

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Fourteenth Legislature
18th Day

Friday, November 17th, 1961

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

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I believe there is a great deal of confusion in the minds of some of the people in the province today pertaining to a question I asked the other day of the Minister of Agriculture. May be some of the people in the province haven't it straightened out as to whether the government intends to extend the deadline beyond November for the assistance in the movement of fodder for livestock. Now I think some think that the answer you gave was December 1, was that right?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I made my reply very clear, I think. The date is extended to January 31st.

QUESTION RE: RETURN NO. 12

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to ask the Premier — on October 16 I moved for a return No. 12. Would it be possible that this information could be made available to us latter on in the day.

Premier Lloyd: — It is a return, Mr. Speaker, which called for certain information in regard to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. The information is not available as yet. I think it is because of the rather lengthy nature of it. It is unlikely it would be made available by this time. We will check and if it is possible to obtain it we will do so.

The Assembly then resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McFarlane:

November 17, 1961

“That this Assembly deplores the failure of the Government to establish and maintain adequate fodder reserve banks for the feeding of cattle and recommends to the consideration of this Government that immediate provision be made for establishing and maintaining fodder reserve banks in this Province.”

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Thurston:

That all the words after the word “Assembly” be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

“commends the Provincial Government for its prompt and effective emergency program in meeting the severe drought situation and its long term policies directed towards solving chronic fodder shortages in Saskatchewan.”

Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood): —Mr. Speaker, in the dying hours of this legislature, I realize that a lot of members on both sides of the House are keeping their fingers crossed hoping that I don't speak too long. I will not make a promise that I will not go over three hours. I am sure that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) will appreciate that.

Mr. McFarlane: — I don't think he can speak for three hours.

Mr. Meakes: — Just what did this motion say and how do we judge the truth or the falseness of a statement other than by comparison. Has this government been negligent in assisting the farmers of this province in a time of drought — those farmers who needed feed and fodder for their cattle? I couldn't help but think about other days when we had drought in this province. I go back to the year 1937 and that year was the only year, in our area, that we really suffered from drought. I go back to those days, in which at that time my father was a municipal secretary, and I was a young man living with him on the farm, but at the same time driving a livery. It used to be my job many times, to drive people who were sent out from the government who were supposed to help and assist the people of that area at that time. I remember, Mr. Speaker, the political heelers I drove at that time, because that is all they were. I stand here without fear of contradiction because as I say I rode with them and I heard their conversation and I heard their comments after.

In another debate, at one time or other in this House the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) talked about if you were a Liberal you got a certain type of treatment and if you weren't you got another. I can say that that is what happened in those days. I can remember that at that time we had quite a large herd of cattle and we were forced to reduce that herd. There was nothing done to try and save that herd — in fact we came down from a herd of over 50 head to 8 cows, and at that time the prices became so low that you pretty near had to tie a \$10 bill onto the end of the cow to pay for its freight to Winnipeg.

I remember my dad shipping 5 head of cattle that weighed 42 hundred and some pounds. The cheque was for \$47 and some cents, after the freight was taken off. Yes, and I remember in that same year driving through southern Saskatchewan through an area of the province that my colleague from Bengough remembers, and I remember seeing the terrific state of affairs of those people at that time. Through those same years I remember the wagons with tents covering the wagons — a cow tied behind
...

Mr. Thatcher: — On a point of order. All this is very interesting but what has it got to do with establishing a fodder reserve for this year. It is very interesting I am sure, but let's get down to the point.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe that it is the hon. member's intention to make a comparison with the type of program which is spoken of in the amendment compared to what has been done before.

Mr. Meakes: — Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the right to speak on both the motion and the amendment, have I not. I assured my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition that I wouldn't go on too long — that I wouldn't go over three hours. If he will just be patient for a moment or two, I won't burden him too long.

Mr. Thatcher: — We should have stayed in committee.

Mr. Meakes: — I want to say this, that this is the only way that you can compare what was done this year — whether this was a job done this year or whether it was a good job — this is the only way of making decisions by comparison. I suggest that this government this year did something about seeing that the cattle did not

November 17, 1961

leave the farms. Seeing that there was a fodder bank — fodder banks in the proper place, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that the proper place for a fodder bank — down in an airport at Weyburn, or at some place over at Mossbank or at Last Mountain — a place for a fodder bank is in the feed lot and the feed yard of the farmer who has the livestock.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Meakes: — This is the place where a fodder reserve should be. Certainly this government, not only this year, but other years in their plan, and I think the Department of Agriculture deserves great credit for the encouragement the farmers have received in sowing grass in community pastures — co-operative pastures — all this has helped to stabilize feed so that this year there hasn't been a great loss of cattle — cattle that would go to market that would have pushed the market down.

I would like again, to put on the record, (I don't know if the Minister of Agriculture is going to speak) but I would like to put on the record of this House some of the things the Department of Agriculture of this government have done. There has been much talk of the shortage of water. Certainly there was a shortage of water in my constituency. If it hadn't been for the prompt action of the Department of Agriculture putting out a pumping outfit on May 3rd — the first one, May 16th — the second pumping outfit went out, June 24th — the third one went out, August 4th, — the fourth one went out, and August 5th — the 5th one went out. This was an emergency that kept the cattle on the farm.

I think one of the things that the Department of Agriculture did that was most opportune was when they threw a fear into the farmers and they made their announcement in the latter part of June about the feed shortage and the necessity of farmers cutting their cereal crops. This was another very important factor, Mr. Speaker. Their radio and TV programs pointing out that feed was going to be terribly hard to get — that this drought covered the biggest part of Saskatchewan, a lot of Alberta, Manitoba and also down in the States. This I know myself — these programs made me sit up and think — what are you going to do. Without hesitation we started cutting our cereal crops. Because of that we have feed in our feed lots.

I think, I for one could not allow this motion to come into the House without amendment, because this is one of those motions — you beat your wife. If you vote against it — it isn't right to beat your wife — you shouldn't have beaten your wife but you beat her anyway. Certainly this is one of

these motions. The amendment, moved by the member for Lumsden, I think, was a very good and a very necessary one.

As I promised, and I assured the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I was only going to speak a short time. I am not going to say any more because I realize that members on both sides of the House, are hoping on going home today. I realize there is another motion on the order paper, that possibly some members would like to speak to. I suggest that all members of this House should support this amendment, and oppose the original motion as it was.

Mr. Arthur Kluzak (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to just speak briefly on this amendment and I would like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture and his department for encouraging and suggesting to the farmers to cut some of the light crops for feed. Certainly a lot of these crops would have had no commercial value had they been cut for grain purposes, and they did supplement to a great part — part of the feed shortage in this province.

I would also like to commend the P.F.A.A. branch of the federal government for recognizing crops cut for feed as total crop failure for payment purposes. This also, I believe, encouraged the farmers to cut these crops for feed.

I went through my constituency quite thoroughly and I represent a constituency in the south-west, parts of which have had practically no crop for three consecutive years. It is an area where one would naturally expect to find a great shortage of feed. The livestock population in the last 10 years has practically doubled in this area. However, I found that there has been very little feed shipped into this area from outside sources.

The member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein), when he spoke on this resolution, mentioned that the Minister of Agriculture was looking for underground water, while he didn't know what to do with the surface water that had been encountered.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I don't think the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch has spoken in this debate. The hon. member speaking must speak to the amendment and not in regard to the debate on the motion itself. The amendment, only, is before the House at the present time.

Mr. Kluzak: — It was suggested that there was nothing being done with this water

that is encountered in dams. I would like to inform this House that in my constituency, I have four irrigation projects which have been sponsored by the Conservation and Development branch of the Department of Agriculture. One of these that I am going to speak on particularly is the one at Ponteix which consists of some one thousand acres of privately owned land. I had the opportunity this fall of being on a tour — a field day at this project. I was amazed at the amount of feed that these people are growing on this land. Some of this fodder — alfalfa was yielding up to 4 ½ tons an acre. I was one of the farmers there taking off a crop of oats that was yielding 120 bushels, while just up on the bench there was no crop. This project alone this year yielded some 27 hundred tons of alfalfa. This is where we are getting our feed in Saskatchewan today that we didn't get under the old Liberal government.

