

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

Friday March 2, 1962

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

ON ORDERS OF THE DAY

ANNOUNCEMENT: MEDICAL CARE PLAN

Hon. W.G. Davies (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an announcement on the orders of the day on the matter of some public importance. I am able to report this afternoon that the Medical Care Insurance Commission has recommended the starting date of the medical care plan. That date is July 1, 1962. The government has accepted the commission's recommendation.

One of the main reasons, cited by the commission in recommending this delay, was the sheer size of the administrative and technical task . . . such things as devising and installing mechanized procedures and recruiting and training an adequate staff required to operate the plan. The commission must also prepare a number of detailed regulations and dovetail the medical care plan with the existing public health services in the province. In the commission's considered judgment, it is not possible to accomplish these tasks by April 1st.

July 1st is the most convenient next date which permits an easier transition from existing private and public plans to the new medical care plan. It is the beginning of a new business quarter and permits orderly adjustments for employers and employees having medical benefit plans. Most municipal doctors' plans require three months notice of cancellation. This was another consideration.

Despite the delay, Mr. Speaker, the estimates will show, when they are tabled in this house, that the estimated collections after January 1, 1962, of one and one-half per cent sales tax, the surcharge on income tax, and one per cent corporation tax, will be appropriated solely for medical care.

Friday March 2, 1962

I am satisfied, as I feel most people of the province will be, that the commission is proceeding as rapidly as possible towards implementing the medical care plan, and has exercised wise judgment in requesting a date which permits both the plan and the public to be suitably prepared.

In order that we will have fully comprehensive medical and hospital coverage by July 1st, I am happy to announce that benefits will be widened under the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. I am referring to the inclusion of out-patient services as insured benefits. These include X-ray and laboratory procedures, as well as minor treatment.

Officials of my department will be undertaking with our Saskatchewan hospitals and providers of service the necessary discussions which must precede such a program and have been requested to complete mutually satisfactory arrangements as promptly as possible. I am hopeful that with the co-operation of those providing these services that these extended benefits can be made effective sometime in April.

The Saskatchewan Hospital Association has in the past called for this type of extension. This service has been provided successfully in Swift Current for the past 15 years. The broadening of S.H.S.P. insured service can be seen to represent a significant additional health benefit to the people of the province valued, in minimum terms at \$2 million. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the government is continuing to apply itself in fulfilling its responsibilities to achieve an understanding with the College of Physicians and Surgeons. I intend to make a public announcement in this regard over the next few days.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, just a question. Could I just ask a question of the minister before he takes his seat? Could I ask the minister if he has any assurance that even on the July 1st date he can get the co-operation of the medical profession to make this plan work?

Hon. C.G. Willis (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Saboteur.

Mr. Thatcher: — It is not sabotage at all. The July 1st date doesn't mean anything if you can't get some doctors to co-operate. I think it is a fair question.

And may I ask one supplementary question? When the minister answers would he also indicate whether as yet either the government or the commission has been able to get the medical profession to meet with them?

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Now Mr. Speaker, I think to some extent these are questions which have been asked before, but with respect to the first question I have confidence that some arrangements can be effective by July 1st. Otherwise I should not bother making this announcement.

With respect to the second question I think perhaps this largely depends on the answer I have given to the first. I do think that good reason will prevail and in consequence arrangements can be made that will be mutually satisfactory to both the suppliers of service and the receivers of same.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question, now of the Provincial Treasurer? Does he mean to indicate that instead of collecting this tax for three months, he is going to collect it for six months, without providing any services for which the medical bill was passed? This is most unfair, most unjust.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!, you cannot make a speech when you ask a question.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is aware that the legislation is clear, that the taxes are to be collected by law. I think nobody more than hon. members opposite have suggested that these taxes ought to be included in legislation and ought not to be collected at the discretion of the Executive Council, I can only advise him that the law as passed at the legislature will be adhered to.

Mr. Thatcher: — Six months taxes and no services.

Friday March 2, 1962

CORRECTION

Mrs. Gladys Strum (Saskatoon City): — Before the orders of the day are called I wish to make a correction in a speech I made yesterday which would have been a very serious error. I was quoting a couple of lines from a memo of the Minister of Finance, who last year was Minister of Education, dated 1961, and what I said was this:

“Another costly expenditure which comes from taxes is education — expenditure on education cannot be tied to production but to need.”

I should have said:

“The value of this years crop will be cut in two — last years budget.”

I should have changed the tense in that line, and it should have read that “last years budget was increased by \$4 million more than the previous year and school grants were increased 3.1.”

Naturally no one knows what is in the budget. I realize what a grave error that would have been and I have discussed this with the Leader-Post and I trust that all papers will make this correction.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to introduce a fine group of students from Yellow Creek and Tway High School sitting in the Speakers Gallery. They are led by their teacher, Mr. Hrytzak, principal, Mr. Matkowski, school trustee, and Mr. Klapychiuk, bus driver and I hope their stay here this afternoon will be educational and a pleasant one. Mr. Speaker, I also want to point out that part of the boys up there were high school soccer champions for 1961.

CORRECTION

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wanted to take the opportunity to make a very brief comment on a report which appeared in the Leader-Post and I believe the Star-Phoenix, having to do with an order for return which was tabled in this house. The report was headed S.G.I.O. repairs 794 wrecks — and having to do with the operation of the salvage division of the insurance office.

I simply wanted to make the point Mr. Speaker, that the Government Insurance Office does not in fact repair vehicles. These were simply vehicles which had come in to the salvage division. In point of fact, part of the operation of the salvage division is to see that wrecked vehicles do not get back on the road. The two points, therefore are: we do not engage in the repair business, and we try to get these wrecked vehicles off the road. Since the error stems from an order for return I wanted to correct it in the house. I will be putting out a more lengthy press statement.

QUESTION: YORKTON MENTAL HOSPITAL

Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton) — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with I wonder if I might direct a question to the Minister of Health? I believe it was Tuesday last I directed this question to the Minister of Health and at that time he said that he expected that by sometime this week he would be able to make a statement on this matter. It was in regard to the construction of the mental hospital at Yorkton. I wonder if the minister, as this is the last day of this week, the last sitting day of this week, is prepared today to make a statement on this matter?

Hon. W.G. Davies (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I said I expected to make a statement before long and I suggest that not very long has elapsed. The answer is still the same and I think I will be able to say this to the hon. member that he won't have to wait much longer.

QUESTION: BUDGET

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 he yet tell the house specifically when the budget is coming down? While he is on his feet does he wish to change his forecast of a budgetary deficit, in view of the fact that he has been collecting millions for medical service from January 1st, which he is not expending?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Thatcher: — I think Mr. Speaker, that question is in order.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, however out of order it may have been, I think the Minister of Health did say perfectly clear that all sums which may be raised from those taxes which will revert to taxes for support of the medical care plan last year, will in fact be appropriated for the medical care plan and therefore the collection of those taxes can in no way be applied for other expenditures and therefore they cannot affect the size of the deficit. All that money is for medical care.

QUESTION: YORKTON MENTAL HOSPITAL

Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I have here in my hands the answer which was given by the Minister of Health in answer to a question on February 27th. The answer is: "I expect that a statement will be made, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the construction of the Yorkton mental institution this week on this matter."

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Snedker: — Now I will ask the minister . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Snedker: — Surely I can ask a question about this.

Mr. Speaker: — We cannot permit a debate on oral questions on the orders of the day.

Mr. Snedker: — On a point of order Mr. Speaker, I am endeavouring to ask the question in such a way that the hon. members on the other side will understand.

Mr. Speaker: — Proceed to ask the question but do not make a statement on the matter.

Mr. Snedker: — I want to ask the Minister of Health of this province just how long this on again off again cat and mouse game with the mental patients of our province in regard to the proposed Yorkton mental institution is going to last?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, that is not a question.

Mr. Snedker: — That is a question, I want to know how long he is going to keep this up?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Snedker: — I am in order.

Mr. Speaker: — Oral questions on the orders of the day are supposed to be questions of an emergency, questions that need to be answered immediately. According to the rules, any question that can just as well be answered by placing a question on the order paper, then that question should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that in the answer to a question that was asked in this house, the information was given by the minister that it would be answered this week, and as far as I am concerned it is getting close to the end of the week, and I think the member is entitled to an answer to his question.

Mr. Speaker: — The minister gave his answer and . . .

Friday March 2, 1962

Premier Lloyd: — It seems to me that the Minister of Health has already indicated that his interpretation of his answer was that he would answer it in the near future. I wonder Mr. Speaker, in view of the time, if we could agree to waive the formal question and agree to revert to them later and proceed with special orders.

