk
Kuziak	Whelan	Semchuk
Cooper(Mrs.)	Thibault	Perkins
Strum(Mrs.)	Berezowsky	Peterson
Davies	Johnson	Brotten
Willis		

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the motion.

Mr. A. H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply, and although I cannot agree with most of the arguments that were advanced by either the mover or the seconder, I do give them full marks for effort, and I think they made a worthwhile contribution to this particular debate. The subject that was dealt with by the seconder of the motion is not an easy one and it is a subject that I am sure that some members, and a good percentage of the public are not too familiar with. I think that the seconder of the motion made a good job in outlining the problem that exists, the history of the taxation agreements down through the years, and I know I enjoyed his remarks and I am sure all of the people in the country who heard him must have enjoyed it as well.

At this time I also want to thank, Mr. Speaker, the government, the members opposite, and of course my colleagues for the flowers and cards of greeting that were sent to me while I was a patient in hospital last summer. This was an expression that one appreciates under such conditions, and I would like to formally and publicly thank both the government and individual members in this House for their kindness on that occasion.

I was pleased to learn this evening that my friend the last speaker, was interested in the Liberal

convention that is coming up at the end of November. You know, Mr. Speaker, there is one great difference between that convention and the convention that will be held on the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd of November in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Thatcher has placed his leadership on the line, and I think this is a good thing. I think that leaders of political parties should be prepared to do this whenever the occasion arises, and I compliment Mr. Thatcher for having made this move. I don't know whether there will be anyone contest his leadership or not. I doubt it, but I would predict that if anyone does, they will be defeated, because I'm as confident as I'm standing in this chamber that Mr. Thatcher enjoys the confidence, not only of the Liberals in the province of Saskatchewan, but he enjoys the confidence of a good many people who are opposed to socialism.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — In the event that someone should decide to challenge his leadership, then they will be given every opportunity to gather support, and to express their opinions, and the delegates at that convention will choose the leader of the Liberal party. But that will be quite different from the convention that is going to be held on the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd. The leader of that political party, who are holding their convention on those particular dates has already been chosen. Not by the delegates who are going to the convention, but they have been chosen by Claude Joidoin and Walter Smishek. The hand has been placed on the shoulders of the successor of the Premier, and the delegates that go to that convention, as far as selecting a new leader is concerned, may as well save their expenses and stay home. This so-called democratic party are no long a democratic party. They are no longer controlled by the delegates of the CCF party or the new party, they are controlled by the labour bosses of Saskatchewan, of Canada, and of the United States.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — I am rather amused again, how one speaker after the other from the other side of the House have stood in their place and criticized the present leader of the Liberal party, as they criticized myself, when I led the Liberal party, and as they criticized my predecessor. And when we are going about Saskatchewan and other parts of the country doing our duty, as the leader of an opposition group, pointing out the

weaknesses of the government that sit opposite, pointing out the problems that exist in our province and that the government has refused to deal with, then we have been told by members opposite, that why we are running down our province, that we would do anything to prevent the industrialization of our province, that we would do anything to prevent the growth of the province of Saskatchewan, and to prevent Saskatchewan from prosperity, Mr. Speaker, people who say and do these things, in my opinion, don't deserve to be members of this House. These people are not even honest with themselves. I wonder how many of my friends who sit opposition happened to watch a television program last night, in which the Premier of this province, the leader of the New Democratic Party in Canada was the speaker. You know I think he used some of my notes, only he replaced the word Canada, where I had used the word Saskatchewan.

Premier Douglas: — I would never stoop to that.

Mr. McDonald: — This little fellow over here — you couldn't stoop to it, because you could get that low without stooping.

