

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**5th Day**

**Wednesday, February 28, 1962**

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

**ON ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**QUESTION: RE TAX ON CLOTHING**

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Could the minister say whether the government has given any further consideration to exempting clothing from the 5% Sales Tax as he indicated he might do in the last session?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the hon. member in the house that consideration has been given to this matter but that the government is not prepared to make any announcement at this time.

**GREETINGS TO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS**

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — I would like to draw your attention to a group of high school students from high schools of Radisson, Borden and Langham accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Anderson of Radisson, Mr. Freise of Borden and Mr. Busnman of Langham. They journeyed down here today by bus and they are going to observe the debate in the legislature, they have an appointment at 4 o'clock to go through the Natural History Museum. I would like to draw the attention of the house to this group of people and sincerely hope that they will get a great deal of information and pleasure from their visit.

**Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, before the next item of business,

**Wednesday, February 28, 1962**

I would like to draw to your attention that we have seated with us a group of students representing the Saskatchewan Campus, both from the Regina and Saskatoon Campus representing an International Student's Association, representing debating teams and debating directorate of the University of Saskatchewan, and you will notice Mr. Speaker, that many of them are from other lands. I think it is a great privilege for us in this assembly to welcome these students, not only here in the assembly but to our province. I hope that as they stay here that we will be able to help them in their studies. I hope also they will mingle freely with ourselves, not only the members that are here, but the people of Saskatchewan, so that we too may learn something from them. With that Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that I hope that their stay is a pleasant one and it will be useful to them, certainly I know that all members will extend to them their cordial welcome.

### **DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Berezowsky, seconded by Mr. Thurston.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, may I first of all join with all of the other members of the legislature in the words of welcome that have been extended to our visitors in the legislature today. I welcome the group from the schools in the northwestern part of the province, I can't quite say Mr. Speaker, that they come from the best part of Saskatchewan, but I can say that they come from extremely close to it and we are very happy to have them with us. As I said on the previous occasion, it is gratifying to know that an increasing number of youngsters from our schools do come to visit us. I have also to record my own appreciation to that which was expressed so very well by the Minister of Education to the students from the university campuses, who are with us today. May I express at this time my own regrets that it won't be possible for me to be with them at the dinner this evening because of another engagement. They will be well looked after at that time by the Speaker of the house and the Leader of the Opposition, who have the opportunity to extend greetings on behalf of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, we listened yesterday afternoon and the afternoon previously to the Leader of the Opposition in the rather lengthy statement with regard to the doings

and misdoings of the government of Saskatchewan and the political party which we represent. I can only, as far as this afternoon is concerned, quote the weather forecast that was that for today there is no relief in sight. This is perhaps cold comfort for the members of the legislature at this time. It will be remembered, I think, that when the Leader of the Opposition began to speak on the afternoon before yesterday he made a number of remarks. I concluded yesterday, and made reference to the fact there were some errors in my opinion in those remarks and I found some reason for a difference in opinion in regard to other matters which he stated. I trust that this afternoon I will be able to demonstrate some errors that were made as he continued to speak yesterday and to demonstrate a valid difference of opinion with regard to some of the things that he said.

It will be recalled that early in his remarks yesterday afternoon he had reference to the fact that Mr. T.C. Douglas, no longer sits in this house. He has now left the field of provincial politics and is taking part in politics at the federal level. As I understood him, Mr. Speaker, he gave the impression of this action as being that Mr. Douglas has deserted something or other in so doing and in fact that he had run away from certain responsibilities when he accepted federal leadership which necessitated resignation from his provincial office. If I heard his statement correctly, then never in the history of this legislature has there been a more glaring mis-statement or a greater distortion of facts than made by one who suggests that Tommy Douglas ran away from anything. The sincerity and the service and the sacrifice made by Tommy Douglas deserves a better comment than that, even from the Leader of the Opposition. I say without hesitation sir, that no man ever gave more of his time and his energy or ever gave it more unstintingly, more unselfishly than T.C. Douglas insofar as the people of Saskatchewan are concerned. No man ever thought less about himself and more about others than did that same Mr. Douglas. Whatever it was that brought him to Saskatchewan, first in the ministry of the church, and later in political activity, there are many tens of thousands of Saskatchewan people of all political beliefs who are eternally grateful for the fact that this happened. I suggest that anyone who seeks to degrade Tommy Douglas by saying that he ran away or deserted, degrades only himself in so saying. He left, as all of us on this side of the legislature know and understand, because he was convinced that the future of Canada was not safe in the hands of either the Liberal or the conservative government, because he was convinced that in that way he

**Wednesday, February 28, 1962**

could best serve the people of Canada. He could best serve by making his voice and the philosophy of this movement heard in forums from one end of Canada to the other. He left at the request of people from occupational groups from every province of Canada. He left to lead the New Democratic Party of which the CCF is the Saskatchewan section. How wise the convention was in its choice of leadership has been aptly demonstrated in the events of the past few days. May I say this, that since that convention at which he was chosen leader, from one end of Canada to the other he has had the reception of the kind rarely accorded a political leader in a non-election campaign period. Service clubs, groups on university campuses, groups from every walk of life gathered in large numbers to hear him.

This New Democratic party, which he is now leading, is in every way consistent with the history and the philosophy and the objectives of the CCF. It is based on the belief that there is a fundamental unity of basic needs and desires of those who form the bulk of the people who produce Canadian wealth. It is based on the knowledge that the basic rights and needs of too many Canadians have been denied for too long in one of the richest countries of the world.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — It is designed to eliminate class prejudice in the only way in which class prejudice can be eliminated, by removing the extreme differences in opportunity which have existed too long in Canada. The trade unions of Canada who have sought and obtained affiliation with this group were simply trying to exercise, to find a way of exercising more effectively political responsibilities. They seek neither to dominate the party nor does the constitution of the party make possible the domination by them.

I had the experience of sitting for a period of some two years on a committee made up part of representatives from CCF, part of representatives from the trade unions of Canada. I can honestly say that if I hadn't known before I went to that committee who it was that came from the CCF and who it was that came from the trade unions, I would never have known as the result of the discussion that went on in that committee. I can add to that there has been no change in that situation during the last six months. Now the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks yesterday sought to leave the suggestion that for

some reason or other we are fading away almost to a shadow. In fact, at a point he had us on the very verge of the grave.

I want to remind the members of the legislature and the people of the province, Mr. Speaker, that this is the same somewhat boastful, boisterous — the Leader-Post calls him prophet — who in the 1960 elections announced to all the country that the Liberals were winning not 40 but 41 seats in the legislature. They came back, you recall, with less than half of that. I recall reading in the Leader-Post editorial this morning that they referred to the Leader of the Opposition as buoyant. You know buoyant frequently means full of air, or some lighter substance.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — May I suggest to him that no amount of wishful thinking or boastful shouting or of stabbing the air by my stubby-fingered friend, the Leader of the Opposition is going to make us fold our tents and silently steal away. The power of people doing things together has always been and always will be the greatest force for progress.