Mr. Speaker: — Special Orders.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

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

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate yesterday afternoon I had spent a few moments drawing the attention to some of the government expenditures and some of the government activity in my constituency, that had been of benefit to the people whom I represent. I also spent a short time in respect to the proposed medical care plan, and I had referred to the organized attempt through various groups, organizations, and individuals to block its progress. Now apropos of this, I want to say at this time that I have been extremely impressed by the concern of some of the members opposite and by members of various other organizations for the concern of the taxpayers when proposals have been made to provide the people of our province with various social services at cost. However, I failed to note the same degree of general alarm and mental anguish when there was a possibility of taking a profit out of this or other programs. Instead, Mr. Speaker, they have been strangely silent in the face of free enterprise price rigging at the public's expense and of course no tears were shed by our tax conscious friends when the Trans-Canada Pipelines buccaneers were climbing aboard the gravy train with the assistance of the federal Liberal government.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Now Mr. Speaker, during World War II young men were expected to give freely of man's most precious possession, life itself. They were told at that time that this was to be the "Century of the Common man." Big business, however,

had other ideas. They were prepared to go on strike unless their demands were met, and a five per cent limit on wartime profits was not acceptable to them. So as a result a neat little arrangement was made and it was sold to the general public under the name of "Profitable Patriotism." This little arrangement created the largest crop of millionaires in our history. Big business grew bigger and bigger. They were given new plant extensions at the expense of the general public, and they were allowed rapid depreciation costs. One example was Aluminum Limited which was given \$164 million in special depreciation. We the taxpayers paid for all the plant extensions and 60 per cent of the huge Shipshaw power development, the rest of it coming from the United Kingdom and the United States in war contracts. Now this company, Mr. Speaker, was allowed to remain a monopoly and exploit for private profit the Canadian Power Company capable of producing two million horsepower, without any government interference or without any government control. All this, however, did not pass unnoticed and it was necessary to have this company whitewashed by a Liberal committee of parliament. Now in the middle of these proceedings the company became somewhat frightened apparently, a little apprehensive, and contributed \$100 thousand towards the building of a church at Arvida, and this Mr. Speaker, is what we sometimes refer to as benevolent capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, before all the boys were home from overseas, the Liberal federal government was busily engaged in abolishing the excess profits tax and lifting price controls, without shedding any tears for the poor Canadian taxpayers. The Liberals fought the 1945 election on the appropriate slogan "Help us build a new social order", and the Canadian people voted for it. But the new social order, like the national health plan of 1919 never arrived, apparently because of the fact that the people who supported the Liberal party and supplied their campaigns funds discovered that they could make more money and more profits out of the old social order than they could out of the new one.

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . Saskatchewan didn't.

Mr. Snyder: — Now the opinion seems to be held in some circles Mr. Speaker that no wars should be provided unless good old private enterprise is able to make a profit out of the operation. Frequently we hear the claim made that public ownership is not as efficient as is private enterprise,

Friday March 2, 1962

and I want to spend a few minutes this afternoon in dealing with this particular question. I suggest if profits are to be the sole measuring stick, without taking into consideration other factors, then this claim does perhaps have some validity. I want to draw your attention to, and offer in evidence a news report from the Leader-Post of January 25, 1962, which comes from Sault St. Marie, Ontario. It states that Algoma Steel Corporation had a net profit in 1961 of \$19,460,000 compared to the net profit of \$13,253,000 in 1960, or an increase of 50 per cent, and significantly enough this was the year that saw the most serious unemployment problem in post war years.

Mr. Thatcher: — I wish your steel company could do as well.

Mr. Snyder: — In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that Canada is a land of 18 million people, and many of its companies are merely subsidiaries of American firms, some of them being 90 per cent American owned, I suggest that we can't get a true picture of the degree of efficiency of free enterprise in our own little back yard. When you cross the international border into the United States then you are really getting into the tall timber. I suggest this is where we see a creditor nation which was not devastated by two world wars, here we have the richest, the most powerful capitalist nation on the face of the earth, and here I suggest we should see free enterprise at its finest and at its best.

I want to take a moment or two to cite a few examples of this so called uncontrolled free enterprise and efficiency. Enginemen's Press, March 3, 1961, reports that 125 thousand steel workers were now jobless and thousands more are only working part time. Yet operating at less than 50 per cent capacity the steel industry has kept its net profit at a steady annual rate of \$400 million. Labor, Washington, D.C. January 16, 1962, in a report to its shareholders American Telegraph and Telephones Company listed the year's net profit at \$1.3 billion, and this Mr. Speaker exceeds the figures which were established by General Motors in 1955 of \$1.2 billion. U.S. News and World Report, January, 1962, in an article "Outlook for Business" states that profit climbing will reach an all time high of \$56 billion in 1962, or \$10 billion above 1961. The article interestingly enough concludes by calling upon labour to use restraint in their wage demands in order to hold the price line.

Fortune Magazine, July, 1960, reports the previous year 500 corporations made \$12 billion net profit after all costs and all taxes.

Senator Estes Kefauver's subcommittee on antitrust and monopolies, has recently concluded another series of hearings which I have mentioned on other instances in this house. The results are somewhat similar to other findings, and they report profits of up to 1300 per cent. One example of these spectacular profits which have been wrung out of sick people in need of medication is in connection with a drug by the name of "Resperine", a sedative and a tranquilizer which sells for \$2.75 for 1000 tablets and under the company brand name it retails for \$39.50 for 1000 tablets. Now this subcommittee has discovered that the drug industry is spending in excess of \$750 million a year for advertising and ballyhoo for the purpose of promoting their own brand name drug.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Just like the CCF.

Mr. Snyder: — Another example of this free enterprise efficiency is in connection with the complicated real estate deals whereby the 102 storey Empire State building was purchased for \$65 million, and it was sold the following day for \$36 million, an apparent loss of \$29 million, yet lo and behold all contracting parties were able to make a profit out of the operation by beating the government out of income tax.

The Wall Street Journal reports that last year was a good one for the Kratter Corporation, a real estate and investment firm. This article shows where the company raised its cash contributions to its shareholders three times during the year and showed a loss in their operation of \$1.7 million. Now this seeming miracle, the Wall Street Journal goes on to explain, is accomplished by combining real estate investment, operating income and the rapid depreciation loopholes which have been authorized by Congress and it states, it is no surprise to anyone I suppose, that the stockholders like it that way.

Now Mr. Speaker, another example of free enterprise efficiency concerns another form of income tax evasion. Mr. James Russell, the business editor of the Miami Herald, in a recent article explains why such . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . subcommittee in Saskatchewan . . .

Friday March 2, 1962

Mr. Snyder: — . . . an enormous amount of U.S. trade is conducted from such tax-haven countries as Panama, Bermuda, Switzerland, Venezuela, and the Netherland Antilles. He points out in this article that over 200 United States companies have set up subsidiaries in Panama for the purpose of conducting international trade in this tax-haven country. I think most members are aware, and I am sure members opposite are aware, that Panama does not tax profits nor does it have a capital gains tax. Now the editor in this article gave an example of the tricky use of these tax-havens, and he showed where a large food chain would set up a subsidiary in Panama for the purpose of buying coffee at the lowest world price. This subsidiary in turn would sell coffee to the parent company on the mainland at the highest price, with practically all the profit being made by the subsidiary in Panama which paid no tax whatsoever.

Still another example of this free enterprise efficiency comes from Des Moines, Iowa, where revenue commissioner Mortimer B. Caplin addressed the Iowa Bar Association and he dealt with government figures which indicated that in the year 1959, \$24.5 billion had not been reported in income as it should have been, which resulted in a net loss to the United States treasury of some \$4 billion. Mr. Caplin said at that time, and I quote him,

“This represents a tremendous additional financial burden which our honest citizens must bear as a result of the errors of their neighbours.”

Only three per cent of this figure Mr. Speaker was on wages and on salaries.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few examples of the type of welfarism which is enjoyed by “Big Business” which the ordinary taxpayer is unable to afford. These various forms of tax evasion of enormous profits, fabulous fortunes and capital investment, has all by one process or another been ‘run’ out of the pockets of the average taxpayer. This has not caused any weeping or wailing or gnashing of teeth from the exponents of the old uncontrolled enterprise system.

I would suggest Mr. Speaker, that those who are the most dedicated opponents to change or of other economic systems are those who have their fingers deepest in the public purse. I believe Mr. Speaker,

that it should be apparent by now that our high standard of living both in Canada and the United States is based on credit, and while the investment capital which is taken out of our economy flows to other countries, our people are left with a rising burden of debt.

In the federal field, in recent years we have been following a pattern which was established in the United States a matter of almost twenty years ago, of heavy deficit financing, pumping back into the economic bloodstream what it has been taking out in profits. This is being done in an effort to stimulate a sick and unhealthy economy. The U.S. News and World Report of November 14, 1960 carried an article '900 Billion Dollars Debt and What it Means to the United States People'. Now these figures included national, state, municipal and also consumer debt and it stated that never before in the history of the country had they ever carried such a large per capita burden of debt. It works out to \$13 thousand for each of the 66 million voters in the last presidential election, or about \$5 thousand for every man, woman and child in the United States. In spite of all this debt accumulation both in Canada and United States, the fact remains that in this country since 1919 we have never enjoyed any prosperity that has not been based on war production.