Premier Douglas: — The only notes you ever had were by Staines.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . that he and his colleagues had used, in regard to myself, present and past leaders and other members of the Liberal party. This is exactly what he was doing last night. Canada is a terrible place according to the new leader of the democratic party. I don't know why you and I stay here, Mr. Speaker. You know there are no walls in Canada, preventing you and I, or anyone else from emigrating from this country, and if the people of Canada take to heart what my hon. friend said last night, there will be as many people leaving Canada as there are leaving East Germany. But I don't think people are going to be fooled by his arguments. But, Mr. Speaker, this is the tool of any party that is in opposition. If we, an opposition, were to give the credit to governments that the backbenchers give to that government, there would be absolutely nothing done. This government only moves as fast as the opposition has forced them to move over the years.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — Of course there are some ministers in this government that even refuse to move no matter how much criticism and opposition

faces them. And of course the Minister of Agriculture is a typical example in this particular category.

I want to refer to some of the remarks that have been made by speakers opposite during this debate. And this is going to take some time, because there is a lot of misquotations, a lot of expressions that were used, and many stories have been told that are not according to the facts, and there are some misconceptions and misunderstandings, knowingly or otherwise. I can start with the address of the Premier.

He started out and he was going to give the Liberal party and the Liberal opposition some kindly advice. Well no doubt the Premier has been consulted over the years by many people who were seeking advice, and I have reason to believe that some of that advice has been good advice, but the Liberal party and the Liberal opposition do not need any advice from the Premier, kindly or otherwise. He has taken on new responsibilities, and I think that the sooner he devotes his full time and energy to those responsibilities the better it will be for both his party and for mine. I know that there are, not only Liberals that are condemning the Premier for not taking over the responsibilities of the leadership of the new party, I notice that even some of his party who now sit in the House of Commons are complaining because the Premier is not there to give them leadership. And they are saying that they have to read the morning papers to find out what the leader of the new party's stand is on many issues. It is a funny thing to me, Mr. Speaker, that this new party, after this glorious convention that we've heard so much about, surely they adopted some program for the guidance of the members we now have in the House of Commons, but apparently not. Apparently their program is made and announced once in a while by the Premier, when he is not busy looking after the affairs of Saskatchewan, apparently he gives some direction to what he hopes some day will be his colleagues in the House of commons.

The second point that the Premier mentioned during his remarks was that in this new medical plan that we are now discussing, that the cost of this plan would not be new costs, but it would be a different distribution of old costs. Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with that statement. When you first hear the statement you are inclined to agree with it, but after you give some thought to it, I don't think it is in accordance with the actual facts. Today as you know, and I know, the costs of the medical bills are paid by people who are ill, or by some insuring company

that they hold insurance with. The Premier has indicated to this House and to the people of Saskatchewan that under this proposal that is now being made to the House, that all of the people are going to share the costs of those people who are ill. The Minister of Education went further. He said that he is going to play Robin Hood — that he is going to take from the rich and give it to the poor. Well now, unfortunately or otherwise, conditions in Saskatchewan and in Canada are not the same today as they were in the days of Robin Hood and Sherwood Forest. I have no doubt that when Robin Hood took the purse of the wealthy and distributed it among the poor, that was the end of the need. But that is not the case today, Mr. Speaker, and for this government or any other government to say that they can level taxes according to the ability to pay, is a false argument, for the following reasons.

Most of those people who have high incomes are people that derive their incomes in such a manner that if their taxes are increased so that part of their income is taken away from them, they can adjust their income and recoup their losses. But most of the people in the lower income brackets are not in this position. Now there is only one taxpayer in Saskatchewan or in Canada and that is the consumer. Those people with little or no income, those people with medium incomes — the great bulk of them today are spending all of their incomes to maintain themselves. Those people with high incomes, in many instances, spend ten, fifteen or twenty per cent of their income to take care of their day-to-day living costs. What has promoted living costs to the position that we now find them? The highest in the history of this nation. Taxation, Mr. Speaker, is what has placed it there. That is what has increased the cost of living — it is the multiplicity of taxes that are imposed on our taxpayers by municipal, provincial, and federal governments. This idea that my friends across the way have of playing Robin Hood is neither practical nor feasible, and the people who are going to pay for this health plan are the consumers of Canada, or the consumers of the province of Saskatchewan, and of course those people with low incomes will be paying taxes on all of their income, those people with high incomes will be paying a consumer tax on maybe ten or fifteen per cent. These people may think that they can bring this about — they cannot. I know that they believe that this is not possible but they hope to convince the majority of people who are in the low income brackets, which is the majority of people in our province and in our country, that they are going to receive something that the wealthy are paying for. This is neither practical nor feasible. The people who will be paying the majority of this shot, irrespective