What he suggested in his remarks yesterday, that the day is coming when all so-called free enterprise parties will rally under the tattered banner of Liberalism in Saskatchewan he dreams dreams and he hears voices, he sees himself, I gather from his remarks, mounted on a white horse, sort of modern male, somewhat rotund counterpart of Joan of Arc driving out the enemies.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — After he got off the radio, and I can understand why he waited until he got off the radio, he undertook to define what this Liberalism was. I suggest to you that such a collection of moth-eaten phrases gathered from all the copy books of history has seldom been heard in this legislature. He undertook in those remarks to establish himself as a spokesman for both the Conservatives and the Social Credit parties in Saskatchewan. This is a little bit strange when one thinks of future events, when one knows that the Liberals in this province will be going about condemning and berating the policies and the principles and the leadership of the Conservatives

**Wednesday, February 28, 1962**

and Social Creditors with the coming election campaign.

He might have remembered Mr. Speaker, that about a year ago now he also tried to represent himself as the spokesman for these two groups. Mr. Kelln, the Leader of the Social Credit Party, at that time, is reported in the Leader-Post, February 16, 1961. The Leader-Post says this:

“Mr. Kelln went on to say, this is the typical type of gutter politics (these are Mr. Kelln’s words, not mine) that the Liberal party and many of their cohorts engaged in throughout the 1960 election and since. On the one hand they claim the Social Creditors were hired by the CCF to split the vote; on the other hand they claim we, the Social Credit party, are now supporting it, the Liberal Party.”

He got a similar rebuff after a similar statement made not many months ago, and on November the 10th, 1961 the Leader-Post quotes Mr. Pederson, the Leader of the Conservative party saying this:

“I would like to ask Mr. Thatcher, under whose authority he has assumed the role of sole spokesman for the free enterprise system of government. Had the Liberals been fulfilling the correct role in the legislature, they might have been justified in seeking the support they now ask, said Mr. Pederson. In our opinion Mr. Thatcher has been doing a poor job as being spokesman for the free enterprise system.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — You might also have recalled a somewhat more striking bit of history . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Who won the election?

**Premier Lloyd:** — Namely, the election of 1952, because the election of 1952 was to a considerable extent a straight fight between Liberals and CCF. The Conservatives in that election ran eight candidates and got 2 per cent of the votes. The Social Creditors ran 24 candidates and got 4 per cent of the votes, so all except 6 per cent of the

votes plus some that went to some independent was divided by the two parties that are represented in this legislature and the election results emerged in this way. Liberals in this more or less straight fight got 39 per cent of the votes and 11 members; the CCF got 54 per cent of the vote and 42 members. The moral I suggest Mr. Speaker is this, that there are some people who don't like parties who sacrifice principle for political advance and the election of 1952 demonstrated that fact.

During the course of his remarks, he referred to a recent broadcast of mine, which I had entitled, "The Value of Paying Taxes". While he didn't really intend to do so, I am sure he paid me a compliment, or at least I accepted it as a compliment during the course of his remarks. He said that the broadcast demonstrated, as I recall his remarks, that I was more a teacher than a salesman. I accept that judgment; it is one of the few of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's that I am prepared to accept. I accept it for this reason; I accept it because the history of this party has been one of support, because the people understood rather than because they had been sold a bill of goods.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — I am quite happy to leave the salesmanship to my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal party, and quite gladly so.

Since reference was made to that broadcast, then I want to read and consequently repeat some of the remarks I made at that time. I said that night that I am asking you to consider the case of public services and the value of paying taxes to provide these services. My claim is that the portion of our income spent through taxes for public services is the best investment we make. I make two basic assertions, first there are two sides to the tax ledger. We must balance money paid out against value received. We must consider what we would have to repay, if we had to purchase personally and privately the services received from these taxes. If we do we'll see the savings involved. To build our own sections of roads, to purchase privately the education for each of our children, are practices discarded a long time ago by those people. They were discarded because by sharing the responsibility, it could be done better and for many it was the only way of doing it at all. My second

assertion is that the value we get from paying taxes for public services is one of the best buys we make.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday, it seems to me, disclaims this point of view in his remarks. He asserted, some at least of his colleagues applauded, that things all cost more when they are done by government.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Particularly this government.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Later, I am sure that some of the members of the opposition, some of them sincerely so, will be trying to convince us that they believe in public ownership. But this cry that things always cost more when done by government and other kinds of opposition to sharing through public programs the production of our nation is as old as organized government itself.

You will recall the cry that went up when measures such as family allowance and old age pensions were first discussed. It was said that these would ruin the economy of the country. They haven't of course; they have in fact strengthened it. Yesterday, from the Leader of the Opposition, we got this same cry of possible ruination because of the cost of social service. Yesterday, for example, he regretted the increase in cost of the hospitalization plan, and as he talked I seemed to hear the echo of the voice of the chief advisor to the Liberal party on house matters, one Dr. McCannel of Regina. I recall Mr. Speaker, reading in the press, that this person, speaking in Minnesota a while ago, said he didn't like the province's hospital plan either, but he went on to say, "The plan is overwhelmingly popular and I doubt that any major changes will ever be made in it." This discerning advisor of the political and the health scene is valued so much by the Liberals that they elected him to their provincial executive.

I say that the question with regard to hospitalization costs is simply this: the question is wouldn't the cost have been less for Saskatchewan people if there had been no organized plan for providing services? Put it another way, is it more demanding on the provincial economy to pay for such services through taxation rather than to pay singly or in smaller groups. There are two tests to be applied, Mr. Speaker, and I expect that the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan has met both of them.



The first test, does it cost more? The answer is no, and moreover the costs are more fully and fairly distributed. The second question, are the services good? The answer is yes, and moreover they are more available to more people. Regardless of that kind of situation, we will remember that a stand-pat federal Liberal government, even after promising in 1945 to share cost of hospitalization, were booted from office in 1957 without having made available a single penny for the purpose of operating hospitals.

There may be those who still believe that be one rich or be one poor, one ought to look after the education of his own children and all the needs of his aged parents. But the number who so believe are getting smaller, for the simple reason that experience has shown that it is better for everybody when we provide such services by doing them together. Individuals benefit more, so do communities, so does the whole economy. We can't of course share the benefits of doing together unless we also share in paying together. May I suggest that the expense to which we wisely use our collective strength to provide opportunities which would otherwise be denied to segments of our community is a measurement of our sensitivity to the welfare and the worthwhileness of other people; it is a measurement of our maturity in society.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition went on to talk about the tax load being carried by the people of Saskatchewan and you will recall his categorical, dogmatic statement that the tax load in Saskatchewan on a per capita basis was the highest of any province in Canada. Again I regret to point out that this is wrong. It is the third error in his address in the last two days. I say it is wrong because that information is supplied to us by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Let me look for a while then at the comparative tax load in the provinces of Canada, for the year 1961-62. I shall look first at the tax load without including the special taxes provided for medical care which have been effective since January 1st of this year, I shall look later at it including those taxes, but without those taxes then the tax load in Saskatchewan is \$88 per capita, this is not the highest in Canada, nor the second highest or the third highest Mr. Speaker, which gives some indication of how far wrong the Leader of the Opposition was.