Mr. Thatcher: — That is not correct. How about from 1945-55?

Mr. Snyder: — Shortly after the war . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — You're just talking about Saskatchewan, but the rest of Canada has.

Mr. Snyder: — Shortly after the war the defence expenditures dropped to a very sharp degree and the pent-up demand for consumer goods took over and established what we refer to as a boom economy. But with that exception and the war-induced exception at that, the fact still remains that we have not enjoyed any prosperity that has not been hitched to war production.

An editorial in the Western Producer, I believe helps to point out this fact quite clearly. It says, and I will quote if I may:

Mr. Thatcher: — No wonder we can't get any business done, he is as bad as Toby.

Friday March 2, 1962

Mr. Snyder: —

“Let the reader try to envisage what would happen if by some miracle, a peaceful understanding were suddenly arrived at. That glorious news would be followed by so calamitous a depression that it is doubtful if our economy would survive. It would mean a sudden halt to all armament production, thousands of factories would be closed, hundreds of thousands would be thrown out of work, we strive and pray for real and lasting peace, yet ignore or are entirely unprepared to meet the catastrophic shock to our whole economy which would be the inevitable result of real and lasting peace.”

Now I want to quote another authority on this same subject and this is part of a statement that was made before a Moose Jaw audience in 1953.

“When I joined the CCF party originally I did so because I felt it was the party which alone could guarantee full employment and reasonable farm prices in a peacetime economy.”

Mr. Thatcher: — Now we are back again . . .

Mr. Snyder: — . . . farm prices in a peacetime economy.

Mr. Thatcher: — Some people smarten up.

Mr. Snyder: —

“After eight years in Ottawa I am infinitely more convinced of that fact. I wish to state categorically that I support the basic principles and objective of the CCF.”

Mr. Thatcher: — That was many years ago.

Mr. Snyder: — I would like to point out that that was a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition before a Moose Jaw audience at that time.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is it any wonder that we can't get businesses to Saskatchewan with speeches of this kind.

Mr. Speaker: — What is your point of order?

Mr. Thatcher: — My point of order is that such nonsense shouldn't be quoted in this House.

Mr. Speaker: — That is not a point of order. If the hon. member would quit interrupting maybe we could get this speech off and the next one started. You may proceed.

Mr. Snyder: — Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to point out Mr. Speaker, that our economy was unable to get off the ground without the expenditures of World War II.

Mr. Thatcher: — That's the worst yet.

Mr. Snyder: — I want to suggest Mr. Speaker, that since World War II we have been losing momentum in spite of the costly stimulants such as armament and debt creation. Our economy has been gradually losing altitude and each recession is finding us at a lower level, and with a larger pocket of unemployment.

Now this condition is not peculiar to the United States or to Canada; it is common to both of them. It was apparent when the Liberals were defeated in 1957, and it was no doubt, in part responsible for their defeat at the polls at that time. I suggest, that trying to make the old private enterprise system an uncontrolled private enterprise system, produce human welfare is like fiddling with the thermostat when the furnace is not working!

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Now Mr. Speaker, when I note the sadness that seems to seize some of the members opposite when they condemn capital expenditures for publicly owned projects, I am not at all convinced that it is the taxpayer they have in mind. Publicly-owned and co-operatively-owned ventures have more than justified their existence in days gone by.

Friday March 2, 1962

Many rural members will recall that prior to the establishment of the Wheat Pool the farmers were in the clutches of the grain elevators and the grain exchange year in and year out. One of the things that many farmers discovered after the pool elevators came into being was that they could get more bushels on a wagon than they ever could before.

The pool elevators, as they are presently constituted can provide a service to their customers at cost. Certainly no private company is reconciled to do that.

Publicly-owned power companies both here and in the United States have also proven their worth. The Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States in its report of the fiscal year end June 30, 1961 showed that they had paid \$6.5 million in lieu of state and local taxes, their net earning of \$103 million, \$50.3 million was kept for expansion of power facilities and in addition to this they had paid \$51.4 million to the United States treasury in payment of principal and interest charges. At the same time they were lowering their residential power rates from .99 to .98 of a cent per kilowatt hour — or less than a cent per kilowatt hour. At the same time private power companies were raising their rates to residential consumers. Here again we have a publicly-owned project which is a self-liquidating debt paid out of earnings.

Now Mr. Speaker, there is just one more feature that I want to deal with this afternoon and that is the question of freedom, and this is a question about which we have heard a great deal lately. There has been an effort to equate capitalism with freedom and public ownership with tyranny. Abraham Lincoln once said that a difference of opinion existed between the wolf and the lamb as to the meaning of the word liberty and he explained this 'that what constituted liberty for the wolf often represented tyranny for the lamb'. President Eisenhower in his farewell address to the nation drew attention to a great threat to democracy in his country and he stated at that time, and I quote:

We must guard against the acquisition of the unwanted influence by the military industrial complex employing millions of men using the powers of a fantastic billions of dollars, developing an influence that is felt in every city, every state house, and every office of the federal government.”

Now the New York Nation which has a world wide reputation for honest and courageous journalism devoted the whole of its October 28, 1961 edition to this very topic. It pointed out in rather concise terms, I believe, what prompted President Eisenhower in his final moments of leave taking, with the attention of the whole nation focused upon him, to issue to his people this very grave warning. The nation showed that this influence, which is felt in every office of the federal government is destroying democracy, not only by undermining the prerogatives of the elected representatives of this country but also by spending countless millions of dollars propagandizing the American public.

The article continued:

“It is no accident that Congress during the first year of Kennedy’s administration should vote without a deed countless billions for arms of every description and at the same time shelve medical care for the aged and federal aid toward education.”

Now the Western Producer in the September 15, 1960 article reprinted a story from the United International News Services entitled, ‘\$2 Billion for Public Relations’ and it stated that U.S. business and industry is spending in excess of \$2 billion a year on public relations, “designed to impart a rosy glow to the corporate complexion.” It stated in this article that there are presently 1350 public relation counselling outfits in operation, employed mainly by corporations, employing some hundred thousand public relations practitioners. It is also forecast by some public relation executives that by 1969 business and industry will be spending in excess of \$6 billion on public relations and the number of people employed in this field will have increased to 250 thousand persons.

We claim that the Magna Carta was the cornerstone of our liberty, and yet the Magna Carta deprived the King of some of his liberties. Perhaps due to King John’s limited imagination he failed to establish a public relations organization, which would represent him as the first victim in a conspiracy to rob all Englishmen of their liberties.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Now in the past Mr. Speaker, we have heard a number of fables

Friday March 2, 1962

repeated in this house and I have one in mind . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — There are a lot today.

Mr. Snyder: — . . . where the wolf invited the goat to come down off the rocky cliff and feast in the green pasture below, whereupon the goat replied, “It’s your meal you’re concerned about, not mine.”

Freedom to corrupt, freedom to deceive through fraudulent advertising, freedom to extort through price-rigging arrangements are all freedoms which are woven into the warp and the woof of an uncontrolled free enterprise system.

In conclusion Mr. Speaker, and to recap for only a moment, I want to point out that the concern that is shown by some members opposite and other forces of reaction for the taxpayer, is lacking in sincerity when we note their complete indifference to big business manoeuvring which has cost the people of this country and elsewhere countless millions of dollars. I suggest, that the concern for the taxpayer, for the people of this country ceases where the interests of big business begin.

On the question of freedom Mr. Speaker, let there be no misunderstanding. The position of this government, of its supporters and its members is clear. There is no group that is more concerned, that is more interested in the dignity and the freedom of the individual than those of us who sit on your right.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I have attempted to point out, in the time at my disposal Mr. Speaker that the efficiency and the freedoms which are claimed by the old, uncontrolled free enterprise systems are a delusion and a snare, the principal benefits of which are enjoyed by a small segment of our population and they are not by and large in the public’s interest. It is my particular pleasure Mr. Speaker to support the motion at this time.

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — I would like to congratulate you for the honour and trust this legislature has placed upon you. I would also like to congratulate the hon. member from

Swift Current (Mr. Wood) for being taken into the government. You have an important job to do and it isn't what some of your associates might think it is. The job I am referring to is this. It is your responsibility to once again restore the confidence this government enjoyed with the rural and urban municipal associations. I wish you well.

During the course of this debate, I would like to draw to your attention and to the members of this house, the 40 students from the constituency of Rosthern, from the high school of Rosthern, who make their appearance to your right. I wish to welcome them here on behalf of all members and hope that their stay will be a pleasant one. The principal of the school Mr. Storey is also present with them.

The junior member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) has just condemned the profit of the private business. Is it any wonder that private business is afraid of coming into Saskatchewan? All big businesses paid 50% corporation tax to the federal treasury. We the Liberal party are proud that private enterprise can make a profit; we welcome this. How do you expect private business to come into this province after hearing the junior member from Moose Jaw?