of what type of new taxes are imposed to pay for the plan are the medium and low-income bracket people.

I was also a little surprised at another statement the Premier made, when he was referring to a document that came into the hands of the Leader of the Opposition outlining what certain tax increases, the amount of revenue it would produce to the province of Saskatchewan. The Premier said that there was only one place that this could come from . . .

Premier Douglas: — I said there were two places.

Mr. McDonald: — Two places, I beg your pardon, then he said that the receiver of stolen property was just as guilty as the person who stole it. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the information that I have is correct, and I have every reason to believe that it is, then the Premier was the receiver of certain stolen property before the members of the medical health commission were appointed and the staff that was made available to them. I think he should think this one over before charges are made.

Reference has been made to means tests. This government, and it has been pointed out by previous speakers, have a record that is equalled by no other government in Canada with regard to the imposition of a means test. This government and the members who sit opposite time and time again have been asked, either to amend the regulations imposed under that means test, or to do away with the means test in its entirety. Without exception they have stood in their places and voted against it. The way they voted against extending help to the farmers here this evening.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — Another remark of the Premier was that health is too important to be left to the average individual's financial position as to whether he can afford it or not. When did he arrive at this momentous decision? Has this happened in the last year? This has always been the case, Mr. Speaker, as far as I know. The Premier and his government have been here for eighteen years, but when he decides to leave the province, then he recognizes this fact, and now he wants something done about it, in a short space of a few months. I am one of those who believe that the providing of complete medical services for our people, under an insurance plan, is a wise and a proper thing for governments to do. This government has enjoyed the pleasure of office for eighteen years, and

could have implemented this plan any time during the regular session of the legislature in those eighteen years. Why have they not proceeded with it? Why is it so important at the moment? Why did this happen all at once? I think everyone knows the answer, Mr. Speaker. The Premier wanted a red herring in the last election. He wouldn't dare go to the people with the record of he and his government as an issue, so he wanted to cloud the issue, he wanted to get a whipping board, confuse the electorate — and hold the election on an issue that should not have been an issue in that election. It should have been implemented by he and his government many, many years ago.

The Premier went on during his remarks, and he wanted to know what group the Liberals supported. Liberals don't support any group. The Liberals of this country down through history have made their services available to people from every walk of life.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — From the top to the bottom, and the day that they change their attitude, I for one will no longer be a Liberal.

Premier Douglas: — . . . Go back to the Tories.

Mr. McDonald: — Well I might even do that. You know you and I both were Tories.

Premier Douglas: — No, I never was a Tory. That is one thing I haven't got on my conscience.

Mr. McDonald: — The only thing is I came right from the Tory party into the Liberal party, and I have no apologies to make. I am just as convinced today, more convinced, than I was the day I made the move, that I made the right move. I didn't shilly-shally around with two or three other parties in between. I didn't go and ask for or seek the nomination of two or three parties at once. When I made the decision I told the then leader of the Liberal party that I was going to run as a Liberal. He said, 'you shouldn't do it you'll get trimmed' and I said 'Well I don't think I will but I'll take a chance.' But I am glad I made that move and I'm glad that I belong to a party that is not a class party. I'm glad that I belong to a party that is not dictated to by any one pressure group in Canada.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — The very foundation of the Liberal party, down through history has been broad enough to attract people from every walk of life and from every income group.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — The idea of being the mouthpiece of the vested interests, sometimes when I look at my pocketbook I think it might be a good idea. The Liberal party has no more interest in the vested interests than my friends who sit opposite. The Liberal party, to my knowledge, never made a loan of \$16 million to some vested interest, some personal friend in Texas.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — Three hundred and eighty million.