**Wednesday, February 28, 1962**

It is the fourth highest admittedly. If one takes our per capita taxes as a percentage, however, of personal income per capita then we are not even the fourth highest, but the fifth highest. Including the special taxes to provide medical care which of course again will not be an additional cost but a substitution for other costs, we still are not the highest per capita in Canada but only the third highest per capita.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Those are your figures not D.B.S.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Those are D.B.S. Figures.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No they are not.

**Premier Lloyd:** — I go on to a second point which he attempted to make with regard to the debt load carried by the people of Saskatchewan. While he is fond of referring to the total and gross debt of the province, he overlooks of course in doing so that Saskatchewan is the only province in Canada which by means of a public program provides the services of all the major utilities, the only province in Canada which, through public endeavour, provides natural gas, electricity and telephone services. Some of the other provinces provide two of them, some one of them, none of the rest provide three of them. This automatically, of course, gives need for some increased borrowing in order to finance the expansion of these services. But this is an investment which provides employment which improves our base for industrial development and certainly would help to bring more abundant living to many of the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — Let me look over some figures that may be found in the report by Wood, Gundy and Company, called Canadian Government Municipal and Financial Statements, prepared obviously on the same basis with regard to each province in Canada. They look at the provincial net debt together with contingent liabilities and guarantees. If we look at this we will find that Saskatchewan's provincial net debt and contingent liabilities and guarantees are the lowest in Canada on a per capita basis.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Socialistic arithmetic.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Wood, Gundy, will thank you I am sure.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Those are your figures.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would care to take the book and read it then perhaps he might believe it. The province which is next to it on a per capita basis is the province of Alberta. If one looks at the net cost per capita of servicing our debt, we find that only one province has a lower net cost per capita of servicing debt, that province is the province of Alberta. We get a similarly favourable picture when we look at the comparative debt situation in local governments across Canada. Here we find that the debt charges of Saskatchewan municipalities, local governments are the seventh per capita in Canada. They are the eighth in terms of the percentage which these charges are of per capita income. It is of interest to note that they are the seventh in the rate of increase of debt charges over the last three years.

One looks at the percentage of expenditures by local governments which the meeting of these debt costs take in the prairie provinces, the picture is this: 14.8 per cent of local government expenditure in Manitoba goes for debt charges; 18.3 per cent in Alberta, in Saskatchewan only 8.7 per cent of local government expenditure is needed for debt charges. Now with typical Liberal flexibility, that condition which makes them wise enough to accept anything, Mr. Speaker, the opposition will argue that municipal debt shows progress and development whereas provincial debt is a very vast thing indeed. However, municipalities have to do more than pay the charges on their debt, so let us look for awhile at total local taxation throughout Canada in the year 1961. Here again Saskatchewan's local taxation was not the highest per capita — it was admittedly the second highest per capita. Ontario is \$8 per capita higher, Alberta which is third is only \$2 per capita less — there is very little difference between the two of us. Local taxation increase however is of a nature that in Saskatchewan in 1959-1960 and 1961, it was less than in seven other provinces. If one looks at the rate of increase of school taxes in those three years we find that the rate of increase in Saskatchewan was in fact less than in the other provinces. It was 11 per cent in Saskatchewan, it was 15 per cent in Quebec and 19 per cent in Alberta, and so on.

There are many ways of comparing and attempting

**Wednesday, February 28, 1962**

to compare the tax of local taxation on rural residents. Let me just give one comparison which is the tax per acre levied by rural municipalities in the three provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. This is for the year 1959, the latest year for which this kind of comparison can be made. Tax per acre in Manitoba 58 cents, in Saskatchewan 56 cents, in Alberta 60 cents. It will be noted that the tax in Saskatchewan per acre was the lowest of the three. You get a reasonably similar comparison if you look at the local tax in our urban municipalities. On a per capita basis, Regina was the 7th of 16 cities of comparable or larger size, Saskatoon 15th of 16 cities of a comparable or larger size. So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no foundation in fact for the statement that Saskatchewan citizens are the most highly taxed in all of Canada. The statistics which I have just given show there is no foundation in fact for that statement. There is foundation in fact Mr. Speaker, which shows a very favourable degree of effort on the part of the provincial government, our local government and our taxpayers to provide some of the extremely essential public services.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No wonder you lost Weyburn.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Let me illustrate this by means of the expenditure on education by the province and by local governments. These expenditures show that in dollars per student we are third highest in Canada, in dollars per capita of total population we are second highest in Canada. It will be of interest to note that the provinces with Liberal governments place seventh, eighth and tenth in terms of expenditures for education per capita. Our per capita expenditure on education as a percentage of our per capita income is in fact the highest among the Canadian provinces, indicating as I said a minute ago . . .

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — . . . the effort made by the people of Saskatchewan to provide good educational services. Let us look for a moment at the transfer of payments, school taxes if you like, for education from the province to local governments. On the basis again of dollars per student we are third among the provinces of Canada, and the provinces with Liberal governments rank sixth, ninth and tenth. On a per capita basis we rank third, and the

Liberal provinces rank fourth, seventh, ninth and tenth. One reason why, Mr. Speaker, these transfers or school grants if you like for education have not been greater has been that we in this province in this government have consciously decided to emphasize expenditures on health services. When we do this we in some part relieve municipalities and individuals of certain costs, and when you do this of course you do improve to some extent their taxpaying ability.

Let me just add a few comparisons of services in Saskatchewan which are available in other provinces only at a cost in the field of health. Take the cost of taking care of and treating persons in the field of mental health. Manitoba services are very similar to those in Saskatchewan, but in the neighbouring province of Alberta there is a charge of 50 cents per day to the parents or to the municipalities in which mentally defective children reside, the municipalities in turn may collect from the parents. There is a charge of \$1 per day for patients who are mentally ill. In British Columbia there is a charge of \$1.50 per day for mentally ill and retarded adults and 75 cents a day for children.

Take the matter of cancer treatment. Again Manitoba is very similar to ours, but in British Columbia the diagnostic services are paid by those who are able to do so, in other words there is a means test imposed. Some 20 per cent of the total operating costs are met by patients' fees. Treatment is on the same basis then, as those who are able to pay do so. In Alberta I think there is no charge; people who go to hospital for diagnostic procedures don't have to pay a thing for the first seven days, but hospitalized cancer patients do have to pay, but they don't have to in Saskatchewan, one to two dollars a day for their hospitalization.

There is further evidence of this effort on the part of the government of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan if we look at provincial health expenditures on a comparative basis. In these expenditures we stand first among all of the provinces of Canada, with expenditure of over \$45 per capita per year on health extensions, and governments in provinces in which there are Liberal governments stand seventh and again ninth and tenth in terms of per capita expenditure on health programs. The province of Quebec for example has a per capita expenditure of just slightly over 50 per cent of that in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Give them time, they have only been in there a year.

**Premier Lloyd:** — They were in Manitoba for a long while. It was even worse in the province of Manitoba while they were there. Now the Leader of the Opposition derived a great deal of pleasure and he felt, I am sure, considerable effect yesterday in talking about new taxes or charges — license fees, permit fees, royalties, etc. There are quite a number of new fees for services of this kind. May I point out this — they reflect new services which are now available, but which were denied the people under the Liberal government in 1944.