Mr. Thatcher: — We would like a little more of it.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, it has been stated by the mover, the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and others that agriculture is in trouble. I wholeheartedly agree, I also believe that most members in this house will agree with me when I say that the farmers of this province have a harder battle to fight since the federal Tories got elected in 1957. I do not wish to direct all the blame for the farmers' plight on the federal administration, goodness knows the provincial administration here has manifold shortcomings, but I believe this government has relied too much on the federal government to solve the farmers' problems. When I look over the Diefenbaker promises, to the farmers, I thought to myself that the hon. Minister of Agriculture here in our province must have been very happy the day the Tories got elected, because they did promise better times for the farmers, as a matter of fact they promised to take care of all the farm troubles. This government is apparently sitting back and watching the show. I believe it would be good if we refreshed our memory of some of Diefenbaker's promises.

Friday March 2, 1962

I have heard him say recently that out of 70 promises that the Tories have fulfilled all but eight. That is Tory arithmetic.

Here is the first one that I think is a dilly. Mr. Fulton at Saskatoon reports by the Leader-Post, March 27, 1957, and I quote:

“If the problems of the farmers in Canada were to be solved it would be under the leadership of Mr. Diefenbaker who understands them and has laid out the Conservative Policy in the past.”

Isn't this a joke? I am sure that the government would laugh louder if you had not helped them get elected. On many occasions the CCF have voted Conservative in the federal, and the Conservatives CCF in the provincial. I would like to remind you what the member from Canora (Mr. Kuziak) has to say about this in the recent by-election at Turtleford February 20, 1961, at Paradise Hill the hon. minister inferred that he would pick the present Tory government if a choice had to be made between it and the previous Liberal administration.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I hear, Hear! Hear!, I would like also to report . . . What did the hon. member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) say when we were discussing the debate on taxation agreements, just a few months ago in this house? I quote from debates and proceedings, volume 1, page 24, the member from Touchwood said this:

“Back in 1957-58 the Canadian people demonstrated their dissatisfaction with the Liberal party to provide a fair deal under those old tax agreements. Now it is clear that the Tories are even worse than the Liberals.”

And he goes on to say this,

“In the meantime, we in Saskatchewan have no choice but to accept this Tory deal to make the best of a bad situation, but we are determined more than ever to turn the Tories out at the first opportunity.”

Well I believe the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) might

turn Tory and the member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) might turn Liberal.

What about the other agricultural problems? What did Diefenbaker say in regard to the thousand man delegation that went to Ottawa? I would like to quote from a meeting in Saskatoon reported by the Leader-Post March 27, in regard to the farm problem.

“An enactment of permanent floor price legislation based on a definite formula to allow for variations of production and demand for individual products. Such floor prices would be announced well in advance of production period each year at the consultation with representation from producers and agricultural organizations.”

I can remember quite plain how hard it was for the thousand-man farm delegation to meet with the Prime Minister and later the Prime Minister found very little time to meet with the farm representatives. Well listen to this one, Mr. Diefenbaker at Kipling,

“The basic price of \$1.40 now paid for wheat was too low and in light of rising living costs worth only 50¢ compared with purchasing power in the present years. This party, if elected would institute a program of price supports for agricultural products with prices announced in advance after consultation with farmers and agricultural experts.”

We're still on the basic \$1.40 and the dollar has depreciated further. In the House of Commons debate of March 12, 1956 Mr. Diefenbaker moved the following resolution.

“It is the opinion of this house that consideration should be given by the government to the advisability of introducing during the present session legislation to create a parity of prices for agricultural products at levels to insure producers a fair price-cost relationship.”

Well then Mr. Hees had to get into the promising business.

Friday March 2, 1962

The Leader-Post reports him speaking at Weyburn March 28th and I quote:

“The Progressive-Conservative party was solidly behind the principle of parity, when we formed the government, we will, well in advance of the crop year adjust floor prices to compensate for any increase which may have taken place in the price level of things the farmers have to buy.”

Now what about helping the young farmers. Nothing is being done by this government or the Tory government but here is what the Tories promised they would do. Mr. Hamilton at Francis made this statement.

“Also needed is a firm set of policies to help young farmers to get started and expand and improve efficiency as well as set policies that encourage efficiency, crop insurance and more democratic control of producers over what they produce.”

What about crop insurance? What about farm credit? It's on the statute books but that's all. Very few farmers can afford this type of Tory insurance. Where can we get the farm credit with a Conservative rule you have to be a millionaire in order to get a dollar's worth of credit. Well these are some of the Conservatives' promises related to the farmers. What has honest John or the followers of John done about these promises? After a long hard and continuous battle the Tories finally came out with a \$200 acreage payment. In five years of Tory rule we will have received three such payments amounting to \$600 or \$120 per year. This the Tories call a fair share of the national income. Parity or deficiency payments — is \$120 per year, according to the Tories, has put stability into the farm industry. The inflated dollar alone has gobbled up more than this, more than this payment plus the devaluation and higher interest rates since the Tories took office. This plus additional taxes that have been levied by this government here in Saskatchewan, plus additional increases in municipal and school taxes has left the farmers in poorer financial shape than at any time since 1937.

You will remember Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago the provincial governments in the dominion were called to the capital to pass legislation giving

the provinces the right to collect income and corporation tax. In other words the Tories had scrapped the dominion-provincial tax agreement with the provinces. These agreements had been reached with the provinces with the former Liberal government and to the greater extent looked upon very favourably by all provincial governments. This government continuously criticized these agreements while the Liberals were still in power. Even John Diefenbaker agreed while in opposition there was a reasonable degree of inequality and in 1957 he promised the people to do something about it. The first thing he would do was this: On April 26th in Toronto, I quote Mr. Diefenbaker,

“A Conservative government if elected would immediately call a federal-provincial conference to settle existing problems. The federal system was threatened by centralization complex of the St. Laurent government and a healthy balance of revenues between federal and provincial governments must be assured.”

Well I can remember how much trouble the provinces had in persuading John for a conference, and he certainly didn't call one on his own initiative. He was continually reminded by the provinces to call one. The provincial government got the same treatment from the Tories as the farmers did — the cold shoulder.

Then at Halifax on June 3rd, Mr. Diefenbaker said this:

“Members of the federal government are forcing provinces and municipalities into the position of beggars. We will call a federal-provincial conference with a view to relieving the frightful load that non-central governments are now carrying.”

At Trois Rivieres, Quebec he said:

“We will not only make sure that the constitution is respected but we will also make sure that the provinces and the municipalities have sufficient money to do the job it should do.”

This is what the provincial governments are waiting for.

Let's listen to this one and I believe this is

Friday March 2, 1962

one of the best of all. Speaking at Saskatoon, Mr. Diefenbaker said this:

“Prime Minister St. Laurent has committed one of the greatest prevarications in Canadian political history in suggesting Ontario would get preferred tax-sharing treatment under a federal Conservative government. They say I have made a deal with Premier Frost. The Prime Minister is afraid that his chances for re-election have been Frost bitten.”

Has this allegation not become history? Your government Mr. Speaker, since the starting of these agreements has repeatedly pointed out that Ontario will now benefit at the expense of the poorer provinces. Speaking further in Saskatoon he was reported:

“As long as he was the Conservative leader his only attitude would be equal treatment of all provinces, not one province will receive a different tax formula than the rest. No new agreement would be made except by agreement of all.”

I do not think that there were any provinces that agreed to the present arrangements, yet the Prime Minister used his steam-roller tactics and we know the results.

Then towards the end of the campaign, he kind of summarized his and the parties thinking in reference to equality to all provinces. Here are the words I am about to quote and you will see the real John Diefenbaker, his sincerity, his honesty and his trustworthiness. Speaking at Cambridge, N.S. June 3rd and I quote:

“I will never participate in anything, not in anyway that will bring about inequality in all parts of this country. I believe in a policy in keeping with the responsibilities of national service that will give to every part of this country a great development plan a reasonable equality of opportunity and when that conference meets no province will dictate. Because agreement can only be arrived at by the consensus of all. No province will dominate. There will be no coercion. Our principle of that conference will be — domination never, co-operation ever,

in all parts of Canada to the benefit of all parts of Canada.”

The people of the dominion of Canada trusted the Prime Minister that these statements of policy would be carried out. Today these promises and agreements are non-existent.

Before I finish dealing with the Diefenbaker promises I should like to have on the records of the house statements of policy of the Tories, made by Mr. Diefenbaker on April 27th, in reference to immigration. That we have a land endowed with many riches that should be capable of feeding and employing a population many times the number we have at present, I believe we all agree on. After World War II Liberal governments opened the doors to immigrants and hundreds of thousands of immigrants entered our country and have become an asset to our nation. If my memory is correct in one year alone as many as 270 thousand immigrants entered this country. I remember the Conservative opposition, and the CCF criticizing the Liberals right after the war for opening the doors to these immigrants. Why, they said with the return of the armed forces, with the laying down of arms, thousands of returned men would be unemployed if this policy was to continue. Yet hundreds of thousands of the Europeans from D.P. camps and concentration camps were admitted to Canada and U.S.A. and I am more confident than ever, that this was a good policy.