Mr. McDonald: — Some promoter. It's never been done in the history of the Liberal party.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Did you never hear about the pipeline?

Mr. McDonald: — Certainly I heard about the pipe line, and my hon. friends can sit there and grin, but if we had a government and ministers in a government in Canada today, who had the courage to put into effect policies and programs and projects that would put the people of the nation back to work, then they would be worthy of the support of the people of Canada.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — If it had not been for the good business sense and the stout heart of men like C.D. Howe, this country would have found itself in the doldrums in which we now find ourselves, a very few short years after the close of the last world war.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — It is in the doldrums nevertheless.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . but because we had people who were prepared to do what was right for Canada irrespective of what the politicians wanted

to do, that is the only reason that Canada prospered, produced full employment, produced a good standard of living for people in every walk of life in Canada, and I'm proud that I had the opportunity of associating with people of that type.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — Then Mr. Thatcher was criticized for having made a trip to Europe. Well Mr. Thatcher discussed this with myself and I am sure many of his colleagues, before he ever went to Europe, and he said 'you know what this outfit are going to say — look at Thatcher, becomes the leader of the Liberal party and all of a sudden he's over in Europe.' In my opinion Mr. Thatcher had a responsibility and a duty to perform.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Please refer to the hon. member as "hon. member."

Mr. McDonald: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I get carried away when I am speaking about a personal friend. The Leader of the Opposition had a duty, and I told him so, to go to Europe. He explained part of his reasons for that trip, and I think ably and well. The advancement of many countries in Europe, since the last world war has astounded people who know anything throughout the world. There must be reasons for that. Governments must have played an active part in the promotion and rebuilding of the nations that were so devastated. Industry has grown quicker in Europe during the last twenty years, than it had ever grown in any part of the world in history today. I repeat, there must be reasons for it. We would like to see the same growth in Saskatchewan, so I think the Leader of the Opposition was well-advised to go to Europe, or any place else, where he might be able to acquaint himself with the moves that were being made by businesses and s in order to promote the activity and the growth and the welfare that is being provided in these nations a few short years after they had been devastated by war.

There is a great difference between the Leader of the Opposition going to Europe and paying his own expenses, than my friends who sit opposite who go to Europe repeatedly at the expense of the taxpayers.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — Some of them went over there and even went to school to equip

themselves for their retirement from public life at the expense of the taxpayers, not at the expense of themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that not only the Leader of the Opposition and cabinet ministers and some individuals, private members should make an effort to travel more. I think travel is a wonderful thing to broaden one's mind. The people who are dealing with public matters should acquaint themselves with what is going on, not only in the country to the south of us our neighbour the United States, but the things that are happening throughout the world, and making a better place in which to live. It is very difficult to learn much of what goes on in Britain, France or Germany while we're sitting here in Saskatchewan, and I would encourage every member of this legislature to take every opportunity to travel in Saskatchewan yes, in Canada, in America, and in as many countries of the world as they can afford to. This is good for the individual and I think it is good for Saskatchewan.

The Premier again said that the Liberal party should get off the fence in regard to medical care. The Liberal party, Mr. Speaker, have been off the fence since prior to the last election as far as medical care is concerned and the program in Saskatchewan. The Liberal party was the first party to announce a medical care program in Saskatchewan prior to the last provincial election. We are on record as to where we stand. Mr. Speaker, I want to be fair and go further than that. I do not honestly believe that there are very many people in Saskatchewan of any political faith, who are opposed to prepaid medical insurance. I think most people in our province, be they Conservatives, Liberals, CCF, or Social Credit or Communist who are opposed to prepaid medical insurance. I think this is true. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that there is a great divergence of opinion in the type of medical insurance that would be best suited to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I recall that during the last election campaign, when the Premier was outlining his party's principles that he expounded and here they are. First — it should be the prepayment principle. In other words you pay the premium in advance, insure yourself; that it should have universal coverage; that it should provide a high quality of service; that it should be administered by the Department of Public Health; but most important of all, that it should be acceptable to both those providing and those receiving the service.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Plebiscite . . .