May I give some examples? There are today fees for students who attend the Saskatchewan Technical Institute. This clearly wasn't necessary under a Liberal government; there wasn't any institute. There are fees in the Department of Education for persons who make use of a drama library or who attend courses for drama directors, or courses for recreational directors. This clearly wasn't necessary under the Liberal government, because these services weren't available. There are fees for community planning consultant services. This wasn't necessary under the Liberals; there was no consultation available — there wasn't even an act, Mr. Speaker. There are permit fees, and royalties with regard to the potash industry. This we definitely didn't need under the Liberal government. This industry has invested in recent years some \$50 to \$60 million in the province of Saskatchewan, and have announced they are going to invest even more large amounts of money.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — There's a lot more when you boys have gone.

**Premier Lloyd:** — There are fees with regard to pipelines in this list he referred to, and this we didn't need under the Liberal government. Talking about pipelines, may I suggest, if there is one word which more than any other often makes Liberals blush it is reference to pipelines.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . selling it.

**Premier Lloyd:** — There are fees for the apprenticeship programs — some 15 different groups. This we didn't need under the Liberals because there was no apprenticeship program. There are some fees with regard to the Real Estate Act —

an act which was asked for by the real estate agents of the province. There are fees with regard to the use of propane, the control and inspection of oil burners, which weren't necessary before. Some of the ones which he referred to had to do with new liquor outlets in the province of Saskatchewan, something that was recommended by an all-party committee of the legislature. There are various charges by the Department of Agriculture for services which didn't exist before but which have been brought into effect under the leadership of the present Minister of Agriculture in this government.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — Let me just give a few examples — provincial pastures for example take up some of the space in this return. There was one provincial pasture in 1944. There were no services in connection with it other than the use of the grass and there were fees for that. There are 33 of these in operation in the province today, services such as vaccination for black leg, such as spraying for warble flies, breeding fees are charged, and this is an extremely logical and economical arrangement for the farmers of the province to obtain this kind of service. Bangs tests began as a program, an organized program, in 1947. It was previously carried out on a rather isolated basis through the province. Calftooth vaccination — there was practically no progress in 1944.

And then the Leader of the Opposition served us what was supposed to be his most death stroke of the entire afternoon. He said, as I recall it Mr. Speaker, "The socialists a few years ago even started to put a \$100 tax on cemeteries. Even in death there is no deliverance from the socialists." Now that is pretty good, Mr. Speaker, I give him credit — that is pretty good.

Now let us look at this particular example — there was in 1955 an act passed with regard to cemeteries, commercial cemeteries, and providing for a fee of \$100. It also provided a \$5 fee, a license for the sales under these particular companies, and it provided of course a requirement that 15 per cent of the sales price be set aside in an irrevocable trust in order to provide protection that the services which had been stated would be given. Now I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this particular example goes far to show the difference between the Liberal party and ourselves. The Liberal

party is opposed to this — the Leader of the Opposition at least is opposed to it. He is prepared to see exploitation carried on even after death. We on the other hand Mr. Speaker, are concerned with welfare of the people even after death. We on the other hand Mr. Speaker are concerned with welfare of the people even beyond the grave.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — There was one rather admitted and curious admission in this statement with regard to the order for return dealing with taxes in 1961 as compared to 1944. You will notice he said, “I’ll omit any reference to these fees for purposes of health programs.” I wonder why. I suggest he left this out because he didn’t want to mention those many health services which this government has made available to the people of Saskatchewan. For example, some space is taken up in relating certain charges with regard to the physical restoration program. Under this program some 70 different orthopaedic and prosthetic appliances are made available to handicapped persons at a nominal cost, and this is made possible in part by national health grants. The air ambulance is there and this takes some space. We didn’t need that in 1944. An examination of those which are attached to the cancer program reveals they take up quite a lot of space, but it reveals more than space, Mr. Speaker. It reveals first of all the desperate attempts of the Liberals to create a cancer service on paper before they were swept out of office.

Now I think I have related before in this legislature an incident which occurred to me in 1944, during the election campaign. There had been an election speaker on behalf of the Liberal party in the town of Biggar, a matter of fact my predecessor in office, the Hon. Mr. Staines, Minister of Education was there, and he had been telling the people about the free cancer services which were available. A lady who had just lost a son because of cancer, and who had paid the bill, came into the office in Biggar, to know if I knew anything about these free cancer services. I said I didn’t but would try and find out. I telephoned to the then Deputy Minister of Health in Regina — he asked who was speaking and I told him — he said well, no there isn’t any free service at this time. He said we are negotiating with the doctors. Now can you imagine Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party going out and announcing services available when they hadn’t yet made any arrangements with the doctors.



**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we were already paying the taxes, and I submit that if I follow the argument of my hon. friend, these taxes were being fraudulently collected, because we were paying and there weren't any services available.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Get to the other 1190 tax increases, Woodrow.

**Premier Lloyd:** — But this order for return about cancer reveals also why the present cancer program is second to no other in North America. Here is set out in detail some 375 different items of service which are rendered by specialists and other physicians and which are made available under a public financed program in Saskatchewan to those of our citizens who require treatment for cancer. These charges do not apply to Saskatchewan residents suffering from cancer. They apply only to those who are non-residents or those persons who may be treated by the cancer commission but who do not have beds. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition so gracefully omitted any reference to this particular section. If I were a Liberal I wouldn't want to talk about it either. I wouldn't want to remind myself and others of the success that this government has had in developing this program, or if I were the Leader of the Opposition as he sits there today, determined, so it seems to me, to oppose a comprehensive medical care plan, I too wouldn't want to remind anybody that there is a public program that is and has been an outstanding success, here is a public program that is completely acceptable to those who receive the service as well as those physicians who render the service.

Let me go on now to talk about the . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Let us get to the rest of the tax increases first . . . 1190 more to go.

**Premier Lloyd:** — . . . general program. The buoyancy of the Leader of the Opposition . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Tell us about agriculture . . .

**Premier Lloyd:** — I return to the topic of

medical care, to comment again on some of the comments made yesterday. First of all with regard to the personnel of the commission. I want to take this opportunity to commend the Minister of Health on the very able commission which has been put together for this purpose. It is a commission that is well balanced in terms of skill and experience, each member on it commands the respect of all those who have been associated with him in the exercise of his respective duties. One wonders why the Leader of the Opposition is exerting such a strenuous effort to make it appear otherwise. Since the charge is made, may I just make fairly brief reference to the members of the commission. The Chairman, Mr. Tansley, a public servant admittedly, for the life of me I don't know what is wrong with being a public servant Mr. Speaker, but I gather from the Leader of the Opposition there is something wrong about it. He is one of the best administrators that had ever been employed in this province of Saskatchewan.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — Director of our budget bureau, of our finance office, acting Deputy Minister of the Treasury at one time, selected by the federal government to take part in a technical assistance program in Ghana. Certainly he is not a doctor, but neither Mr. Speaker is he going to diagnose illness or take out anybody's appendix. He is there for the purpose of administration.