In 1957, after seeing this, Mr. Diefenbaker had this to say, and I quote:

“The only limit on immigration should be the capacity of Canada to absorb newcomers into her economic life. Australia’s forward-looking immigration policy, Mr. Diefenbaker emphasized, had produced the conclusion that it could absorb just under four per cent a year of its population. Such a yard stick, he said, applied to Canada would establish the target of 640 immigrants in a year or more than four times the number that came to Canada in 1956.”

The result of Tory administration, unemployment at record levels, since they took office, forced the government to close its doors to immigration, with the result that today less than four times the number in 1956 are admitted and it is estimated that just about as many leave this country in a year.

Tory times are hard times.

Friday March 2, 1962

Mr. Speaker, we all know that Mr. Diefenbaker's promises to the farmer and to the provinces would cost a lot of money. Why, he had sat in the house as an opposition member since 1941, so he was in a better position to know the costs than anyone else. He was credited with keeping a very close eye on government spending. He was in a position to know the functions of good government. Well, even the newspaper reporters were beginning to wonder how John would get all this money — where it would come from. A reporter asked him, and I quote:

“How the Conservative promises of increased expenditures square with the promise to reduce unnecessary taxation, if a Conservative government could do both and still do it on a balanced budget.”

Why, he said, and I can see him on television, pointing his finger at you, he said,

“This estimate is made on the basis of budget surpluses which had been growing from year to year. The surplus last year was \$500 million and if the economic forecast of Trade Minister Howe was correct, the surplus of the current year would be 50 per cent greater.”

Well, they got elected and bingo the first year they had a deficit of \$700 million, a difference of \$1,200 million compared to what the Liberals had in the last year of government. The farmers didn't get a nickel from the Diefenbaker government in the first year he was in office.

It is estimated that the Diefenbaker government will have plunged the country into debt to the tune of three billion dollars. Not only will the country face a three billion dollar deficit since the Tories took office, but the employment insurance fund has been completely depleted from the \$900 million surplus that was there when the Tories took office. Where is John's vision. Sure, the Tories tell us that we have sold the farmer's wheat. Their bins are now empty. Those of us who had and have surplus wheat are glad to get rid of it, but is it not true that nature has been very unkind to the farmer in the last five years? Why we have not had a bumper crop under the Tory rule. Even the rain stays away. This is the biggest reason why our bins are empty. Why 75 per cent of the farmers in Saskatchewan never have had a surplus of wheat.

These large wheat sales affect only 25 per cent of the farmers in Saskatchewan. Only nine months ago, Alvin Hamilton told us farmers, "boys you are growing too much wheat, get into the forest business and start planting trees." Seven million acres of it! A few months later he told the farmers, "Boys uproot those trees and plant wheat, I will need every bushel you can raise to fulfil my commitment." So next spring we will be planting wheat.

The results of these poor crops have put severe hardships on many farmers. The P.F.A.A. payments and the \$200 acreage payment is not enough to see the farmers through to next years' crop. Tell me Mr. Minister, how is the farmer with no crop and no income to pay for his seed wheat at perhaps \$1.80 per bushel, seed oats at \$1.30 a bushel, plus his gas, oil and repairs? All you have offered so far is 75 per cent of the freight rate on seed. This is not enough to see him through with the prospects of another dry year and a severe hopper threat.

The Tory free enterprise government versus the NDP socialism will not be an election issue. We don't want either of them.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Boldt: — If you haven't got the answer Mr. Speaker, Hazen Argue has, I need not tell you. Mr. Speaker, this government is in trouble and they know it, and I am not going to let you get off the hook without mentioning them briefly. You are in trouble with the rural municipal people on the time question. You are in trouble with the medical bill. Your social welfare department needs a real good face-lifting.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Boldt: — If it was necessary for the government to remove the Minister of Health and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I think it is equally necessary to remove the Minister of Social Welfare.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Boldt: — In spite of the fact that you are over-taxing the people of Saskatchewan, you are in financial trouble.

Friday March 2, 1962

And Tommy Douglas has not been able to sell the NDP to the farmers nor to labour. In other words you are in trouble. Call an election and your worries will be over.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the motion.

Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate, I wish first of all to congratulate you Sir, upon your election as Speaker of this assembly and I trust that you will fulfil your obligations to this house with the same spirit of justice and impartiality that was evidenced by your predecessors.

I wish also to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply, all previous speakers in this debate and in particular, our own Leader of the Opposition who not only made a valuable contribution to the debate, but demonstrated in no uncertain terms that he will become the Premier of Saskatchewan after the next general election.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Foley: — I was especially pleased with the capable presentation made by my colleague and my desk-mate, the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley), during his maiden address to the legislature yesterday.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Foley: — Winning the Weyburn by-election was not only a tremendous personal victory for Mr. Staveley, but it has definitely paved the way for a Liberal victory in Saskatchewan as soon as our socialist friends across the way summon up sufficient courage to go to the polls.

This was a very significant election in that it was the first test of the New Democratic Party at the polls in Saskatchewan. The fact that they failed dismally, Mr. Speaker, I think indicates more strongly than any words that I might say, what is going to happen both provincially and federally when they again go to the polls in a general election.

The defection of Mr. Argue from the ranks of

the NDP has been significant for many reasons. I feel it has been significant, more than anything else, of the fact that the NDP is no longer, if it ever was, a party based on the broad interests of all the people of Canada. It is evident that more will follow in his footsteps, as must happen of course, if a party in the opposition is to gain power. This I am confident the Liberal party will do, both provincially and federally in the near future.

I want to address a few remarks to my own constituency of Turtleford in this debate not having had an opportunity to do so after the by-election of last February. I would first of all like to thank sincerely those good people in the constituency of Turtleford who saw fit to give me the privilege and the honour of again representing them in our legislature. I want to assure all of the people in the Turtleford constituency that I will do my very best, on their behalf in our deliberations in this house.

We have had a good deal of snowfall this year in our area, Mr. Speaker, in fact the newspapers report some forty inches. After our very serious crop crisis of last year, I hope that this augurs well for a good crop this coming summer. The agricultural situation is critical, not only in many parts of north-western Saskatchewan, but throughout the province. We were fortunate in having some rainfall in the western portion of my constituency which alleviated a complete crop loss. Nevertheless it seems to me that the present Minister of Agriculture is remarkably barren of policy in the face of what I consider to be a very serious agricultural crisis. The Speech from the Throne, certainly does not contain a great deal of assistance spelled out for our farm people. The Minister of Agriculture says, and I quote the Leader-Post of February 27th, that the farmers of this land have little or no bargaining power and that the farmers of today are influenced more by political decisions than anything else. This is from the Minister of Agriculture who is apparently ready to overlook the serious drought, the influx of grasshoppers and other pests, and all of the natural factors which have placed agriculture in this province in a very serious position. Certainly in my opinion, the Minister of Agriculture should give immediate consideration to providing seed grain to the farmers of the province in the spring, certainly in my opinion the new tax — the Education and Health Tax will not be of assistance to the farmers this coming spring.

I have received several letters regarding the “power to grow program” of the power corporation, in which

Friday March 2, 1962

they ask the farmers of the province to leave their lights on during that particular week. Well Mr. Speaker this may have many things to commend it, but I suggest that some consideration might have been given by the power corporation to reducing the power bills in return for the co-operation of the farmers across the province. There is no doubt that much remains to be done by this government and while a good many of our agricultural problems have improved, I hope the hon. Minister of Agriculture and his cabinet will devote more of their energy to his matter. Possibly, if so much of the energy of this government hadn't been devoted to this battle of the nerves, with regard to our health problems in the province more might have been done, not only in the field of agriculture, but also in the field of services for our mentally ill, for our chronically ill, increased educational facilities for our retarded children and many other things that I could mention.

Before I leave the discussion of the constituency that I have the honour to represent, I want to take a moment to sincerely congratulate the community of Turtleford. It is one of the first communities in our part of the province to have now completed a water and sewerage program and to have it in operation and I warmly commend all of those in the community responsible for the successful completion of this project.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — How about the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. Foley: — I also want to say Mr. Speaker, that in answer to a question I put on the order paper in the fall session asking if any particular provincial grants had been paid to the community of Turtleford, for water and sewerage, the answer was no. Then there was a little addition to that answer, in which the government stated that no formal application had been made for a grant. I want to say that since that time a formal application has been made by the community of Turtleford and I sincerely hope it will receive favourable consideration from the government. I am also very hopeful that in the near future, the communities of St. Walburg, Glaslyn, Paradise Hill and Spiritwood will be able to proceed with water and sewerage plans.

I would also like to congratulate the community of St. Walburg in completing a beautiful new arena rink and feel that this will be a very fine addition to the

community and to the surrounding area.