Mr. McDonald: — No, I don't think the Premier mentioned that. But he did say that it should be acceptable to both those providing and receiving the service. Now, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in a peculiar position, when headlines like this appear in the daily press: "Doctors say No." I don't think this ever needed to happen and I do not believe that a successful plan can be brought into operation unless the fifth point, as expressed by the Premier during the last election, is in existence when a plan is brought into being. I want to repeat that I do not believe that it was ever necessary for the doctor animosity that apparently exists now.

I want to go back a few years, Mr. Speaker, not to the last election, but to the election preceding that, to the election of 1956, and to the regular session of this House of 1955. The Liberal opposition at that time made a proposal to this government and I made the proposal myself, that what was needed in the province of Saskatchewan at that time was a provincial local government conference to discuss this issue, along with all of the other issues that confronted Saskatchewan at that time, and I say today that they are still with us. No such conference to my knowledge was ever held. After the 1956 election some representatives of local government and a lot of other people were invited into this chamber (well I don't know what you'd call it, the word that I would use would be un-parliamentary) — the members of the legislature were invited as guests to sit behind the rail and say nothing. This, Mr. Speaker, was supposed to be in the minds of the gentlemen that sit opposite, a provincial local government conference. The only thing that emanated out of these discussions has been the suggestion that we should scrap all local government and bring in a county or modified county. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the issues that should have been discussed. Medical services; the school question; the question of financing hospitals; the question of building more mental hospitals; more geriatric centres — there is a thousand and one questions that should have been discussed and dealt with and policies brought into being and into effect by this date.

This government was not prepared in 1955 or 1956 to take local government into their conference, and they are not prepared to do it today.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I am as convinced as I'm standing here that if this government had taken local government into their conferences, made a decision as to what type of taxes were going to be allowed to rise; divided those tax revenue with local governments, that we could have had a prepaid medical care plan in effect today, with the complete and wholehearted commission-operation of the medical profession. I oppose the position that we now find ourselves in. I don't know how you can provide a medical care plan if the doctors are opposed to you. It would be like trying to keep law and order and fight the police force at the same time.

Surely we are not in such a rush that these differences cannot be worked out, so that we can go forward with the backing of the general public, and the backing of the medical profession, hospital boards, nurses and all of those people associated with medical care, so that we can provide a service for our people that the people are going to welcome with open arms, and that those people who have to provide the service are going to be willing and prepared indeed to get going with the job. This is not the case.

I am disturbed because the government has not seen fit to wait for the final report of the Thompson commission before proceeding with this plan. There is more to providing medical care for our people than just, as the Premier says, the only difference will be is that now the government will pay for your medical care instead of you paying. Medical care goes much further than that. What about our mental hospitals? Are we going to take \$20 million or whatever is necessary to provide medical services and disregard the mentally ill? When these people were left out, under certain payments that were paid by the federal government of Canada to the province of Saskatchewan, you will recall the holler that came forth and emanated from the people who sit opposite. But now they are guilty of the exact same practice. They are saying to the mentally ill, 'Oh well you've got some other kind of illness, you don't come under this plan.'

What about the aged, the crippled and the maimed? Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that of the last dozen cases that were brought to my attention, and my help was solicited to have these people placed in geriatric homes throughout the province, twelve of them out of twelve died before they ever got into a geriatric centre. Are we going to say to these people, "Well you don't come under this plan."