Now e have another one thousand acre project and it is crown owned and it is cut out in plots and I believe there are 28 farmers in that area that have plots in this project. This project also produced this year some two thousand tons of fodder and they couldn't take a second crop off it and I am sure from now on this project will double this yield. We have the Vidora project which is also in a very sub marginal area. These areas I speak of are areas where people just couldn't stay if they didn't have this type of assurance for winter feed. This project at Vidora this year produced 35 hundred tons of alfalfa plus a great amount of grain. These are very worthwhile projects that are being sponsored under our Department of Agriculture. I defy anyone to say that this department is not doing anything in the line of supplying feed to farmers. When we have such projects in our area as this, we don't have to worry about feed banks. We know that these projects will produce.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I must point out to the hon. member that he is not at this time able to discuss the matter of feed banks. I believe so far he has been discussing the effective emergency program of the government, which is quite in order. But the motion itself has to do with adequate fodder reserve banks, and is not under discussion at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is contended in the original motion that the government has been negligent with development of fodder reserves. This amendment commends the government on what it has done to counter the suggestion made in the original motion. I think the hon. member is absolutely right in speaking about fodder reserves. This was what the original resolution specifically mentions.

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, I believe it has been your ruling that we speak on the amendment first and when this has been disposed of speak on the original motion. Now that was the understanding on this side of the House. Is that not correct, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — That is true. As I earlier pointed out I believe that the member speaking has been quite in order in referring to what has been done the provincial government in regard to the emergency program because that is in the amendment. I suppose in that regard the preparing of fodder reserves is possibly part of it, but the hon. member speaking to the amendment is not at liberty, to discuss the establishment — the deploring of the lack of action of the government in regard to reserves or otherwise. The discussion of maintenance and the establishment of adequate fodder reserves for the feeding of cattle is not before the House at this time. The government's program is, so you can make a distinction in regard to these things.

Premier Lloyd: — On a point of order, I would like to ask a question — if the establishment of fodder reserve banks was part of the government program in meeting the drought situations would it then become a proper topic for discussion.

Mr. Speaker: — I would say so.

Mr. Kluzak: — Mr. Speaker, I also wish to add that the Vidora area, which is very sub marginal, that I have visited farms there in the summertime and I have seen quite a lot of feed left over that will carry them on to the next year and of course they are adding to it. They grow more feed, in other words, than what they can utilize in one year.

Now these opportunities for these projects have laid there for years and years, I am sure, but the Liberal government didn't have the insight or the initiative to develop them like we have under this government. I certainly will support the amendment.

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, when we reply in this debate do we have to reply to the amendment or can we discuss the amendment — if I speak now would I be closing the debate?

Mr. Speaker: — No, I would assume now that you were speaking to the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He can speak on the amendment and then

he can close the debate as the mover of the motion, but of course he can't play the same record again.

Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — I was very interested in the remarks made by the speakers to the amendment and I must say, Mr. Speaker, after listening to them I haven't found out in any instance of the speakers who have taken part — the mover of the original amendment, and speakers who have followed, where they have found any instance where they could commend the government on the establishment of the prompt and efficient emergency program to meet the severe drought situation, the long term policies directed toward the solving of chronic fodder shortages in Saskatchewan. It is very obvious that no mention has been made by speakers who have taken part in this debate of fodder reserves. The only mention I heard of fodder reserves was by the last speaker. It only goes to substantiate some of the charges I originally made — that there has been no long term program for the establishment of these reserves and therefore no action has been taken in meeting this emergency.

I suggested earlier the measures I thought should have been taken. What I want to point out is this — it says that they commend the government for the long term policies that they have brought about to take care of this situation. During the summer when it appeared that we were going to have a very serious situation in regard to drought, and it appeared as though the government was going to have to give some aid to the farmers because of the lack of these reserves — because of the lack of a long-term program or even a short term program to take care of this situation, we found that there was no supply of hay in the province at that time. Then in a moment of desperation, the Minister of Agriculture issued a statement stating that the farmers could have access to the hay along the highway and the road allowances — the farmers could have the access to the hay and grass along the road allowances. Mr. Speaker, as far as government programs are concerned, as far as any measures set-up to prevent this situation, when it came to a climax, the only thing they could fall back on was the hay and grass along the road allowances.

In all sincerity, I ask the Minister of Agriculture, what type of a program was this? Down in the eastern area of the province, if you were to go out and cut the hay along the highways and road allowances, all you would get is about four bales of Russian Thistle and about six cartons of broken beer bottles. That was the type of a fodder reserve the government had at that time.

The mover of the amendment said that it was too bad that dairymen had to go to Alberta and he regretted that the Liberal party hadn't built the South Saskatchewan River Dam and what he was referring to at that time were the dairymen who had to go to Alberta to get sufficient hay and fodder for their herds for the winter. Mr. Speaker, if this government had, in their long-term programs or even a short-term program — if they had utilized reserves and water resources that were in the province at the present time to set up areas where they could grow and irrigate forage and fodder, as was mentioned by the last speaker, then possibly farmers wouldn't have to go to Alberta. To say that the South Saskatchewan River Dam should have been built and would have been available now is only evading the issue because there is nothing to take care of a situation such as we have at the present time for the next two or three years, even though work is going on on the South Saskatchewan River Dam. As far as the excuse is concerned there again, they have not provided anything to take care of the situation.

Then, of course, the mover of the amendment said that the Department of Agriculture had instructed the farmers to show summer fallow only. Mr. Speaker, in many cases if you listened to the experts you would be entirely wrong. It is fine for an expert after conditions have arisen to say this is what should have been done. In too many cases we have heard that. We have seen how farmers have suffered after listening to advice by experts — these so-called experts. I am going to give you another instance. It was only two or three years ago when the experts advised us not to grow durum wheat — they told us there would be no market for durum wheat, and advised the farmers not to grow durum wheat. Then what happened? the very next year there was a terrific demand for durum wheat because there was no durum wheat in the country. Then again last year there was a terrific demand for durum wheat, and it is going on in the future. To say that experts have advised them to sow summer fallow only that is no practical and efficient way of dealing with an agricultural crisis, especially after seeding has taken place, then you can't evade the issue on that.

The other statement, in trying to convince us on this side that the government has some long term policies — went back to 1937 — which is a favourite trick of the members on the opposite side — the members to your right, and said if you were a Liberal you got relief and if you weren't a Liberal you didn't. Mr. Speaker, to bring in issues like that to try and support a government feed program, I submit it is absolutely ridiculous. Too often we have listened to this type of thing in the House. It used to be the favorite statement of the

November 17, 1961

former Minister of Highways to say that at one time when they attended a meeting in the country there were 14 cars and found out that they were all P.F.R.A. individuals. What he didn't tell the people in this House is that not too many years ago, there was a meeting in my own constituency — there were 11 cars there, but 11 department officials — people went there to try and get an increase in their old age pensions, or supplementary pensions. It took 11 cars with 11 of a staff to tell these people they couldn't get it. Now I think that was no excuse to try and support an employee of this type.

Then they tried to suggest that in those times cattle prices were substantially lower than they are in the emergency we went through. Mr. Speaker, for any member on the government side to get up and try and indicate to this House, or the people of Saskatchewan that they are responsible for the high cattle prices in Saskatchewan at the present time, is absolutely ridiculous. It isn't the agricultural policy of this government that has kept up the cattle prices of this province, it isn't anything they have provided for the farmers that have kept them up. The only thing that has kept the prices of cattle in Saskatchewan, yes, and in western Canada, today is because of the terrific demand for feeder stock in the United States. In too many cases, year after year, these same people across the way have condemned policies, they have condemned personalities, and condemned everything practically within the United States. Then when we come to a period of economic distress, a period when we need the help on the farms to be able to sell our cattle we find that our best market for western cattle is still across the American border. So I suggest the only reason farmers of Saskatchewan today are enjoying a high price for their cattle and the only reason they are not in a economic hitch and having to sell their cattle at sacrifice prices, is because of the terrific demand for those cattle in the United States. In the States they had terrific corn crops, and they are utilizing their reserves and their soil banks for the feeding of cattle.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what this amendment says, regardless of the fact that they are trying to commend the provincial government for something they have not done, they had better start thinking right away in terms of doing something for the next 2 years to try and sustain and protect the 1,900,000 head of cattle we have in this province at the present time. That I think is the main issue today. If they are only gong to depend on the policies they have had this year to try and carry them through another year, then the people of Saskatchewan might as well go out of the cattle industry.