But we are well served, and I don't know how we could be better served, by doctors on the commission, than by those who presently sit there. Dr. Hjertaas, farm background, post graduate work in Manitoba and in Edinburgh, chief of surgery at the Victoria Union Hospital in Prince Albert. Dr. Wolfe, seven years of practice in rural Saskatchewan, a recipient of a two-year Rockefeller foundation fellowship, and these fellowships don't go to just anybody, Mr. Speaker, lots of able people competing for them. During that period he had the opportunity to study and do research with regard to the organization of medical care and health services generally. Dr. Roth — the Deputy Minister in this province. Outstanding in Canada, but I want to say just a bit more than a passing tribute to Dr. Roth, because he is as was noted yesterday leaving the province of Saskatchewan in a few months. He has given excellent service here. He is leaving mainly because he sees the need for greater opportunities for training people to do work in public health. Mr. Taylor one of the abler lawyers in the province of Saskatchewan,

a part-time lecturer at the College of Law at the University of Saskatchewan, President of the Bar Association of Saskatoon last year. Mr. Kipling, farmer, town councillor, co-operatives, chairman of the Melfort Health Region Board since it began. Mr. Stuart Robertson, farmer, municipal secretary-treasurer, I am happy to say Mr. Speaker, a former secretary-treasurer in the municipality in which my home is, the municipality which was one of the early ones to develop a municipal doctor plan. More recently secretary-treasurer of the health region in Swift Current which has had such an excellent record of providing medical care services in that area.

I say again Saskatchewan citizens are well served by this group of men. It would be hard to find a more able group. It is difficult to understand why the Liberal leader is so anxious to try to destroy confidence, or is it so difficult to see after all? He suggested yesterday that the majority of the people of the province don't have confidence in this plan. But what's the evidence on this score within recent months, Mr. Speaker? The Saskatchewan Farmers' Union passed a resolution supporting it at its annual convention, referred to it in its brief to the government just a few months ago. The Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, many of the individual trade unions throughout the province have endorsed it. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture, meeting just awhile ago at Banff, here is the quotation from the Leader-Post:

“A national compulsory medical care insurance program on a contributory basis was approved by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.”

**Premier Lloyd:** — This includes representatives from Saskatchewan farm movements. The federated co-operatives at their annual meeting, just a matter of a few months ago supported it. The executive of the co-operative movement of Saskatchewan have done the same thing. More recently, the optometrists of Saskatchewan, meeting in Regina, a news report on the date of February 16th, 1962 has this to say:

“Saskatchewan Optometric Association, Wednesday approved the statement of association policy for the comprehensive health program in Saskatchewan.”

**Wednesday, February 28, 1962**

“The association approved the principle of comprehensive health care on the basis of six terms of reference. The association stipulated that the integrity, the dignity and freedom of the health professions, together with the rights of the patients must be preserved under any health program and the practitioner must be preserved under any health program and the practitioner must be free to exercise his professional judgment instilled as defined under the respective professional acts.”

With that we heartily agree.

Mr. Speaker, these then are some of the people and some of the groups who stand with our proposals. May I ask who stands with the Leader of the Opposition in his request of yesterday that the act be repealed and be replaced with one based on a means test? You will recall his reference that the act should provide care for the indigent and those who could prove that they couldn't pay the premium.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I said nothing of the kind.

**Premier Lloyd:** — You are so quoted in the Leader-Post of this morning.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You are making that up.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, he made it up. I can be forgiven for quoting what he made up.

I think that we need to remember, and I should think the Liberal party would want to remember, that it was this same person, who as a member of the House of Commons in Ottawa, spoke in opposition to universal old-age pensions. I should think they should want to look at the statement in connection with that statement about social welfare, yesterday, a statement which I am sure, under different circumstances, my friend the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) would describe as being “weasel-words”.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You have plenty of them.

**Premier Lloyd:** — I should think they would want to look at this in

connection with his reported statement in Ottawa about a month ago that even Mr. Diefenbaker is too far to the left. I suggest Mr. Speaker, that the time is coming when the Liberals need to take a pretty hard look at this “boy” of theirs, who is presumably leading in Saskatchewan a great reform movement. He may well be. He may well be himself, mounted on a white horse, I suggest if he is, he is looking the wrong direction at least. If he is hearing voices, I suggest that the voices that he heard aren’t the voices of angels, they are the voices of an outmoded political creed which long ago has been discarded by most people in Canada.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — He went on to make the statement that doctors in the province were being threatened, bullied and maligned. This Mr. Speaker, is pure unadulterated nonsense. The Minister of Health in this government has extended every possible effort and every possible courtesy, short of promising to sacrifice the basic principle of a comprehensive health plan in order to arrange a meeting with the representatives of this group.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — But not till the bill was passed.

**Premier Lloyd:** — He referred, at one stage in his remarks to the Toronto Star, as a paper whose advice should be heeded. So let me read a part of an editorial in the Toronto Star of the issue of February 24th.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . said about Argue.

**Premier Lloyd:** — The Star said,

“The best way in which the doctors can make certain that medical standards are preserved under the government-sponsored scheme, which is bound to develop in Canada (not Saskatchewan but Canada) is to co-operate with it. To get in there on the ground floor and help draw up the rules. They will serve their own cause best by working with, not against governments, and they should recognize that where public funds are being spent, public supervision is essential.”

They go on to say,

“What Canadians want (not just people in Saskatchewan but what Canadians want) is a system that will provide all of them, rich and poor, with the medical care they require. They do not want to bilk the doctors. They merely want to be sure that every citizen gets medical attention when he needs it, not as a matter of charity but as a matter of right.”

Mr. Speaker, that now well-worn phrase that what Canadians need is parity not charity applies in the field of medical care as well as in the field of price for wheat.

Let me say this, that the medical care proposals, which are now before the people of this province represent the conscious will of the people of Saskatchewan as expressed by this legislature. It grew out of the satisfaction that the people of Saskatchewan had gained from other publicly-financed, organized health programs. The real problem for the Saskatchewan College of Physicians and Surgeons is not just how to work with others to make available all of their great pain-relieving life-extending, life-giving services. The real problem is one which their executive has posed for them and that is one of admitting respect for law and government as proper instruments of general welfare.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — Because some reference was made to how doctors might feel about this particular matter, I want to make just a few references to some of the evidence that has come out of Great Britain, where admittedly the situation and the proposal is quite different, but underlying principles can be quite similar. I take these from a book which I recommend to the members of the opposition entitled “Essays on the Welfare State.” It was written by one of the heads of departments of the London School of Economics. It says this:

“Since 1948 all the medical schools in Britain have been flooded with applications. Bark’s hospital in London was reporting 2,000 applications for 100 places. The report of the committee of vice chancellors and principles in the university admissions has shown that the number of applications for

applicants was higher in medicine than in any other faculty.”