Mr. Speaker, we have a good many problems in northern Saskatchewan. I hear plans by this government, for a new \$2½ million telephone building, continuation of the new head office building of the power corporation and four lane paved super highways. While of course in their own way, many of these projects are worthwhile, I think it should be remembered Mr. Speaker, that a good many of the areas which I and other members in the northern part of the province represent have yet to get all-weather roads, even gravel roads to the extent that we would like. We are greatly lacking in rural telephone service and while some progress is being made — radio telephones in some of the more isolated areas, nevertheless this government is lacking in a concrete policy for the type of assistance which would encourage widespread rural telephone service. There is a remarkable lack of progress in that respect today.

I mentioned a moment ago that this was the first test of the New Democratic Party at the polls, in the Weyburn by-election. Certainly I have been amazed by the timidity displayed by the members on your right with regard to their new party label. It is interesting to note that even in advertisements appearing in the paper advertising speakers for the New Democratic Party our friend across the way, the Minister of Agriculture, still likes to have his picture and his name appear in the press as having been authorized by the Saskatchewan CCF, almost eight months after it has passed out of existence. It is very interesting.

Opposition Members: — You don't like them Toby.

Mr. Foley: — A good deal has been said about the name and I suggest that this party lacked courage when it very scrupulously avoided tacking the label of socialism on the name of the new party. Certainly the developments of the past few weeks have been a very serious repudiation, not only of the philosophies of this new party, but a repudiation of the leadership of this party by Mr. Douglas. Certainly when Mr. Douglas changed his mind about seeking federal power and suddenly ran for the leadership of the New Democratic Party, certainly this in my opinion contributed to an overwhelming Liberal victory in the constituency of Weyburn. Certainly Mr. Douglas made the position of Mr. Argue and others in the party very untenable indeed, with his attitude last year when Mr. Coldwell resigned. If any indication of labour domination was needed, I think this was it Mr. Speaker — the fact that there was a

Friday March 2, 1962

widespread move to leave the leadership of the national CCF party vacant for a year. It was only as a last ditch effort that something was done about it.

It is interesting to note the comments which Dr. Eugene Forsey of the C.L.C. made recently. First, some time ago, the fact that he objected to the striking out of the word 'national' from the constitution of the new party. The fact that he felt this would contribute to Canadian disunity. Now just recently Dr. Forsey, and I quote from the Leader-Post of February 26th, said:

“Labour took part in the founding of the NDP because the C.L.C. decided in 1956 that the backing of the CCF was a bust and that a new democratic movement on a broader basis was needed.”

Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest and I think with every evidence that the backing of the New Democratic Party is also a bust and will continue to be in the future.

Mr. Speaker, one more matter affecting my constituency that I would like to mention before I give way to the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner). The education tax administration in Saskatchewan has created a good many problems. I think all hon. members will recall that in the fall session, when in answer to a question of mine as to in which Saskatchewan communities the education tax act was unenforceable, the reply by the Provincial Treasurer was that it applied to all the area in Saskatchewan. When we questioned him further, he admitted that there was a difference in the enforcement of the act in the border cities. In other words, the act was not as rigidly enforced. Mr. Speaker, this creates a serious problem in my constituency, I know other delegations have approached the hon. Provincial Treasurer in this regard, and I trust that something will be done soon.

Now I listened to the hon. junior member from Moose Jaw (Mr. G.T. Snyder), with a good deal of interest, in his attack on free enterprise in his attack on profits, and I want to ask as did the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), how in the world can we attract business into our province when people give us that kind of publicity and attack those people who would be potential investors in the future of Saskatchewan? I might just remind him when he speaks about profits that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, which is a crown corporation of this government, found it possible to spend over \$100 thousand in advertising last year.

Before closing I would like to just briefly mention the time problem. It is still with us in Saskatchewan. There is no question about it. In my area we have school units operating on one time, urban centres operating on a different time, and it is still creating a good deal of difficulty. I feel that this legislature should take another look at the time problem as soon as possible.

Now Mr. Speaker, because of the lack of assistance in the Throne Speech for the farmers and the northern residents of this province, I will not support the motion.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in the Throne Speech debate this afternoon, I am going to open my remarks with a few brief words in regard to an announcement that was made this afternoon by the Minister of Health and at the conclusion of those remarks I will be moving a motion of non-confidence in the government.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — I think the members on the other side Mr. Speaker, almost would have voted for that motion. It would be the first time that we have won a vote in the house if they did. However, a few moments ago the Minister of Health made the statement, and I would just like to say here that the demotion of one minister and the promotion of another has meant the delay in the medical scheme for the people of this province to the extent of three months.

An Hon. Member: — Nine million dollars.

Mr. Gardiner: — The people of the province, due to the fact that they have been paying taxes to make this plan possible for a period of two months, will by that time have been paying taxes for a period of six months. I am quite certain they will be very disappointed in the fact that this government had not carried out its responsibilities to the people of this province in such a way as to permit the organization of a proper medical care insurance plan for the people of this province, within the time limit that was set by the government when they presented the measure to this legislature last fall. We are all aware that in at least three tax fields the government has for the last two months been collecting taxes from the people for a plan which they promised during the

Friday March 2, 1962

session of last fall, to go into effect on April 1st. The only provision in the taxing of the people at that time, left out in order to make up for the fact that those services wouldn't be provided for the month of January, February and March, was the fact that the personal tax was not going to be collected this year. But the other taxes were collected on the basis of this plan going into operation on April 1st. So Mr. Speaker, I am going to move, seconded by the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. McFarlane), and following the moving of this motion, I would ask if the Speaker would probably withhold his decision until a later date and I will continue and complete my remarks on the Throne Speech. The motion is as follows:

“Resolved that this Assembly deplores the failure of the Government to adopt a workable plan for medical services insurance and condemns the policy of collecting heavy taxes before any services have been provided.”

Mr. Speaker, in the statement made this afternoon, and I hope while you are reading that, I can continue with radio time.

Mr. Speaker: — You may proceed now.

Mr. Gardiner: — Thank you Mr. Speaker, for that ruling and I would like to, for a moment, say to the Minister of Public Health, and I am sure he is aware, as others in this province should be that the services he has stated today will be available to the people of this province, in order to use up some of the funds that are being collected in taxes, are not available in the hospitals of this province and I am informed that X-ray services, in the hospitals of this city and very few places in this province could take care of the load of X-ray services that they would have to take care of if this plan goes into effect now, or on the 1st of April, or before the 1st of July. So this is a figment of the government's imagination that they are providing any new services to the people of this province or to the hospitals, because these services are not available and they cannot be given to the people of this province.

To continue with regard to the question of the prepaid medical care insurance plan. I think we should look back for a few moments to the record of this

government as to who is to blame today for the fact that there will be no plan going into effect in this province until July 1st when the people were told last fall that this plan would go into effect on the 1st of April. It is my understanding that following the passing of this measure in the legislature last fall, that my friends across the way held a meeting in the city of Regina. It was at a time when they felt the medical plan wasn't gaining the popularity and the support of the people of this province. They of course thought in their own minds that it merited and they knew something had to be done in order to bring out a public clamour for a medical plan and also a public clamour against those citizens in this province in the medical profession. I am told that at this meeting word went out to the organization of the CCF party in this province to take every measure to create dissention, to create hatred towards the members of the medical profession in such a manner that the people of this province would insist that the medical profession go along with the plan of the government.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

Mr. Gardiner: — What is the point of Privilege?

Premier Lloyd: — I want to deny and deny categorically that any such meeting as that which the hon. member refers was ever held or ever contemplated.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, the Premier can deny it all he likes. It is my understanding . . .

Premier Lloyd: — On a point of privilege Mr. Speaker. I have made a rather firm and clear statement and I suggest that the rules of this house require the hon. member to accept my statement.

Mr. Speaker: — On the point of privilege the Premier raised, he has denied that any such statement was made or issued and you must accept the Premier's statement.

Mr. Gardiner: — It is his privilege to deny it if he wants. He is not the only member of the CCF party. I didn't say that he made any statement. So he has nothing to deny.

Friday March 2, 1962

As far as I know I have never mentioned his name in my remarks, and if any other member of the CCF party has information that is different from the Premier's, I am quite certain that if he is going around the province telling it, that the Premier and his party should see that he doesn't, if they don't want information from their party meetings to go to others in the province of Saskatchewan. This is the information that I have heard around this province. The Premier can deny it, if he likes, but the actions that have taken place in the last few months, in my mind, bear out completely the statements that have been made as to what took place at particular meetings in this province.

Premier Lloyd: — Such as?

Mr. Gardiner: — Because of the fact that constituency organizations of the CCF are continually passing resolutions; because organizations in which the CCF party have attempted to infiltrate their opinions and their ideas over the last few months have also been passing resolutions; not in every case annual meetings or general meetings, but in many cases the directors of the organization have passed these motions and without the direct consent of the membership of those various groups. In addresses from across the way, during the speeches that were made by hon. members on the government side of the house, and this bears out the fact that labour organizations have been passing motions in this province.

Premier Lloyd: — You name them.