It is all very well to say to us — sow summerfallow. If next year is the same as this year, there won't even be a spear of grass in summer fallow. It is all very well to say that we have 2 or 3 little areas down in the south-west part of the province where we have a reserve of fodder at the present time. If we have another year next year, the same as this year, the little amount of fodder that is down there will only sustain a few local herds. When they condemn the past government of this province, under the conditions they had to operate under during the 10 years of the drought stricken thirties, at that time as I pointed out earlier, we had to go into Manitoba — we had to go into Alberta, and we had to get hay in the United States. I suggest to the minister and to members of the government that this year may have only been the first year of a crisis, but what they have to start planning on and start planning on now is something to try and preserve this cattle population in case we have 3, 4, or 5 years of similar climatic conditions — as they had last year. That is why we on this side of the House and those of us who are farmers, those of us who want to try and sustain the large cattle population of 1,900,000 or 2 million head of cattle. We want some assurances that if we are going to go through climatic conditions such as those we have had this year that we will be able to sustain at least a herd that we can get by a drought period on.

I suggest that if the markets in the United States ever crumble, then you may come to the point where you will go down to a cent a pound for cattle — as some of the members across the way tried to indicate. As long as the only salvation for our cattle industry today is the willingness of the American farmer to come up and buy our stock and feeder types of cattle, Mr. Speaker, I will not support the amendment.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I will have any great difficulty in answering the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane), who spoke against the amendment and for the original motion. If any evidence was needed of more support for the original motion, he made a perfect demonstration of that in speaking against the amendment.

There are two points which stand out in this debate and in regard to this particular matter. In 1937, Mr. Speaker, he said quite rightly, that we imported into this province some 500 thousand tons of fodder from outside sources of supply. He also stated that we had built up no fodder reserves in this province. I want to reply to those two propositions, Mr. Speaker. First of all . . .

November 17, 1961

Mr. Speaker: — Those things I believe were said in regard to fodder reserves when the hon. member was moving the original motion, unless I am mistaken. I do not believe that is under consideration at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am speaking in support of the amendment which commends the government, rather than condemns the government for building fodder reserves. My contention is that we have done all of these things and that the original motion has no justification.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is quite in order in regard to fodder reserves in pointing out their relation in regard to the long-term policies or the effective emergency programs. That is what is under discussion at the present time. To go back and discuss the fodder reserves separately apart from the amendment could not be in order.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to this amendment. The amendment being the opposite to the original motion commends the provincial government for its prompt and effective emergency program . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — We know what it does Toby . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . in meeting the drought situation and its long term policies directed towards solving chronic fodder shortages in Saskatchewan.

I'm first of all going to speak in connection with the latter part of the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and this is what I was doing in the first place. Putting it this way I suppose I am in order.

Mr. Speaker, when I assumed the portfolio of agriculture in this province, I noted then the almost complete absence of any field staff in the agricultural representative field. I could see no facilities or no government agency that would assume the responsibility for irrigation development, for dry land reclamation development or for drainage reclamation. There was no such organization in the provincial Department of Agriculture. The provincial Department of Agriculture, prior to 1944 did not develop any land for irrigation in this province, nor did they develop any land for fodder production or pasture production in this province. None whatever, Mr. Speaker! They had no facilities, they had no equipment of any kind to do it. There was no organization whatever, Mr. Speaker. We had to build an organization from the very start, not only in the field of extension by painstakingly building up, not only an ag. rep. service but a complimentary local agricultural committee service, supplementary to the ag. rep. service.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) well knows this. There was a complete absence of any policies of assistance to farmers and groups of farmers who had been organized co-operatively and could develop fodder projects or pasture projects. There were none of these programs available. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley ought to know. I told him if he should take an annual report of the provincial Department of Agriculture now, and compare it to 1943, if he wants factual evidence, but the man doesn't want factual evidence.

I am not going to talk long, I don't have to, Mr. Speaker, but what I have to say are facts on the basis of the programs developed by the provincial Department of Agriculture over the years — let's look at some of the results. This year it is generally accepted was just as dry as 1937. In 1937 —

Mr. Danielson: — Don't talk nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: —Yes the hon. member, before he took his seat, he almost expressed the wish that another year would be a dry year. The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) said in this House that we haven't seen anything yet. Just get a few more dry years and he said it very gleefully as though he'd welcome that so this government would be embarrassed and so they could claim the proposition that we have built up no fodder reserves. It is a mighty good argument because I had a representative in his constituency. I suppose one of these hopped up characters that called me over the phone and took sheer delight in the fact that the municipalities had ordered 30 thousand gallons of grasshopper chemicals in one day and he said — now you're up against it — now you're on the spot. Burn and sizzle will you. This is the kind of propaganda and the kind of people and mentalities that they develop in the rural areas.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! There is a point of order being raised.

Mr. McFarlane: — I wasn't sure . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am sure he hasn't a point of order but I will sit down anyway.

Mr. McFarlane: — I wasn't sure whether he said that person was in my constituency or . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No. In the constituency of the hon. member for Arm River.

November 17, 1961

Mr. Danielson: — He has brought my constituency into the debate. I think he should give me the name of the municipality where this person resides.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes I'll do that. The rural municipality of Craik. I don't know the gentlemen's name.

Mr. Danielson: — One of the best CCFers in the province of Saskatchewan.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! the hon. member is not taking part in the debate at the present time.

Mr. Snedker: — On a point of order. I think it would be quite in order to demand the name of the person he is referring to. He is referring to a person in debate in this House and I think it is quite in order for members in this House to demand to know who said this.

Mr. Danielson: — That gentleman spoke when he was talking to his friend and this is why he was so free with his language.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — This is not a point of order, but another one of those imaginary, illusionary assumptions that the hon. members opposite like to make. I said the particular gentleman who called me was a resident of the R.M. of Craik.

Mr. Thatcher: — You said he was hopped up.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . I don't know his name. I don't even know his name because he was so tight that he could hardly mutter his own name over the phone when I asked him to give me his name — a man that would make an outlandish statement like he did . . .

Mr. Snedker: — Mr. Speaker, I honestly don't believe that the hon. member should use this as a reference when he can't give the gentleman's name, when on his own admission he was drunker than a skunk when he was talking.

Mr. Speaker: — . . . the hon. members of the legislature have that authority to do so.

Mr. Foley: — On a point of order. I don't think it becomes the hon. Minister of Agriculture to refer to any resident of this province in the terms that he used. Certainly if a man cannot phone the Minister of Agriculture and issue a complaint without being referred to in this rather disrespectful manner, we've come to a pretty pass in this province.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, these are not points of order at all.

Mr. Speaker: — I do not believe there is any ruling in regard to parliamentary procedure in this regard. I think it is a matter for the hon. minister to take under consideration himself.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It hurt the hon. members opposite, but I have to put up with some of these instances — these reactions that you get. This particular gentleman took a sheer delight in the fact that a great calamity had struck the province, and as a matter of fact I asked him, how long he had been out of grasshopper chemicals. "I just came in from the field", he said, "and I just ran out." I told him there would be a supply for him in the morning, but he persisted in his argument — oh you fellows are going to roast now. Now you're up against it. In fact he reflected the kind of talk that I hear in this legislature from the hon. member from arm River (Mr. Danielson) when he is sober, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to go on, let's take a look at the results . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Another bale of hay, that is the result.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . this year in contrast to 1937 we have brought in from outside the province about 75 thousand tons of fodder. We have to date approximately 150 thousand tons, which certainly has reduced the over all need of going outside the province for fodder supplies, particularly in light of the fact that our cattle numbers are vastly greater now than they were in 1937. But some of the more basic things that have been done towards building up fodder reserves and alleviating the problem of drought as much as we possibly can. I mentioned the program — the reorganization within the department in order that all of the branches of the

November 17, 1961

Department of Agriculture would be directed primarily towards two objectives. To bring greater productive stability to the agricultural economy of Saskatchewan. We all went through that 1930 experience. I did as the reeve of a municipality. One of the first objectives that I could see that we had to do was to bring greater stability to overcome as far as possible the handicap of moisture deficiency in this province. It was for this reason that for the past year we have been developing this kind of program, which have to a measurable degree alleviated circumstances this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we certainly can't take all the credit for what has been done under P.F.R.A. programs or our own programs for being in a better position to meet drought in this province. In all fairness there are other factors that are very important, Mr. Speaker. The advent of better machinery, better cultural practices, better attention to moisture conservation and better scientific knowledge being available to the farmers — extensive advice such as, Mr. Speaker, that in a year like this or a year that will be forthcoming if we have very little snow, the sound advice to give is to put oats in your summer fallow for feed. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) thinks that is not good advice, but deep down in his heart he knows this is good advice. There were tangible and concrete things done as well. You can't meet situations just through extension of this sort of thing — other action had to be taken.