They comment too on something which I suggest is indicative of how doctors feel about it. It says that nearly one in five of all of the men admitted to medical faculties were the sons of doctors — nearly one in five. In other faculties, less than 2 per cent, which I think is one out of 50 of the men admitted were the sons of doctors. With regard to the doctor-patient relationship which is important and much discussed, this comment was made. The committee on general practice set up by the Central Health Services Councils composed mainly of doctors holding important positions in the British Medical Association and the Royal College of Physicians and other professional bodies came to this conclusion. The committee does not think the advent of the national health service has disturbed the relationship between doctors and their patients. The evidence of the British Medical Association, of an enquiry made by the social survey for the committee, and of an enquiry made independently, bear out the general impression made by the evidence of individual doctors, that the relationship is good, in some respects indeed it was found to be better than before and this was attributed to the absence of the money bar and to increased co-operation among doctors.

Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of our health program in Saskatchewan which receives a great deal of discussion. Sometimes, while I realize the people feel extremely keen and emotional about it, and while I realize that the needs are great, I think it is subject to some unfair discussion. So I want to say something about the mental health program which exists in the province of Saskatchewan. Again, as an indication of efforts of the people of Saskatchewan through their government in developing this kind of service. Let's look at some comparisons with other provinces. My reference is to the operating expenses of mental hospitals in 1959 — operating expenses per capita. Saskatchewan \$9.62 — being first. British Columbia \$8.22 — being second. Alberta \$7.63 — being third. Of the Liberal provinces, Mr. Speaker statistics on Quebec aren't available. Newfoundland is eighth and New Brunswick is ninth. Let me go back to the figures for a moment because while these are the expenditures, they don't all come from the provincial government. Of the \$9.62 in Saskatchewan — \$9.08 comes from the provincial government. Of the \$8.22 in British Columbia — \$7.48 comes from the provincial government. Of the \$7.63 in Alberta only \$3.83 or less than half comes from the provincial government.

**Wednesday, February 28, 1962**

Secondly, I make this reference that Saskatchewan is the only province in Canada which shows a decrease in its institutional patient population during the 10 year period from 1949 to 1959. Our actual bed capacity for this service is the highest per one thousand population in Canada. But it is by the results obtained that our mental institutions have the right to be judged. In 1944 discharges amounted to 62 per cent of admissions and I admit all the difficulties there were at that particular time. But to show what has happened — in 1961 the discharges amounted to 94 per cent of admissions. From 62 per cent to 94 per cent.

Now the Leader of the Opposition had something to say about the increase in civil servants the other day Mr. Speaker. Here is one reason why more people are employed and here is one of the benefits coming from the employment of more people.

Is there anyone who suggests that there is no real meaning in the words “More abundant living” as applied to the persons who are affected by this program. Sixty-two per cent in 1944 meant 384 people. Ninety-four per cent in 1961 meant 1,633 people returned to health and to opportunity and to more abundant living.

Let me refer also to the preventative program — largely preventative — which has been undertaken. Seven full-time mental health clinics in operation in the province; 15 part-time mental health clinics in operation. Again this has meant some increase in staff, but it has been worth it.

It was with regard to research that we have a particular reason to be very pleased and proud because the statistics will show that Saskatchewan spends on research in this field more than does all the other provinces of great dividends. I am very happy Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, to announce that we will this year be providing the means whereby there may be plans for the campus of the university of Saskatchewan, a psychiatric research centre. It is expected that construction will be undertaken next year. This is supported by the Canadian Mental Health Association and the federal government, along with the provincial government of Saskatchewan.

To sum it all up I should like to read a statement of Dr. Robertson, when he appeared recently before the Hall Commission on Medical Services, here in the city of Regina. Here are his words:



“We also recognize, with some dismay that some atmosphere has been created to suggest that mental health services in this province are, if not appalling, than very bad. They are of course in the opinion of international experts, third in the world, after Great Britain and Holland.”

That is where our medical services in this province stand.

Now I want to turn to a reference of the Leader of the Opposition to the increase in the number of civil servants, and in turning to this I turn also to his fourth error. The figures that he used, as I took them down were that there were 7,293 in Saskatchewan and 4,261 in Manitoba. Maybe I interpret his words wrongly.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I think it was 4800 that I used.

**Premier Lloyd:** — The report of the Manitoba Civil Service Commission shows 5,201 civil servants on December 1960 — over a year ago. That is different from 4,261.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The figure I used was 4800.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Certainly there are more now, probably close to 6,000. The total positions in Saskatchewan in 1961-62 — permanent positions are 6,800. Now there has been a growth in the number of employees in the government of Saskatchewan. I recall a very dramatic explanation of this by one who used to be my seat-mate, the former Attorney-General in the province of Saskatchewan, who pointed out to the legislature that after all it takes more men to man a ship that is under full sail and going some place than it does to take care of one that is tied up at harbour and with barnacles all over.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You’ve got the barnacles now.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Now, let’s look at some reasons why this increase in the number of public employees has been not only necessary, but also of advantage. Budgetary expenditures have increased from \$24 million to \$147 million. The Department of Education alone will spend more money than the total government of Saskatchewan did in 1944. The

**Wednesday, February 28, 1962**

major increases have been in field staffs. The Departments of Public Health, Agriculture, Social Welfare, Municipal Affairs. There has been an expensive decentralization which has meant the taking of health and welfare, agricultural and grid road services out to the people. There have been all kinds of worthwhile services which didn't exist in 1944. Let me just list some of them. The Technical Institute at Moose Jaw — 66 new employees there. Five geriatric centres — 310 employees. Two training schools for mentally defectives — 636 more employees needed. The Physical Restoration Centres — 65 employees. The Air Ambulance — 19 employees. The grid roads — 35 employees. The Department of Co-ops — 56 employees, there were a few before. The Department of Mineral Resources — we certainly didn't need many people in this department in 1944 to look after the development of our mineral resources — 197 employees now. Just these few examples which I give, and they only demonstrate a few of the services which have been not only desirable but necessary, add up to 1,374. One wonders that the Leader of the Opposition would be ready to go back to the good old days and scrap these programs, which would have to be done to reduce the size of the public service.

May I turn now to spend just a few minutes in connection with the economic growth of the province. New industries in Saskatchewan announced in 1961, or under construction in 1961, or completed in 1961 represent a capital expenditures of some \$41 million. When they are in full production they will provide employment for something over one thousand persons. In addition to that there were expansions in 51 of our industries which represent a capital investment of some \$27 million.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You announced them before and they . . .

**Premier Lloyd:** — Look for a while at the net value of commodity production in 1961. The picture with regard to farm production was of course disappointing. The 1961 net value of farm production \$181 million. This was a reduction of nearly \$300 million from the previous year, a reduction of over \$500 million from 1961. This is a severe shock to any economy — obviously so. May I point out this, Mr. Speaker, that the affect was more severe than necessary because of the inadequate cost-price relationship which has existed for many years. If our farmers had received, during the years when they had produced so well and so much a fair price for their produce then the shock of this last year would have been much less. Let's just look

at what that history is. Here my reference is to statistics produced by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and used by them in their submission to the House of Commons committee on farm machinery prices. They show that from 1959 to 1960 the increase in the composite index of farm costs was 26 per cent. During the same period the index of prices of farm products declined 20 per cent. May the house be reminded Mr. Speaker, that this began under the Liberals, got worse under the Tories and between them they have gone a long way to ruin the agricultural economy of Canada.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — To illustrate these increases they referred to a letter which one farmer had supplied them with. He wrote with regard to these increases in the price of farm machinery. He said, “A 12 foot combine in 1947 cost me the equivalent of 1800 bushels of No. 2 wheat. In 1952 — 3800 bushels of No. 2 wheat. In 1960 — 6400 bushels of No. 2 wheat.”