Mr. Gardiner: — My friend mentioned the various co-operative organizations passing notices, and of course the minister and others have used the example of various organizations which did not pass motions, stating that they approved of this particular plan that the government was putting in, most of their motions were that they supported a government scheme of prepaid medical insurance for the people of this province and they did not say that they approved of the particular measure that was presented by the government.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

An Hon. Member: — Some of them may have been his relatives.

Mr. Gardiner: — I haven't bothered to interrupt anyone over there and I hope

Mr. Speaker that the same privilege will be given to me.

Now Mr. Speaker, I am told that the organizers were to go out and spread stories and to write letters. I have seen in the last two or three months, letters from people that I know are CCF supporters and they have been quite active in the past. They quietened down for a while and there were very few letters. It was in the last two or three months these letters were coming in ever-increasing numbers — one even from the brother of the Premier of this province.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now do you deny it?

Mr. Gardiner: — I also understand that one of the ushers in the building here even wrote a letter to the paper in regard to this particular plan. This bears out as well the information that I have received about this meeting of our government across the way. Of course the Premier and the Minister of Health, they get up and say ‘Oh, we haven’t said anything about the doctors.’”

There was something Mr. Speaker, that took place in this house the other day. It was read to us by the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), the present member for Cumberland sitting on the government side of this house when he got up, and if there is one reason in this land why anyone should oppose a plan of the type that this government is attempting to institute, that very reason was exhibited by the member for Cumberland the other day, when he stood up and attempted to insult and ridicule doctors in this province because they had received certain sums of money from the government of the province of Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no doctor, there is no one in any profession or group in a free country and in a democracy who, if he does not want to work for the state or work for the government, has not still got that right to be a free man if he so desires. There seem to be some people, and I have read this in letters in the last while, there seem to be some people who think, because one may not want to receive his pay from the government or work for the government, that there is something wrong with them. That he is saying there is something wrong with those who work in public service, nothing could be further from the truth. Just because of the fact that I may not want to work for a government, doesn’t say that I think there is anything wrong with anyone who desires to, but

Friday March 2, 1962

in a free country and in a democracy we say to our people that they have a right, if they so desire to go to work for the government and they still have the God-given right in a democratic country to work for themselves if they so desire.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — And that exhibition the other day was one of the reasons why I would say that a plan such as this government is attempting to institute is a breach of the freedom of individuals in this province and could be if that kind of performance were to be carried on in the future.

I see that the CCF organizations have put little pieces in all the weekly papers that are supposed to scare the doctors of this province into following the government scheme. An item in the Star Weekly seems to indicate that surely if the government is going to be paying them, they should have some control over them. The doctors have never asked for a cent from the government of this province. The doctors have never asked to be put on salary or to be paid by this government. For heaven sakes why should they be forced into the position that the CCF party think they should be in this province and such ridiculous statements as that appearing in the Toronto Star Weekly on that occasion, be supported by the government across the way? It only indicates one thing to me Mr. Speaker, and that is that since the change of leadership of the government across the way, since the change of leadership in the Department of Health the socialism of these two individuals, the Premier, and the Minister of Health, the extreme socialism that they support and always have, has taken over the control of the government of this province. There are many sitting behind them who do not believe in this type of control today, and I believe some of them will not be sitting there for too long a period following this particular session.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — I have seen on many occasions in the past similar examples of the type of campaign that is being carried on at the present time in this province by the CCF party and the New Democratic Party, or whatever they call themselves to try to gain public popularity for a plan they know the public, if they knew the facts, would not have anything to do with at the present time.

Of course, they go along, they have their stories about what this medical plan means. They say after all it is only like the hospitalization plan. When they get out in the country that is what they tell the people. Well I'm going to tell the Premier and the Minister of Public Health that the particular plan that is now on the statute books is a far cry from the hospitalization plan or any organization of a hospital plan. You and I know, as residents of this province, that hospitals have to be constructed by groups of individuals. We also know that they are buildings constructed of stone and mortar that have no choice of their own, that cannot leave this province if they so desire. That in a plan of this type we are dealing with other human beings, we are dealing with men who in this country were born free, and desire to be free and should have that right protected. They should have that right of freedom protected.

Now, with regard to the bill that was placed before us last fall. There were four basic changes that we requested from the government of this province. None of those changes would have affected the principle of medical insurance for the people of this province, but none of those basic amendments was accepted by the government. Those amendments were to provide protection, not for the doctors — I don't think the doctors need much protection. The doctors are still in a position that if they so desire they don't have to live in the province of Saskatchewan. Most of them are probably in a better position than you and I are to leave Saskatchewan if they desire to do so. So this particular bill is not a particular item against the welfare for the doctors or the freedom of the doctors, but it is a bill which strikes at the freedom and well-being of every man, woman and child in the province of Saskatchewan. That is the reason why I oppose it.

The Minister of Agriculture says, 'malarkey'. At this point I would like to indicate that there was a little malarkey across the way the other day when one of the members stated that the medical profession and all the people of this province support the cancer commission act in this province in the way it is presently being carried out by the government of this province. I don't know where the present regulations came from or where the regulations came from originally, but I think every citizen in this province should know something that I don't think they know at the present time and that is just because you are a cancer patient doesn't guarantee you free medical services when you have cancer in the province of Saskatchewan.

Friday March 2, 1962

I think it is well nigh time that the government spent a few of the dollars that they are spending on ridiculous advertising to let the people of Saskatchewan know what the facts are so they have some protection when they do have cancer, so they do have protection and know what they can do and know what they can't do.

I have heard of two cases within the last three months in which people have found that they are suffering with cancer, in fact one of them actually started three years ago, the other one is a recent case, in which cancer patients have been refused to have their bills paid because they had not gone to one of the cancer clinics in the province of Saskatchewan. Possibly I should have known that that was in the regulations or act or wherever it happens to be. Possibly other people in the province should have known that, but I believe that there are thousands of people today that do not realize that fact in the province of Saskatchewan and do not know that if they happen to go to a hospital elsewhere and are found to be suffering from cancer, that they cannot have some of their bills paid in those particular cases.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Could we have the names?

Mr. Gardiner: — I want to make it quite clear that because you have people going around this province saying that there are free cancer services to all the citizens of this province that they are saying a falsehood because they should at the same time tell the people what they have to do in order to obtain these services free in the province of Saskatchewan.

Of course, as is quite often the case, a person may find after they go to hospital some place else, that they have cancer, which was the fact in one case. The other case, the individual thought he had cancer when he went to the hospital. In the second case the person didn't have any idea and they went outside the province of Saskatchewan because that is where their doctor happened to be. The one case in that particular instance was the city of Winnipeg, and when the services had been provided and it was found after the operation had been completed that the person had cancer, their bills have been turned down by the Cancer Commission in this province for payment.

Hon. Mr. Davies — On a point of privilege. Could the hon. member give

the house the names of these two individuals.

Mr. Gardiner: — I have been told that I can give the name of the one case, and I will be prepared to give the name of the other. The one is the wife of Mr. Ian MacDougall, the member for Souris-Estevan. The other one is the case of my own father. Now Mr. Speaker, in both these cases, and I am not attempting by these two examples to state that there was anything political in either of these cases, but here are two people that should know, if anyone in this province should, what the law is, but they didn't know, and their doctors never told them. Maybe the doctor didn't understand what the regulations were in this particular case.

An Hon. Member: — Very unlikely.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well my friend the Attorney General, I expect that sort of treatment from him. It is his usual practice in this house and outside of this house to continually jabber away when someone else is speaking. It doesn't bother me too much, and I will just go right ahead.

I have given those two cases to the minister, and one of them started three years ago as I stated, and the other one took place this last fall. I am not going to, of course, state that anything should be done in the one case, but I do feel that in the case of the wife of the member for Souris-Estevan that some action should be taken in this regard, to make amends at least on the same basis as any other resident of Saskatchewan would be treated and on the same expenses. No one, I don't think, would ask that anything other than what is being provided to every citizen of this province be provided in either one of these cases.

I would suggest to the minister that there are probably many cases such as this, certainly these are not isolated cases, certainly there must be cases taking place like this every day of the week. I think the people of the province should also know that the work of the doctors, prior to the actual diagnosis being made in the cancer clinic is not paid by the Cancer Commission after it is found that the individual has cancer. Also the only doctor's costs that are actually taken care of to my knowledge, are the actual costs of expenditures made while the patient is in hospital. Nothing else is taken care of. There are cancer patients in this province who spend hundreds of dollars every year on

Friday March 2, 1962

visits to doctors in their own communities while they are suffering from this dread disease and yet we go around this province as public men and try to tell our people that there is free treatment and care for cancer patients once it has been diagnosed as such.

I think it is about time in this house, that we made quite clear to the people of this province, exactly what the facts are in relationship to the health services that are provided and no longer go around glibly saying to the people that we are providing them with free treatment for this and free treatment for that, when the facts are not being related to the public of the province. So I think it should be made known to the people of this province, that the government does not provide complete free medical care and treatment for cancer patients, after it has been diagnosed as such in the province of Saskatchewan.