October 19, 1961

Mr. Speaker, all of the problems should be included in any medical care plan that is worth its salt to the people of Saskatchewan or any place else. These people are ill. There are not adequate facilities in Saskatchewan to take care of them. I think they are just as important as the patients that are ill because of other causes. One could go on and include many, many groups and many, many health problems that are being excluded under this proposed plan because of the rush to get it through. I repeat, you've been here eighteen years, why didn't you do something? Now you have to do it in a few short weeks to release the Premier onto the poor and the innocent of Canada.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — Well, after waiting eighteen years on this government, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it would hurt us to wait another few weeks until the final report of the Thompson commission is made available. Not made available to the proposed commission that is supposed to administer this plan, but made available to the members of this House. This is where that report should be made available, and I think in all sincerity, it should be made available to us even before it is made available to the Toronto Star, even if the Toronto Star is the mouthpiece of the new party. I don't think they should come ahead of the members of this legislature.

I want to refer to some of the other statements that have been made by the members opposite. You know I was rather amused when the member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) was making his contribution, and he talked about many things, most of them he didn't know anything about, but one of them was a pulp mill, and I never thought for one moment that anyone on the other side of the House would ever mention the word. You know we've had a lot of discussions about pulp mills, ever since I became interested in politics. We've been promised enough mills by the other side of the House . . .

Premier Douglas: — . . . switch from potash to pulp mills.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . that if they were all built, Mr. Speaker, there would be no unemployment in Saskatchewan. We would be importing labour from Europe and all over the world just to cut pulp for us. When I led the Liberal party I used to have a lot to say about pulp, because a lot of these promises were made when I

happened to hold that position, and the one promise was made on the eve of the 1956 election. Oh this was a grand announcement. You recall it, Mr. Speaker. Why the headlines, instead of having just one big headline like this, there were three or four lines, pictures of the Premier and the then Provincial Treasurer, and their colleagues Campbell from Vancouver sitting in the office signing the document. I happened to be in Wilkie with my friend the member from Wilkie, making a speech, and either he made a good one or I did because he is back, but one of the things that I said at that meeting, I challenged the Premier to make this document which he had signed with Mr. Campbell public, and I said if the Premier refuses to do that I will be my last five-cent piece that we don't get a pulp mill. Do you know what the Premier said. I will read it: he was making a speech at Kenaston. You know he used to flit around the province quite a bit in those days, but now he's on wagon wheels, but in this speech at Kenaston here is what the Premier said and I quote:

“Liberal leader A.H. McDonald came out with a petulant request for the government to make public the agreement made with the company which is to build the pulp mill at Prince Albert. The Liberal leader had stated at Unity, Friday night that if the agreement were not made public before the election I'll bet my last dime that the mill will never be built. Did you ever hear a more childish outburst?”

Childish outburst said the Premier, speaking to the poor innocent people at Kenaston. A more childish outburst. We have had seventeen childish outbursts with the Premier and his colleagues with regard to a pulp mill, and we're further away today from getting a pulp mill than we've ever been. Our neighbouring provinces are building pulp mills. There was an announcement here two or three days ago of another mill being built in Alberta. But just to hear a pulp mill, I have said it before and I'll say it again, that a pulp mill will never be built in the province of Saskatchewan as long as that man is the Minister of Natural Resources.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — Same thing about potash and oil.