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Good old private enterprise.

**Premier Lloyd:** — The other part of our production enterprises are those which are called the non-agricultural industries. Here the value of production in 1961 was \$542 million. It was up \$22 million from the year previous. It is up \$351 million from 1951. In 1961, may I point out, our non-agricultural production was \$284 per cent of our non-agricultural production in 1951. It was 500 per cent of our non-agricultural production in 1946. Over the last five years the net value of our non-agricultural production has been 60 per cent of the value of our total commodity production in the province. When we took over this province from the Liberals, when there was a real period of stagnation and lack of service here, our non-agricultural production amounted to only 25 per cent of our total production. This increase has been in construction, in manufacturing and electric power and in mining. I will just quote a few examples. The net value of mining production in 1961 was more than eight times that of 1946. The net value of electrical power in 1961 was more than six times that of 1946. The net value of our manufacturing was more than three times that of 1946 and the net value of our construction was more than six times that of 1946.

There is more evidence of growth if we take a look at non-farm personal income. In 1961 wages and

salaries amounted to some \$650 million. That was \$17 million more than in 1960. It was \$450 million more than in 1946. Wages and salaries amounted in 1961 to three times the amount they did in 1946. If one looks further at the agricultural industry we find there evidence of diversification. Cash income from farm products other than grain shows this. The figures for 1961 aren't yet available but they amounted to \$212 million in 1960. This was \$10 million greater than in 1959, it was \$53 million greater than 1955. As a matter of fact Mr. Speaker, in this six year period the cash income from farm products other than grain has increased by 37 per cent. These statistics Mr. Speaker show that the total economic base in this province has been increased and has been strengthened by diversification. They show also that the agricultural industry has been strengthened by diversification within and by increased production of other industries.

During the course of the debate from time to time there are some references made to more abundant living in the province of Saskatchewan. Well now I am not sure how hon. members opposite define more abundant living. I know there are undoubtedly a variety of opinions as to what it is that constitutes and how one measures the abundance of living. But it is measured by the comforts which they are able to enjoy, by the quality of experience which is available to them, by the recreational facilities and opportunities which they have access to, by the ease of travel from one place in the province to another, and by a great many other things also. I want to just examine for a few minutes some of the ways in which through largely public and tax-supported programs people of Saskatchewan are enjoying a more abundant living. I submit that nobody can deny that lives have been saved and suffering decreased because of programs such as cancer, hospitalization, air ambulance, mental health extended programs, health regions, rehabilitation centres. These admittedly are not all new programs, but those that aren't new have been greatly extended. Secondly there are those older people in our midst, Mr. Speaker, and comfort in old age means a great deal in terms of abundant living. Freedom from the fear of having no place to live, of being dependent on charity. When you remove these kinds of fears, you add to the abundant living. There is in the province accommodation for some 4,650 people in our geriatric centres and senior citizens' homes. More than this is needed. Nobody will argue with it. Accommodation for over 600 is now planned or under construction.

Certainly opportunities for education is one of the ways in which we should measure a more abundant living. One thinks of the contribution of larger school units, of what this has happened, particularly to a great many of our rural and small urban youngsters who would otherwise have been denied high school education. Assistance available by way of scholarships to students or loans to students who are going on to university, to teacher's college, to the technical institute and schools of nursing. The expansion in technical educational facilities and let us recognize the very great help of the federal government on this point. There is more expansion underway now. The tremendous expansion at the University of Saskatchewan on both campuses — the one campus not very far along yet but certainly much to be done in that regard.

I think there would be few people who would argue that bringing the miracle of electricity to some 60 thousand farm homes, brings a great deal more abundant living. There are some 73 thousand homes, many of them in small communities throughout the province that have the abundance of living that comes from the use, at reasonable prices and with the comfort of natural gas. One could go on and talk about the extension of recreational facilities in our provincial parks and our regional parks. These are now getting closer and closer to more and more of our people. Increasing use is being made of them.

There is one other kind of measurement that I want to have reference to. It shows a considerable improvement over the five year period which we have just finished. Public programs haven't made this all possible but public programs have certainly assisted. When you look at some of the facilities which have been added to households in Saskatchewan in this last five years. For example 60 thousand households have added a hot or cold running water supply, an increase of 80 per cent, 60,000 households have installed baths or showers, an increase of 97 per cent, including those who have installed flush or chemical toilets, an increase of 62 per cent, 68,000 who have added electric refrigerators, an increase of 50 per cent, 49,000 have added telephones, an increase of 35 per cent, 103,000 have added television sets, an increase of 159 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that measured in terms of services of facilities and opportunities more abundant living is being enjoyed by Saskatchewan citizens.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

**Premier Lloyd:** — Many factors are combined to make this true. The industry of Saskatchewan people, their will and ability to work together, the development of our resources by corporations and co-operatives who have confidence in the integrity and fair play of this government, and the development of resources by public enterprise, and the function of the government has been to facilitate to arrange to organize, sometimes to do the directing. For 18 years this government, with the consent of the people on five separate occasions has done this facilitating, arranging and organizing and doing. We submit it has been done so competently and effectively — and this we will continue to do.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

**Mr. E. Whelan (Regina City):** — Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to express my sincere congratulations to you on your election as Speaker of this assembly. Your election brings honour to you and to your constituency. All members of the house readily acknowledge your ability to adjudicate, your sincerity and your desire to be fair.

I should like to congratulate the mover of the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky). He is well-liked by all members of the house; he has courage, tenacity, ability and a reputation for representing his constituents faithfully. He has been elected and re-elected with resounding majorities. His efforts on behalf of his constituency are readily acknowledged and his remarks in the Speech from the Throne debate were added evidence of his persistent efforts on their behalf.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — The seconder of the motion, the hon. member for Lumsden (Mr. Thurston) has an enviable record as a spokesman for the farmers on the Regina plains. Because of his understanding of their problems, the hon. member was able to provide us with a straightforward objective statement that will be carefully noted and considered by the agricultural population of Saskatchewan.

Since the last time this house sat, the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) has been elected.

I should like to congratulate him on his election and welcome him to this legislature. I am sure the hon. member will experience a great deal of satisfaction sitting in this house, even though his stay may be terminated in 1964 and even though he may find it difficult, at times to interpret the policies of his party.

After listening, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition and to the Premier of this province participate in this debate, I am sure the people of Saskatchewan will understand why Premier Lloyd has the wholehearted support of every member of the government caucus, and the listeners, if they make an objective comparison, will realize why Premier Lloyd will continue as Premier of this province for a good many years to come.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — On entering this debate, Mr. Speaker, I should like to divide my comments into three sections. First, some clauses from the Speech from the Throne and how they affect the province and my constituency. Second, a scrutiny of some of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, and third an attempt, perhaps a vain attempt, to interpret opposition policy regarding some of the issues of the day.