There were other help-mates too. Agriculture is mechanized. Communication and transportation facilities are much better than they used to be. Rural roads are better and highways are better. We are able to move fodder about with greater facility than we did in the 1930's. We can thereby make a redistribution of fodder from one area to another more adequately. To go back to the long term policies and their contribution toward alleviating the drought problems and the building up of fodder reserves.

In the administration of land — we have tied in land branch policies with this over all policy by making available to individual farmers who had undersized units more land wherever this was possible. We carried on, Mr. Speaker, a very intensive program of land classification in order that we could dispose of millions of acres of vacant crown land and put them to use. Since 1950, Mr. Speaker, we have brought into use some 2 million additional acres of vacant crown land. This has given a contribution. There are at the present time some 20 thousand leases in effect for grazing, for hay production, and cultivation leases. In addition, Mr. Speaker, and this is often overlooked when people speak about P.F.R.A.'s

contribution, which has been notable, it must be remembered that the provincial government through the land utilization board of the lands branch has the responsibility of acquiring land for all purposes and making it available for P.F.R.A. pastures, for provincial pastures and for co-operative and municipal pastures. Over the years the provincial contribution to P.F.R.A. pastures in terms of land has been 1,600,000 acres — land acquired for P.F.R.A. pasture purposes.

We haven't stood still and depended on P.F.R.A. When I became Minister of Agriculture in this province we had one major provincial pasture in Saskatchewan. Since then what have been the results — let's look at them. At the present time we have under operation and development some 36 provincial pastures, in addition to that under our earned assistance policy and on crown land, which the crown made available, there policy and on crown land, which the crown made available, there are established 102 fodder co-operatives, municipal pasture projects, making a total of 111 co-operative and municipal pasture projects. This makes 142 pasture projects, either co-operative or under the administration of the provincial Department of Agriculture. Let's add to that some 57 fodder projects that have been developed either by the conservation and development branch itself, or under our earned assistance policies. This gives us 200 projects for pasture and fodder production. Thousands of acres of land have been improved both with the community pastures, and on these fodder projects as well, Mr. Speaker. Thousands of tons of hay have been produced that would have never been produced otherwise in this province. Why, Mr. Speaker, we have hay from doffer projects that we developed in the constituency of the hon. member for Cumberland, and this hay was made available in the south. This is true all over the province. You can't have that many projects, Mr. Speaker, without seeing them, and I must assume that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) and the hon. members opposite were aware of these policies and the extent of these programs before they ever brought this motion in the House. I rather resent the motion, Mr. Speaker, because I have taken a great pride in the fact that we've made wonderful progress and . . .

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I'm not saying, Mr. Speaker, that we've reached the ultimate by any means. We should be doing twice as much as we're doing in these fields if we are to overcome the reoccurring expense of emergency assistance.

We add to these pastures, the 60 P.F.R.A. pastures in Saskatchewan, and to give you some indication of our co-operation

with P.F.R.A. in this province, we have more community pastures and fodder projects in this province than any other province in Canada, including P.F.R.A. pastures. There are no P.F.R.A. pastures in Alberta and there are some 10 in the province of Manitoba. I wish the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) would write that down in his notebook. Insofar as fodder reserves are concerned in the province of Manitoba, on a long-term basis, they don't exist. Insofar as emergency encouragement for fodder production is concerned, in this province as a result of the \$5 per acre payment, we have about 60 thousand tons more fodder than we probably would have had, had we not given this incentive to farmers. In this one new branch alone, the conservation and development branch, there was an expenditure of well over \$17 million for dry land reclamations, for irrigation reclamations, and for reclamation by drainage. The drainage program looks good too, Mr. Speaker, and it does give a contribution also to our fodder supplies because land under water can't produce fodder, and land that is drained with proper gates put in the dam, the water can be released from that dam and used for fodder. Under our drainage and flood control program, and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) knows something of this, he knows for example that there were very nearly \$6 million spent on land reclamation program. All these figures, Mr. Speaker, are available in the annual report of the Department of Agriculture, if he wanted to sit down and honestly look at facts for a change, and not bring a lot of baloney into this House, and mislead the general public.

Government Members: — We can't hear you Toby.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I know they are not too far way, but by putting these facts on a higher little louder level might penetrate some of those thick skulls and some of this political partisanism that I note so well from the opposite side of the House.

How many projects were worked on and developed, not completely, some partially developed certainly, and some on which only the engineering services were done. Most of them had received some attention in ditching. There were 453 projects — drainage reclamation projects worked on since the conservation and development branch was organized. Still the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) says that nothing has been done. Other programs were introduced as I mentioned, to encourage fodder reserves. The program of assistance for forage seed under the plant industry branch, under which we make forage seed available at cost to farmers. The orders for this seed run up to 5 and 6 thousand orders a year,

which is enough for seeding 150 thousand acres a year to forage production. It is estimated that over the years we've made enough seed available to sow well over a million and a half acres of land to forage production. I agree again, Mr. Speaker, that this program too ought to be stepped up, and many others as well.

I will not take the time of the House to go into any more detail, merely to point out that the effect of this kind of development has made it possible for us to overcome a very, very serious fodder shortage in this province this year. Everyone knows that if we have another dry year, as dry as we had this year, than certainly there is no one, between now and then, can do anything about growing fodder. There isn't enough time to do it. But we can do these things on a long-term basis, Mr. Speaker. I think the results speak for themselves. We haven't had to import since I have been minister, the same amount of fodder from outside sources. This has been one of our worst years and I'm happy to report to the House, as everyone knows, we met the situation in good style, Mr. Speaker. No one over on this side of the House has ever suggested for one minute that the provincial government was taking any credit for cattle prices in this province. We've never done that, although, we've been condemned a good deal by the opposite because of the high farm costs for which similarly we are not responsible. Therefore we are not responsible for the one and we can't take credit for the other which depends on national policies.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a few letters that make me feel fairly good. One from the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture which says that at a recent meeting of the agricultural board a motion was passed expressing the appreciation of the farmers and farm organizations for the excellent assistance provided by the provincial Department of Agriculture in averting disaster in the livestock industry because of the drought and subsequent feed shortage. I appreciate these letters of appreciation coming from an organization like the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the Saskatchewan Dairy Association, who extended similar appreciation for the help and assistance that was made available to them, and from municipalities in the constituency of the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker). He might like to have me read it to the House. This is the rural municipal council of Fertile Belt:

“On behalf of the council I would like to take this opportunity of thanking the minister and yourselves for the splendid co-operation and assistance we received while moving fodder from Edmonton to this municipality. Without your help it would not have been possible to supply our farmer's needs.”

November 17, 1961

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that we have endeavoured to build up our livestock population, our forage crop production because we are certain that it will bring greater productive and income stability to our provincial economy. A great deal more needs to be done and we are hopeful that if and when this comes into existence, that it will be a comprehensive program under which further assistance can be given both to the province, to the municipalities, and to the farmer to make still greater progress in this direction. It is particularly needed in the northern part of the province where we've stressed the development of community pastures and fodder projects. On this fringe area of Saskatchewan there is a great need for adding to the land resources of those farmers who have undersized units. This must be done. Then too, expansive programs for assistance in the utilization of water that is stored for irrigation purposes. Stepped up programs for increased assistance for small stock-watering projects generally. It has been mentioned that we haven't utilized irrigation water. We certainly have. We've worked on some 54 irrigation projects involving some 36 thousand acres of land that has been developed. We didn't wait for the South Saskatchewan. We've been developing the smaller irrigation projects principally throughout the south-western part of the province, Mr. Speaker.