Mr. McDonald: — Then my friend went on and talked about the cement plant in Regina, the member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), and you know I wouldn't think that they would ever mention the cement plant in Regina. You know the history of the cement plant, Mr. Speaker. It was started here initially by those people that are now promoting the steel mill, Mr. Sharpe. I imagine that the Provincial Treasurer and the people that sit opposite can read a balance sheet, and maybe I am giving them a little more credit than I ought to, but I would think that anyway they could look down to the bottom and find out how much profit came from the cement plant on their Canadian operations. If they haven't looked at it I would suggest that they do, because out of those total profits, \$340 thousand of them were made at this cement plant out on the outskirts of Regina at the expense of every user of cement in this province.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, this is the only cement plant that I know of that has no factory door price. Do you know that the cost of a barrel of cement to the consumer in the city of Regina is higher than any place else on the North American continent. You will recall when Mr. Fines was trying to soften up the opposition and to get us in a frame of mind where we were prepared to loan some money to this business, why he said, "This is going to be a wonderful thing for Regina and Saskatchewan." The Provincial Treasurer said this was going to employ so many people; it's going to bring down the cost of housing; and by the time he finished I was even convinced. But this hasn't been the case. A bag of cement costs more in Regina today than when the minister made his speech. The only effect he had was he upped the price of cement. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, the price of cement here today is the Winnipeg price, or the Alberta price or the Edmonton price plus the freight? Some of our contractors have even got more sense than the people who sit opposite. They wouldn't put up with this and they're bringing cement into Regina from the city of Winnipeg. This is a fantastic arrangement. I wish the Minister of Agriculture were here, because he is doing the same thing today. Now we have Canada cement trucks drawing cement from Winnipeg to Regina and Saskatchewan cement trucks drawing cement from Regina to Winnipeg.

Premier Douglas: — This is the free enterprise you like, isn't it?

Mr. McDonald: — This is this planned economy. And you know, the Minister of Agriculture . . .

Premier Douglas: — You're really mixed up now.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . for the amount of money that he has spent in freight assistance on moving feed. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I were responsible for what is going on in Saskatchewan today in this regard, I'd crawl in an ink well and pull down the lid rather . . .

An Hon. Member: — You could make it to.

Mr. McDonald: — This Minister of Agriculture has implemented a program that pays the freight for truckers to move Alberta hay down to Moosomin and Manitoba hay out to Swift Current. You see loads of hay going west — zoom, zoom, zoom — Manitoba hay. When they've gone by then there are loads going east — zoom, zoom, zoom — Alberta hay. The minister says if you get it within 25 miles of home we won't pay anything, but if you go to the Yukon after it we'll pay the freight. The only attributes this man apparently has is that he can talk to Alvin Hamilton. He said 'I told Alvin.'

Premier Douglas: — Alvin must have told you too.

Mr. McDonald: — The only deals that were ever made were deals between Alvin and you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's go on to some of the other speeches from the other side of the House. Well there's a lot of them here, and I suppose most of them are not worthy of even answering.

An Hon. Member: — Oh we've had so much why not a little more.

Mr. McDonald: — Well if you want some more we'll give it to you. You know the member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) when he built up to his remarks about medical care, he said you know there is certain groundwork that has to be laid. They couldn't bring in medical care until some other things had been taken care of. Hospital beds and other things had to be provided. Mr. Speaker, there is a lack of hospital beds in most of the communities that I know anything about in Saskatchewan

October 19, 1961

today. In my hometown of Moosomin we have a lack of hospital beds. If they could hang sick people up, they would have them hanging on pegs in there, because there are no beds to put them in.

Premier Douglas: — There are a lot more beds than there were a few years ago.

Mr. McDonald: — When I was a patient in the hospital here in the city of Regina; a lack of beds there. We have money to bring in new plans but we cannot operate the ones that are already in existence. Hospital boards throughout the province have a deficit and nobody to pay for it. Why didn't the member for Wadena see that these problems were taken care of before we advanced. I was going to refer to free cancer and mental treatment, but after the speech of my colleague the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) surely to goodness the government and some of those people who sit opposite now have it through their heads that we provided the free cancer treatment in Saskatchewan. I consider it an honour to represent the constituency now that was represented by the individual who brought free cancer treatment to Saskatchewan, the late Dr. Munroe. I give credit to Dr. Munroe and to the Anderson government for the foresight that they had in bringing this service to our province.

Let us give credit where credit was due. Dr. Munroe was a Conservative and a good one, a personal friend of my family, an excellent family physician, an excellent Minister of Public Health, and I think he was a credit to the province of Saskatchewan and to the people of this province.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — The next item on these scraps of paper, Mr. Speaker, is entitled "Brock" and I think that should give me leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.