Plans of the provincial government, the University of Saskatchewan, and the city of Regina, for the university site in this city will be presented to all of us during this session. We will have an opportunity to analyse and study the work undertaken by the joint committee. In my estimation the joint development will provide a seat of learning that is essential if we are to keep pace with the social and scientific changes that are confronting us.

A few years ago high school graduation was necessary to obtain employment. Now we find a university degree will be necessary for employment in this age of automation. School teachers, parents and government leaders must encourage the entire community of southern Saskatchewan to make full use of the facilities that are being so carefully planned.

I commend the government for their participation in the development of this necessary educational institution. As a result, more and more citizens of my constituency will find education and employment opportunities

**Wednesday, February 28, 1962**

readily available to them.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — There is a need for more and better housing for senior citizens. I commend the government for their construction programs in this field.

In the near future I expect the work week will be shortened for the people in the factories and on the farms. A huge tourist industry will develop. The people of Canada, indeed the people from all over this continent will have time to enjoy the beauty of our scenic province and utilize the recreational facilities of Saskatchewan.

The excellent development of provincial parks and recreational areas meets with the approval of my constituency, Mr. Speaker.

The study of the Mechanics' Lien Act, as set out in the Speech from the Throne is long overdue. In its present form it is cumbersome, outdated and difficult to interpret. Members of the bar, contractors, sub-contractors and employees will benefit from the study that is proposed.

During the last few months discussions have revolved around the medical care plan and its implementation. The assurance in the Speech from the Throne that implementation is being proceeded with as expeditiously as possible is welcome.

Young couples, senior citizens, retired farmers and those who are chronically ill are urging us to get the plan under way as soon as possible.

Now where does the opposition stand in this regard? In 1919, and incidentally Mr. Speaker, it was the year that I was born, they promised the people of Canada a comprehensive plan. With their usual political haste they have repeated the promise in some form or another, in election after election, right across this country, and what has been the result?

They failed to implement even a national hospitalization plan. This was done by the Progressive Conservative government. In this way the Conservatives earned the prefix "Progressive", if you compare their record with that of the party sitting opposite.



In a bombastic performance in this house yesterday, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, listening to public opinion with one ear and listening to some doctors with the other criticized the commission, criticized the Minister of Public Health and criticized the plan.

What did all this tub-thumping add up to? I suggest it added up to this. That the Liberal party in opposition is the same Liberal party that 43 years ago promised us a national health plan. It was kidding us then, it is kidding us now and their only contribution to the implementation of this plan is a negative one. It is fighting delaying action on one pretence or another in contradiction of the wishes of the people of this province and in typical procrastinating fashion.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition is sympathetic to the medical hierarchy. He makes lengthy and noisy speeches on their behalf. Mind you, he insists that he is in favour of a medical plan.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Not your kind though.

**Mr. Whelan:** — He wants to continue with the private plans. They have proven costly. They have failed to cover chronic cases. They have had to be supplemented out of the pockets of patients.

Members of the medical profession, like any other citizens, are bound by the law. Laws drawn up by a democratic government of this province are theirs to obey as well as yours and mine. Laws are not passed in any province, in any city, in any place in Canada to be ignored. Would it not be ridiculous if a handful of people in our province ignored the traffic rules and decided to drive on the left hand side of the road, contravening the Vehicles Act, the city bylaws and ignoring the police forces? Yet, Mr. Speaker, here is a handful of people, who if you were to follow their reasoning would drive on the wrong side of the road, against traffic and claim it as a right and a privilege and dare anyone charged with the responsibility of government to challenge them.

I say in all sincerity, encouragement from the opposition benches has only added to the impasse. Regardless of the vocal representations and regardless of a stubborn position taken by a handful of people, collectively the people of this province in accordance with

our pledge and through their government and this legislature will have a prepaid medical care plan.

Recently the national leader of the CCF sought the leadership of the New Democrats. In his campaign for leadership I found him energetically ambitious. Obviously one motive governs all others and that is ambition. The man is ambitious. Now, I suggest that he is still ambitious and that he is still seeking leadership. Perhaps the leadership of the federal Liberal party. Let not the members of the opposition benches forget for a moment that with or without their backing he may be on his way.

Let's look at the evidence and let's examine it carefully. This man said the hon. Lester B. Pearson, when he was chosen to lead the Liberal party was the worst mistake the Liberals ever made. I repeat — the worst mistake the Liberals ever made. I refuse to comment on this remark.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . He has his eyes opened.

**Mr. Whelan:** — . . . obviously if the man who made this remark was sincere when he made it, he can hardly be satisfied with the leader at the moment. There is some indication that the federal leader of the Liberal party is aware of his predicament and some of his supporters may be aware of it too. When the former parliamentary leader was accepted into the party, Mr. Pearson refused to give him the customary political bear-hug for the press photographers.

There is evidence that the Liberal party, at least in this province, has looked outside of their party for leaders. Now Mr. Speaker, I refuse to be drawn into any discussion as to whether or not this defection that we are discussing has been effective or palatable or acceptable, but the record proves, and the fact remains that the Liberal party has established a record for picking leaders with little seniority within the party. The handful who appear to run the Federal Liberal party may choose a leader because he has changed his political allegiance.

In Saskatchewan a similar choice was made, certainly without approval from all the M.L.A.s opposite, and if this precedent and the result is any yardstick then I hope our former parliamentary leaders' ambitions are soon realized, and the sooner the better for the democrats.

I have no criticism of politicians doing what is known now as the “political twist”. I cannot democratically criticize political about-face and I hold no personal grudge for those who practise this questionable manoeuvre, but I say this, it is a disservice and I say sincerely, it is a disservice to all of us in public life, when a person who has switched his political allegiance sits stubbornly in a riding drawing pay for representing a philosophy which he has abandoned. He was elected by one group but now chooses to sit with another group . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — He was elected CCF and now there is no CCF.

**Mr. Whelan:** — . . . a group he soundly defeated in election after election.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — There is no CCF now.

**Mr. Whelan:** — If there is going to be a change of political garb, if people in public life sincerely desire to change their convictions, then I suggest in all earnestness that they should resign their seat. It is incomprehensible to me and to many people, I maintain, that a member should continue to represent a seat when he adheres not to the philosophy for which he was elected, but to a philosophy which was soundly repudiated. Here is the error in judgment. I say it is an error in political ethics which I cannot condone, which I condemn, which I criticize, but which the opposition leader and his news media are glorifying and praising.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

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

**YEAS — 32**  
**Messieurs**

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

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

**NAYS — 15**  
**Messieurs**

Thatcher  
Klein  
Batten (Mrs.)  
McCarthy  
Harris

Danielson  
Cameron  
Gardiner  
Staveley  
Guy

Boldt  
Horsman  
Coderre  
MacDougall  
Snedker

The Assembly adjourned at 4:30 o'clock p.m.