Having said this and having given this information to the House, Mr. Speaker, I must support the amendment and I certainly in the face of this evidence could not support the original motion.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate, but the fact that I have to depart shortly for a water and sewer opening in my own constituency, to take part in that, I felt I should speak now following the statements by the minister — that possibly I should make some statement with regard to the activities of the government in connection with the so-called program that they carried out during this last spring and summer, with regard to the emergency situation on the farms in this province.

I think one would probably be remiss if he did not give at least a 'thank you' for those things that have been done by the minister and his department. I am sure there is no one on either this side of the House, or anyone in the province of Saskatchewan that would deny the fact, and if he could there would be much more room for condemnation of this government, if there was nothing to thank them for on this particular occasion.

But as the minister has stated in his address here today, and has taken credit for some of the actions that the government has taken during the past few months, he forgot to say at the same time, as he usually does, that the farmer himself had to pay for most of these so-called actions on behalf of the government of this province. I want to thank the minister for the fact that there have been water pumpers around the province — some that have been operated by his department, some that have been operated by the P.F.R.A. with the assistance of the federal government. No one denies the fact that all farmers and the communities that have had the use of these pumpers are grateful for the fact that the pumpers are there. But that is where it stops, Mr. Speaker, because there isn't a farmer, to my knowledge, that the minister could point out that hasn't paid for the cost of this pumping.

I remember calling the minister, and personally I don't agree with the minister's idea that anyone that calls you on the phone whether you have his name or not, that you can use something that he is supposed to have said to you, as proof in a debate in this House or any place else. It reminds me of a previous statement made in this House some years ago, by a member who quoted a person who had passed away and was no longer around to defend himself. The Minister of Agriculture quotes somebody he says came from the constituency of Arm River, who phoned him when he was drunk and then he says the man never gave him his name. Now how can anyone go out and prove that this conversation ever took place or the minister was ever attacked in the manner he was. I think that is a fairly poor statement to come from any minister of the crown any place, and to try to use as the methods of abuse that he is taking in his department. I can assure him that I have full knowledge that anyone that holds the position that he does will take a lot of abuse throughout his holding of that office, and if he is going to bewail the fact that he is taking that abuse from people throughout this province or any place else, well then if he can't stand up to that abuse he should step out of the position that he is holding. Anyone knows, who serves in any public field, that there are going to be those individuals, without facts and without information, will attack and abuse those that have powers and that are in public life and have to carry out government actions. So as I say to him across the way, that I can't be too sympathetic for the fact that he has had some abuse heaped on him during the past year because I know he and some of his friends took great delight in heaping abuse on others in years that have gone by, in even more vicious terms than he has stated to the members of this House — at times of troubles and difficulties throughout this province.

We've also heard from some of our friends across the way, the seconder of this amendment, and it is not the first

November 17, 1961

time he has made these statements, about running around with people that worked for governments and making wild statements, not mentioning any names, saying this happened, and that happened. It is the same old type of thing that he has been doing in this House ever since I came in 6 years ago, but he has never backed up once with the proof, or once with the name of any individual who could be approached to find out if this particular thing ever took place. That is the type of evidence that is presented to us as members in this legislature to try to say that this government is doing something different than a government did 22 years ago, when most of the members who are sitting here today were not even in public life and had nothing to do with public life. But my friends across the way like to bring up factors that took place 25 years ago, when they were kids or something and somebody told them that a somebody went without relief because he didn't happen to be a Liberal, or somebody didn't get feed or he didn't get into the hospital because he wasn't a Liberal. They keep making these statements across the way, and to this day I have never had one iota of proof from the member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) or anyone over there, — that could be considered proof — statements that names were actually used that anyone could use as evidence in the legislature, or court, or any place else in our country to prove a case. We have had dead men brought up; we've had men that are a good distance from here that most of the members in this House have never heard of; their names have been brought up at times in evidence to prove things that have been done by previous governments years ago. It is not the government of 25 years ago that is on trial before the people of this province, and the people of this legislature, it is the Minister of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture and this government that are on trial in this province, and after the exhibition of this past summer, of course organizations are going to write letters. I would presume that with some assistance I would write a letter too, but it isn't assistance that the people were looking for this last year, it was leadership, and that leadership wasn't forthcoming. Sure, after demands were made — after requests were made — after delegations came in — after letters were written — after telephone calls were made — sure something was done and for that as I said before, we must be grateful for small mercies.

Let us take into account the two most important programs for a drought year. The one I mentioned a moment ago about the assistance with water. At the beginning, and I must say that last year it was very dry and without rains this spring, we knew we were going to be in this situation, but at the beginning of the problem, there was one pumper available, then it was increased to two.

For a long time that is all we had in the province — two outfits working. At the present time I understand that there are anywhere from 5 to 10, but they aren't all government outfits. Some of them are owned by individual owners who have turned over that equipment, and the government is providing assistance in price in order to make it workable. But this has all taken place during the last few months, when it should have been provided for long before this present year. It should have been provided last year in anticipation of this very thing, because we knew there was a danger of drought. We knew there was a danger of a lack of water in this present year. But last spring when many farmers required a great deal of water in their dugouts for their cattle the pumpers weren't available, and there were many areas that had to wait until August or September in order to have their dugouts filled. Some of those farmers in the meantime had to dispose of some of their stock because they didn't have enough water for them and they didn't have enough feed.

Again, with regard to the movement of feed. Certainly, any organization in this province, I don't think it is very fitting of the Minister of Agriculture to get up and read the letter from an organization as if they are supporting this particular motion that is before us today, and use it in support of this particular motion, that this legislature should commend the government for its action. Any organization, even if it was just the smallest amount of help, would feel that they had to send such a letter to any government organization and extend their thanks for any help that is given. But when the member used letters like that to come here and tell the members of the legislature, that because he got a letter from the livestock producers thanking him for any help they were able to give to them during this emergency, and asks us as members to vote because of a letter like that — to vote for this motion commending the government for the great part it has played in solving the problems of the farmers, then I say again that that evidence is not very conclusive for any member in this House to vote on this particular motion that is before us at the present time.

I say again, that of course, every farmer in the province of Saskatchewan that receives some financial assistance for the movement of fodder should of course give thanks for that amount of help, but as I have stated before, this program is nothing new. It is not a program that was developed by this government here in the province of Saskatchewan, it isn't something that hasn't been done by governments in this province for years and years.

November 17, 1961

As the minister has stated that in this present year this government has moved 150 thousand tons of fodder for the farm people of this province. In 1937, the government of that day moved 450 thousand tons of fodder. Surely if we are to thank the government of today for the job of moving 150 thousand tons, I am quite certain the Minister of Agriculture shouldn't be standing up in this legislature and condemning a government, which in 1937, moved 450 thousand tons of fodder into this program to help our farmers.

Of course, as he stated a few moments ago, this last year in many ways, I think, was drier than 1937, but we didn't have the circumstances that led up to 1937. We hadn't had the circumstances in many areas of this province, not for one year, but for six years prior to the drought of 1937. The situation couldn't even be compared with the situation that the government had to face and had to deal with in 1937. For the Minister of Agriculture in this province today, to stand up and try to defend his actions today on the actions taken during the period of 1937, is shameful to say the least, when he should try to defend himself on this resolution by a comparison of that type. We had a government which had come through 6 years of the worst depression this province and many parts of the world had ever experienced. We had a government whose revenues were low because of the fact that the people couldn't pay their taxes. They couldn't afford to pay them. They didn't have the money. They hadn't had crops, many of them, for 5 or 6 years. We were facing that situation, but what is the situation today?

The situation today is that the government knows, and of course realizing that, could have without the loss of one cent, to any resident in this province, see to it that the equipment was available at the beginning of this year to make certain that every farmer that needed dugouts filled for this coming winter, had those dugouts filled. Well I can tell you today that there are still many farmers waiting to have their dugouts filled. There are still many farmers that today are digging new dugouts trying to get water supplies for them. These problems haven't been solved for the government of this province. Another thing is when we speak of the cost of this program, some farmers are paying \$80, some are paying \$100, some of them are paying \$120 in order to have these dugouts filled. I'm not certain, the minister told me when I phoned him once, that they were just trying to cover the cost. They didn't want to make anything on this deal with the farmers, they just wanted to cover the cost of the program. But today he stands up in the legislature and he wants to take the credit for this particular dugout-filling program by the provincial government, and the farmer he told me was going to pay every cent of the cost.

It wasn't going to cost anyone else in the province a nickel. So I say it is nothing to feel proud about, for the minister to take credit for it — that some dugouts are going to be filled in this province before winter, at the full cost to the farmers who are receiving the service. Anyone could do that. Individuals could have drawn up the same program and done exactly the same thing for the farm people. I think it is up to the government of this province to take leadership in matters of this type, but not to take credit for something that is not coming to them.

Then again, I just want to refer to fodder. The other day I had the opportunity of making up an application for fodder assistance. The particular farmer who had brought his forms for me to make out for him, by the time I had completed making out the forms with the portion of the cost paid by both the federal and provincial governments, this particular farmer was still paying more for the feed than the feed cost originally, out of his own pocket — was still paying more for the feed than the feed cost him originally, even after the federal and provincial governments' portion of the cost had been taken into account. So I say here again, that this has been some assistance of course, and this is an old program, not something that the present Minister of Agriculture can take credit for or say that his government originated it, in the form of a program to look after the conditions that existed in this present year.

Then of course we come down to the final part of the amendment and this is the question of long-term policies. It is a little bit too late to be talking about long-term policies in this present year. The member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) was ridiculed by the Minister of Agriculture for stating that the same thing might happen next year. Well, I am quite certain after the year we have come through that there is no chance of having fodder reserves for another year such as we have faced this past summer. There isn't any chance, even long-term policy won't be any good for next year. They may be good for a drought that that may come along 10 or 15 years from now, but they won't be of any use to the farmers of this province next year because there isn't any fodder around to have for reserves at the present time all of it is needed for the cattle that are here now. If there is no hay crop next year the minister will have to admit that there are going to have to be many of the cattle that are in the province today will probably have to be done away with unless we can get feed from other parts of Canada or from other parts of the United States. For him to ridicule the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley for suggesting that this might take place and warning the government of this, I think it rather shameful on the part of

November 17, 1961

the Minister of Agriculture. Surely this is what we should be doing, is warning the government and the farmers of these very facts, and asking the government to take further action. Of course if they had taken the actions that were suggested by members on this side with regard to a fodder reserve some years ago, when it was first suggested and members over here were urging more action on the part of the minister, then he might not have had to face the situation he did this past summer. When I went to him on one occasion he said don't suggest that the government do anything, we don't want to get involved in this matter of providing feed to the farmers directly. Whatever you do don't get the government involved in this thing — it will be just like what happened back in the 1930's is what the minister said.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — On a point of order. The hon. member knows that he is leaving the wrong impression.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member may make a correction at the end of the speech.

Mr. Gardiner: — I think that would be better because if he was going to correct my impression, I think I have the right to take any impression I want, from what the gentleman said. That was the impression I got and he made the statement to me two or three times and rang his hands. Oh please don't get us involved in any arrangements for providing direct assistance to the farmers of this province in the way of supply of feed. That is the type of action that we usually get from the government across the way. They don't want to do anything that might get them involved in a little bit of difficulty because of what individuals might say after this job has been completed. We have had the exhibition of some of our friends across the way that have tried to take political advantage on individuals in this province for some things that happened back in the 1930's and I don't blame the Minister of Agriculture, in a sense, for not wanting to get involved when he knows the way that they handled the situation politically in the 1930's — I don't blame him for not wanting to get his government involved in anything of that type, but I do say this, that when members on the other side of the House are going to stand up and commend the government for its prompt and effective emergency program, when there are hundreds of dugouts waiting to be filled.

There is one chap out with a pumper now, he has 13 dugouts to fill providing the weather stays so that he can fill them. If the weather turns cold, and that is just one little community, the P.F.R.A. have 2 or 3 other pumps going steady in that particular area of the province, at the same time

so that the same thanks, if my friends want to give thanks for these problems, the same thanks should have been included towards the federal government, because they have been doing exactly the amendment thing as our provincial government during this particular emergency that exists at the present time. But I say that many of the things that were done during this past summer were done too late and too little, in order to help many of the farmers in this province. That is why I could not support the amendment that has been moved by members on the government side of the House. I don't think there is anyone in this province could support something, an amendment which states that there has been a program — there has been no program.

As I stated a few moments ago, when this water program started I tried to find out where the pumpers were working. I called the Department of Agriculture. The chap I spoke to who was supposed to be in charge of the division said he didn't know where the pumps were. Well I said have you any idea who might know. No I don't know who might know. Well I said are you working through the municipalities. He said, no we're not working through the municipalities. I said who is in charge of this program. The fellow that is running the pumper, he said, is in charge of the program. He was supposed to have been at that time in our area three weeks prior to that — it had been promised a pump would be there. The farmers had been waiting for 3 weeks. They didn't know where he was. They didn't know how to contact him. The Department of Agriculture didn't know where he was and no municipal official knew where he was.

If that is what you call a program, if that is what you call a co-ordinated and a co-operative program, Mr. Speaker, then I couldn't vote for a motion which would make a statement such as that. Then when you come down to the question of feed. The farmers of this province looked after the question of feed, not the minister and his department. Again they paid some of the dollars towards it. Hundreds of farmers in my area spent dollars of their own money running back and forth from the north part of this province, down to their farm homes, they spent dollars on long distance telephone calls, trying to find out where feed was available, and quite often, even at that, when they got to where the feed was supposed to be, even when they had been informed by the government — the feed wasn't there and they had to run around looking for a supply some place else. Yet the minister says we should get the credit because there happens to be a feed supply on the farm of most of the farmers in the province at the present time. This government is great at taking credit for the fact that the farm people of this province are prepared to take action on their own behalf in an emergency such as we faced this last summer, and for him to get up and

attempt to take political credit for the government of this province for the actions undertaken by the farm people themselves, does not sit well on the responsibility of any cabinet minister in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I don't see how any member on the other side of the House can vote for a program which is non-existent, which has been non-existent, many parts of it have been here for years, on the statute books and have not been innovations by the government that we have sitting across the way. In fact, Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of this crisis to the present time, the government has failed to provide the leadership; has failed to provide sufficient assistance to our farm people, in a time of great crisis. I say that under those circumstances I don't think any member in this legislature could vote for an amendment which would commend this government for something they haven't done, commend this government for a so-called program of the future that no one has any idea what it is going to be, except that the ministers states this. I have advised the farmers in Saskatchewan — my department has, we have fellows out telling them just exactly what they should do if they want to survive in the future. I am going to tell the minister, I think that the farm people of this province, they may accept some of that advice, but most of them, I think, will be well advised if they do everything in their power to look after themselves, and not depend too much on the Minister of Agriculture who sits across the way, and the government of this province, because if they are looking for actions, Mr. Speaker, they aren't going to get actions from the present minister and from the government of this province. For those reasons, I would oppose the amendment that has been moved.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege and to correct a statement made by the hon. member. He said that the department had no knowledge of where the pump units were. They had. They were in daily contact with the conservation and development branch. Personally, I don't know where they are at the moment, but he can get the information from the conservation and development branch. They are in constant contact.

I want to ask this question of the hon. member. Would he tell us the date when P.F.R.A. put his 3 pump units in the field? He said we were late. We were in the field, as the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) knows on May 1st. When did the P.F.R.A. units start?

Mr. Gardiner: — We are not here to either defend or oppose the operations of the P.F.R.A. and I hold no brief for the present federal government as my friend knows. Just because of the fact that P.F.R.A. wasn't into

the field quick enough, or didn't act quick enough, is no reason for the provincial government being in the position that they did not act. We are not here to defend or oppose the actions of a government over which we have no control. We are here to deal with your actions.

With regard to the other matter. I was in touch with the conservation and development branch of your department and they were the ones that didn't know where the pumps were.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: —Mr. Speaker, another question. Would the hon. member in all fairness, due to the fact you can't pump when it is cold say that May 1 was a pretty good date.

Mr. Gardiner: — It was for the little bit of equipment that you had. Since then you have increased that. If you had the same number of pumps at that time as you have today, you might have done something to solve the problem. The farmers paid for every cent of it.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) has told this House that we shouldn't support the amendment to the motion. I asked myself this — why shouldn't I support the government by supporting this amendment, because I do know some facts that have been bypassed deliberately by the speaker who spoke. They say talk is cheap and he always speaks a great deal but he doesn't say very much. Let's take a look at some of the facts and what the government has done in the past, and maybe the hon. member hasn't been to different parts of Saskatchewan, as some of the rest of us have been. Only recently I travelled through Meadow Lake, and across the north and I have been across other parts of Saskatchewan and I have seen some of the conditions that exist. First of all let's take a look at the north. We have plenty of hay right now. We have plenty of hay to sell right now. I saw as the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) said a few days ago, he saw hay going east, and then hay going west, but we see hay going from the north every day by the truckload to the south where it is needed. The reason the hay is going to the south is because of the policies of this government.

What were some of those policies? First of all the government has encouraged the people in my particular area and I think right across the north, and that is why you see those stooks there today of cereal hays and wild hay — there is still lots there.

The government has encouraged fodder projects. There are a number of them in my constituency, as has been pointed out

November 17, 1961

by the hon. minister. There are a number of them in other constituencies across the north, and isn't that the place where you should have those fodder projects, where you have probably a little more rain, and a different type of soil that will grow lots of hay? That's what the government has been doing, and just because the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) or the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) don't see those fodder projects out here in the prairies, does not mean that we do not have them in the province of Saskatchewan for the good of the Saskatchewan people. I invite them both to come up and take a look, and I can invite them right on my own farm where I have 30 or 40 tons of surplus hay right now, which I have been trying to sell and cannot, because other hay has been moving. I suppose I will be able to sell it in due course of time; there are hundreds of tons there available for farmers who will need it towards spring. Again, I say it is all due to the policies of this government.

We have grazing areas. We have had this government for a number of years paying money over to municipalities to seed road allowances, and in our country and across the north — it doesn't matter whether it's around Meadow Lake or Prince Albert, new roads are being built and these roadways along the sides are being seeded down with a mixture of alfalfa and brome grass. This year I have counted thousands and thousands of bales of hay along the road allowance, certainly enough for the needs of our own people so, if there was other fodder available that was the surplus fodder we had to help these other people in the southern part of the province. That is what we are doing; we are helping the people in the southern part of the province, and that is due to the everlasting credit of the Department of Agriculture, under this minister, because no such program was in effect under the Liberals, as I recall.

You will find the same story, Mr. Speaker, along the highways in my part of the country. Yes, we have had drought and poor crops this year, but fortunately we have had good hay crops. As I would like to point out to the hon. members when they say people go up to the north and cannot bale hay, there must be something wrong because nearly every farmer who has surplus hay has given information to the Department of Agriculture, to the municipalities, they are listed in the elevators, there are requests coming in from the south and the requests are replied to, and I say anybody that has come up has been able to get hay. So this kind of nonsense we have been hearing for the last half hour or hour is not true, and I say that this government should be highly commended for the things they have done.

As a matter of fact, I know of some situations where there was some straw which wasn't baled because it was not needed. In other words, we have had surpluses, Mr. Speaker,

and just because people might go to Alberta to get some hay it may be a different quality of hay; it may be closer, I don't know, but I'm telling the story as I know it, and therefore I think it very regrettable and deplorable that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) brought in a motion in this House, deploring the failure of this government. I don't disagree with the latter part — we suggest they should consider maintaining fodder plants. The government is doing that, and I think they should expand. I have said that on many occasions, because it is good progress but to say that you deplore the failure of the government when there has been no failure, I think it is not justified, it is not fair and certainly is not true.

Having said these few words, I wanted to make it clear that if the hon. members would come up to the northern part of Saskatchewan and see for themselves, they wouldn't be sitting in this House talking the kind of nonsense they have been talking for the last few days.

Premier Lloyd: — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly again resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole.

THIRD READING

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Erb, by leave of the Assembly: That Bill No. 3 — An Act to provide for Services Rendered to Certain Persons by Physicians and Certain Other Persons — be now read a third time and passed under its title.

STATEMENT RE THIRD READING PROCEDURE

Mr. Speaker: — Before permitting debate on this motion I would beg the indulgence of the House in order to clarify a point of procedure. Hon. members will be aware that it has been the practice of this House to combine the motions for third reading and passage of a Bill except when the motion is debated, in which case the motion is divided into its constituent parts in strict accordance with Beauchesne, 4th Edition citation 417.

November 17, 1961

I had asked the Clerk to study this procedure, and I am advised that the second motion is a historic relic which has long since been dispensed with in the British House of Commons, and was recently abolished in the Canadian House of Commons.

I have informed both the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition of my intention in this regard and I now ask the consent of the House to follow the modern practice of combining the two motions in all cases, that is whether the motion is debated or not. That is the motion for third reading, and that the motion now be passed.

The House having consented to the proposed change, the debate continued on the said motion: -

Mr. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am only going to take three minutes. This has been a long debate, and I think the views of the Liberal party on this issue have been pretty well clarified on first and second reading, and throughout the committee, so I only have to take a few minutes of time to sum up our position.

I want to say again that Liberals do favour the principle of prepaid medical insurance.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I must point out that there is quite a difficult proposition on my hands with regard to handling this third reading. The principle of the bill cannot be discussed on third reading. The contents of the bill may be discussed on third reading. Nothing may be added — no motion or amendment may be made to add anything to the bill, but we must discuss the contents of the bill as it stands at the present time.

Mr. Thatcher: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All I was going to say was that, in order to emphasize that we favour the principle of prepaid medical insurance we voted in favour of this bill on second reading. That is the only point I was going to make, and we did that even though we were opposed to many clauses of the actual legislation. I think it is a fair statement to say that in our British system of government, whether it is in Ottawa or London or anywhere else, when second reading is before the House you must discuss the principle, and after the ruling you just made, I think it makes it all the more clear why we voted as we did on second reading.

I will say again that there are no Liberal MLA's

here who are not in favour of prepaid medical insurance, but notwithstanding the vote which we made on second reading, we indicated at that time if major changes were not made in the committee stage that we would be obliged to vote against the legislation in successive changes.

I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that in committee we moved amendment after amendment. We made proposal after proposal. We suggested a plebiscite, for instance, and we suggested, if I recall that there should be regional control. We proposed that the Thompson committee should be brought on to the floor of the legislature, and so on, but the government adamantly refused to adopt one single amendment or single change which we suggested. As a result, we believe that the bill which is now before us for third reading will give us state medicine — not prepaid medical insurance, and thus we feel obliged to vote against this bill on third reading.

I want to briefly reiterate our reasons. First, because during the former stages the government has given us no assurance that it can obtain the assurance or the co-operation of the doctors, and without that co-operation, if the Premier can't get that co-operation in the months ahead — this legislation doesn't mean anything.

The second reason for our vote on third reading is because of the staggering costs involved — \$23 million, or \$22 million and the belief that it will likely be larger in each successive year.

Our third reason for opposition again is the unprecedented tax burden, and particularly the five per cent sales tax, which we think is vicious and regress.

Our fourth point in opposing it was the fact that, coming as it did in this year of recession and drought, and our final reason for voting as we are going to do this afternoon is that we are afraid that if this does pass, Saskatchewan will lose many of her best doctors.

The Liberal party again believes that this bill is being passed for one reason — political expediency, and in the long-run we don't think it will serve the best over all interests of the people of Saskatchewan. That is why I say again we shall oppose it on third reading.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I think I can reply in perhaps even less than three minutes. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition spoke only for three minutes. There is one thing I can agree with him on, Mr. Speaker,

November 17, 1961

and that is when he said they had made the stand of the Liberal party very clear. I agree, but unfortunately my interpretation of what this stand is does not concur with the stand which he has proposed as that of the Liberal party.

It seems to me unmistakably clear, Mr. Speaker, that a group that has opposed not only the basic sections of the bill, but has also consistently opposed any suggestion whereby the costs of the plan could be met, could hardly in good faith hold themselves up before the country as being in favour of doing something. This, I submit, is the stand very frequently taken by members of the opposition — of pretending to be in favour of some particular end, but not in favour of doing the things which must be done in order to achieve that particular end.

The only other comment I wish to make is one with regard to costs. The Leader of the Opposition has stated again that this is a cost of some \$23 million, and corrected that, I believe as being brought down to \$21 million or something like that. It is true that, in order to finance this particular plan the government will have to collect some monies in the neighbourhood of \$20 million to \$21 million. It is not true, and it isn't accurate and it is not fair to suggest that this is a new cost on the people and on the production of the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan have been paying in recent years, an amount of \$18 million or in excess of \$18 million in order to provide their medical costs. The fact is they will now be relieved of paying the monies in that particular way; they will pay the money in another way. This does not constitute an added burden of cost to the people of the province, such as he suggests it will.

Let me put it any other way, Mr. Speaker. If we were not to proceed with this plan does he then suggest that the people of Saskatchewan would be \$21 million better off? The statement is practically ridiculous to suggest that, and I would trust a better interpretation in all fairness to the people of Saskatchewan, might be given to the cost of this plan than the one that has been given. The government, it has been said, has been unable to give assurance that the doctors would co-operate. Now it is true, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have any written pact or written agreement with the doctors of the province. I may say, too, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Health said the other day, we do not have anything direct from the doctors of the province to say they will not. There has been some press reports purporting to be a report of a decision made at a meeting in Saskatoon, but to this date to my knowledge

there has been no intimation to the government unless the doctors who were responsible for the press report suggested speaking to the press — there has been no indication with regard to their proposal.

As I said previously, Mr. Speaker, all that is being asked, in fact, of the doctors here is the acceptance of payment through a different medium than many of them accepted previously. The other way we look at it is that we are offering to them this system which poses a more effective way of influencing the practice of medicine than has ever been offered to doctors before. We can see no reason why the doctors of Saskatchewan will not respond in the way that doctors in most other parts of the world have, to plans very similar to this kind.

Mr. James Snedker (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, anything that I have to say will be brief. As I understand parliamentary procedure in this legislature or any other legislature in the British Commonwealth, the first move in consideration of a bill, is that members vote on its introduction, that is as to whether or not it should be allowed to be introduced into the House. When it has passed through that routine, then second reading is agreement or opposition to the principle of the bill, that is the reason for second reading and the meaning of second reading. Finally, the bill enter a period of third reading when the bill has proceeded through its stages of committee and the various clauses have been read, approved, amended or opposed as the case may be. Then the final bill, in its final form as it leaves the committee, is placed before the House for third reading. That is my understanding of British parliamentary procedure, and I think it is correct according to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Guide.

I would just like to make a few observations, more in sorrow than in anger . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I do maintain that what is properly before the House at the present time is the contents of the bill.

Mr. Snedker: — That is exactly what I make going to speak on. I was making these points before I proceeded to do so. But I suppose somebody called me out of order, and we will not enter into the usual procedural hassle which usually occurs when I endeavour to get my views before the legislature.

The bill, as it is before us now in third reading is the finished and completed bill as it came out of committee,

November 17, 1961

and the remarks which I have to make — I want to say that I make more in sorrow than in anger — in regard to actions taken by this government. I voted for this measure in principle, and I stated clearly at the time that I had always believed in a comprehensive form of health insurance — a medical scheme. I made that quite plain. I also made it quite plain (I think and hope I did) to the hon. members of this House that I fought a campaign during the last provincial election, not on the principle of a medical scheme, but on the method of its implementation and when I was taking part in that campaign during the last election, I stated in no uncertain terms to all people who would listen to me in my own country and in other parts of the province, that I believed in a medical plan administered on a regional basis — that is that the administration would be by elected officials elected in each region or elected by the people. I would be remiss in my duties and obligations to the people who sent me to this House, if I did not once more reiterate the things which I said previously in debate, and state my reasons for voting against this Bill in third reading.

when we came here it was intimated by hon. members on the other side of the House when some of us criticized the haste with which this legislation was being placed before the House, when some of us criticized the haste with which the Thompson Committee had been hurried in the report — it was stated by members opposite, “Wait until you see the bill.” Then make the suggestions; criticize it and say what you please. We waited until we saw the bill, and when the bill came into the House it said that the whole medical scheme would be administered by a commission. It was stated by members on this side of the House that we didn’t approve of the bill as it was placed before the House, but that we would make those suggestions which we thought should be made; that we would propose those changes which we thought should be made; and we voted for the bill in principle on that basis, and then we proceeded to propose the things which we thought should be changed in the bill, and I would draw the attention of all her members of the House, as the Leader of the Opposition has already done, that not a single one of those proposed changes was accepted by the government. Not one.

One of the changes which we proposed was regional administration.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! there is one thing in regard to third reading, it is the contents of the bill as it stands; we cannot advocate or bring in amendments and things of that kind — we cannot discuss things that are not in the bill.

Mr. Snedker: — I am discussing what is in the bill — what is in the bill, Mr. Speaker, is administration by a commission.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member is bringing, or speaking to something that was asked for to be included in the bill, and was not included in the bill, it cannot be discussed at this time.

Mr. Snedker: — What is included in the bill, Mr. Speaker, is administration by a commission, and because I oppose administration by a commission because I oppose that method of administering the health plan, as opposed to the other methods which we recommended, because that commission will lead to bureaucracy, because it will lead to patronage, because it will lead to an ever-increasing group of civil servants who won't be able to justify their existence; because of those things I am opposing this bill on third reading, and I am stating why I am opposing it in no uncertain terms. As I have said before, I would be remiss in my duties to my people if I did not say why I oppose it and I think I have that privilege.

The hon. members on the other side of the House said we would have the opportunity of suggesting changes. Well we suggested them and not one of them was accepted, and as I said, Mr. Speaker, when I started to speak, I do this more in sorrow than in anger when I think of the previous promises, the previous principles of the gentlemen who sit opposite. I remember those years in the early 1930's and 1940's when they believed in freedom; when they believed in democracy and when they spoke of it, and yet here they have instituted the very thing which at that time they didn't recommend; they have instituted administration of the health scheme by a commission which is going to be, in my opinion, just another dictatorial organ of a socialist government.

I think I have made it pretty clear, Mr. Speaker, as to the reason why I am going to oppose this bill. I am not going to speak any further. I think I have done everything I could to secure a different type of administration, the type of administration which I thought and knew would be of benefit to our people, but this administration by a commission will not be a part of our people — it will be part of a socialist machine. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this bill, more in sorrow . . . than in anger.

Government Members: — Good! Good!

Mr. Snedker: — Well, I'm glad at least the hon. members on the other side of the House approve of something that I am doing. I intend to vote against this bill, Mr. Speaker, because as I said before, I believe that administration by a commission will lead to any increased group of civil servants who won't be able to justify their existence; I believe it will lead to bureaucracy, autocracy, and dictatorship. I do not believe that it will lead to that type of self-government which I believe in and which all the world today stands in such crying need of.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I picked up this morning's paper and what did I see in it? 'East Germans Crawl through sewers to Escape from East Germany'. Yes, to get to a country where they would have freedom; where they could vote for the things they believed in. Mr. Speaker, can't we introduce a little more self-government in this country instead of less? Because I believe in those things — because I believe in freedom, democracy, self-government; because I believe in what those people believed in when they did that — I am proposing this bill for those reasons, Mr. Speaker.

The question being put it was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 30
Messieurs

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

NAYS — 16
Messieurs

Thatcher	Gardiner	Horsman
McCarthy	Foley	Coderre
Barrie	Guy	MacDougall

NAYS (continued)

McDonald
Danielson
McFarlane

Boldt
Klein

Snedker
Gallagher

At 5:45 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat on the Throne, and gave Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor then said: —

MR. SPEAKER AND
MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

It is my duty to relieve you of further attendance at the Legislative Assembly. In doing so, I wish to thank you and congratulate you upon the results of your considerations.

Important matters have come before you for discussion and decision.

You have provided an alternate arrangement for the collection of personal and corporation income taxes by the Province of Saskatchewan, the need for which arose when the Government of Canada announced its intention to abandon the tax rental and tax sharing arrangements which have been in effect for some twenty years.

You have approved legislation for the provision and financing of medical care. The inauguration of the programme provided for by the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act will be a significant step forward in the social progress which the people of Saskatchewan have achieved.

In taking leave of you, I desire to thank you for the manner in which you have devoted your energies to the activities of the session and to wish you the full blessing of Providence as you return again to your respective homes.

The Hon. Mr. Blakeney, Acting Provincial Secretary, then said: Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it pleases His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.