I am just going to suggest to the Attorney General, when he suggested a few moments ago, and I overheard him, that maybe I had no confidence in Saskatchewan. I am just wondering why he had to send for a lawyer, to Toronto, in order to defend his department not very long ago.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Speaker: — We cannot bring in discussion on cases that are before the courts.

Mr. Gardiner: — Last year in the discussion of the bill that was presented to provide medical care for the people of this province, the opposition brought out four main points during that discussion. I think if the government that sits across the way had been prepared to just give a little bit, in regard to this plan, the people of Saskatchewan would have protection that they have been promised on the 1st of April, and they wouldn't be waiting until the 1st of July. There is only one group that is responsible for the delay in the implementation of the medical care insurance plan and that is the Premier and the government that sits opposite.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — What was the first suggestion, Mr. Speaker?

A very simple one. It was that the government provide a non-political commission, that all the people of this province could support and co-operate with to make this plan possible. The government across the way, every member stood and defeated that particular amendment to the medical care insurance bill.

What were the two suggestions made at that time by members on the opposition side of the house? One was made that the commission should be set up on a regional basis so that the people of the province of Saskatchewan themselves, the democratically elected people in the province of Saskatchewan, elected by their own citizens would have control over this medical care plan. Secondly we said about the objections of the government across the way, was the objection to the possible size, was that they ask various responsible organizations, that all of us realize represent the majority of the people of this province, that they be asked to appoint members to this commission. Both those ideas were rejected when the government said they were going to go ahead and appoint their own commission. I am not going to go over the list of names of those who were mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition the other day. All of us know the members of that commission, and in spite of what the Premier said, there was no denial in his remarks the other day of the political affiliation of each of the gentlemen that had been read out by the Leader of the Opposition the day before. We know that most of these men have university degrees. I imagine some of the leaders in countries that we wouldn't want to live in have university degrees. That doesn't mean that they are the type of people that we would put in charge of the life and death of the citizens of this province.

An Hon. Member: — Stupid!

Mr. Gardiner: — And that isn't stupid.

An Hon. Member: — . . . only qualifications.

Mr. Gardiner: — The only qualification they have is the fact that they are members of the CCF party, the big majority of them. There is only one I think of the whole group of the medical commission, that I have some doubts as to whether he would be a member of the CCF party or not, just one. So this is the commission that the Premier said, that

Friday March 2, 1962

because of the brilliance shown, because of the university degrees that they have — and I quite well admit that they are down there on paper for everyone to see — but that doesn't mean that they are the type of people that everyone in Saskatchewan is going to co-operate with in order to make possible the benefits to the people, that have been promised by the government that sits across the way. If they had accepted either suggestion that was made on the opposition side of the house at the last session, that one thing in itself might have solved the problem and might have given the people of this province prepaid medical insurance, effective April 1st. But no — the government said we can't do that — we are not going to change this.

So, what was the second suggestion. The second suggestion was that the commission be made responsible to this legislature, and again the government across the way said 'no' we think they should be responsible to the government. So that recommendation of protection that was asked for the people of the province, and for the medical profession, was again turned down by the gentlemen and ladies that sit to your right, Mr. Speaker.

Third, we asked that the financial control over this scheme, which is another way in which the representatives of the people might have direct control over the medical plan, that the financial and taxing control be placed in the hands of this legislature. Again Mr. Speaker, we were denied as an opposition, this right of amendment. In other words, we said and I think quite rightly so, that under the present hospital plan the government of this province has shown year in and year out, that they are going to make political use out of our hospital plan. This may work all right, as I said a few moments ago, when you are dealing with brick and mortar — when you are dealing with buildings that have been built and cannot be moved, but individuals Mr. Speaker, are not going to be made the pawn of politicians or any government. I defy the right of those of us in a democratic country to say that we should place their control in the hands of politicians, whether it be the CCF government or whether it be the Liberal party that I represent here today.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — So we asked three possible protections for the people of

this province — the fourth recommendation that we made again had to do with finances. That was that the people be assured that the monies that were going to be collected through taxation were going to go for the purposes that were indicated by the government of this province. That was the fourth major suggestion that was made during this special session last year. We asked that this money be placed in a special fund so that the legislature would know at all times whether these taxes were necessary for the purposes that they were being voted and whether they were necessary to carry on the medical care insurance act that we were passing at that time. Again the government was not prepared to make one move in order to make this plan acceptable to all the people of this province, and particularly acceptable to those that had to provide the services that were going to be provided.

My friends across the way, there isn't one of them that could provide this service themselves. There isn't one of us on this side that is in a position to be forced, if necessary, to provide services to the government of this province, because that will be the case if the present government is allowed to carry through with the intentions that they have at the present moment. I think all of us should be proud, whether we are professional men, whether we happen to be in any particular group of people in this province or in Canada, and if we aren't we should be ashamed of ourselves, as people living in a democracy. We should be proud instead of insulting a group of men who believe, not financial, my friends across the way will get up on platforms and they should be ashamed of themselves, and tell the people of the province that the only reason the doctors are bucking this plan is because they may lose a few dollars. One of the cheapest type of statements that could be made by any public man about any person in this country when any doctor who is worth his salt at all, in the province of Saskatchewan, could go any place else in Canada or the United States and make possibly double what he is making financially here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I have been just as strong, in fact I think I mentioned in the session of last year, that it wasn't too long ago that a person told me that at a doctors' meeting they were told that I was more dangerous than Tommy Douglas to the medical profession. This was a statement that was made at a doctors' meeting sometime ago. I haven't always agreed with everything that has been done by the medical profession, I don't very often agree and I don't think any of us agree with

Friday March 2, 1962

any particular group in everything they do. It would be foolish if we did, and I don't agree with some of the actions of the medical profession during the last few months, but I can say here that within the last two or three months I can well see that there is only one group that is responsible for the fact that there is no co-operation taking place, and that is the government of this province across the way.

At this particular meeting I was referring to a few moments ago I understand that pertinent individuals took the stand that the government had to show a new face to the public. They had to try to indicate that they were all of a sudden very friendly to the doctors, and they had to leave the impression that they were very willing and prepared to meet with the medical profession at the time their other friends were out doing everything they could to spread dissention and dissatisfaction among the people of this province of the medical profession. There again, Mr. Speaker, this particular story I have been relating to you is borne out by the fact, because our new Minister of Health has been pleading with the doctors. He says, we want to meet with you, we want to have a meeting, and make an arrangement about this. We would like you to meet with the commission and in the last month he has changed that and says, the government is prepared to meet, but up until a month ago it was the commission they were supposed to be dealing with, and the Liberal party stated since the beginning that it was the duty of the government to sit down and to ask the doctors to come and meet with them and discuss the legislation that was placed before this house last year, and to make an agreement with the doctors, not the commission.

The commission had nothing to do with putting this act into force. The commission has no responsibility to anyone in this province, except the government that sits across the way. The only one that the doctors themselves actually speaking, legally speaking have no responsibility to the government, or no responsibility as an individual in this province. He is still a free man. He has no legal responsibility to be in any way shape or form, so that I say to you today, that it is the responsibility of this government that if they desire to have the co-operation of the medical profession, to arrange a meeting, not just to discuss how this present legislation is going to be carried out, but to discuss how changes can be made to assure the profession and the people of this province the protection of their liberties and freedom, which could be threatened. The Minister of Agriculture can laugh.

The legislation of some countries of the world of this type that under some governments has been used to abuse the people of that particular nation, and my friends across the way can laugh if they like — they don't know much about history if they don't know how some people have been treated in dictatorships in the world, through the fact that they had complete state control of medical services and the health and welfare of every man, woman and child in that particular country.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think that the introduction of the statement made here today by the Minister of Health bears out exactly what the opposition has been telling the government for months before this act was brought into force, that if they had sat down with the doctors months ago and at least after the commission had reported and before they drew up this legislation, and attempt in some way to bring into this legislature an act which those that were to receive the services and those that were to provide the services could co-operate and agree with, that if the government had done this we wouldn't find ourselves in the impasse we are at the present time. That is the position that we are in that the government now comes to us and says we can't put our plan in before July 1st. Not even guaranteed — the minister stated to us that the commission says they hope the starting date will be July 1st. I don't think the minister or the commission can yet guarantee anyone. Yet I heard him stand up here in the house the other day and assure the Leader of the Opposition that technical problems would not hold up the start of this plan, that this plan could go into effect on April 1st, even without the I.B.M. machines that the Leader of the Opposition asked about. Then the next day the leader got up and he said can you get along without trained personnel. Oh yes, the minister said, we have lots of trained personnel in the department. That's rubbish, that has nothing to do with the starting date of the medical care plan. Now today he has the nerve, about two days later, to come back to this legislature and report to us that because of certain technical difficulties and because of the fact that they have to train staff, and half a dozen other reasons, the medical plan can't be continued with or begun until at least July 1st.

Now Mr. Speaker, I ask you, can the people of this province trust the statement that it will be July 1st when we in this house, within two days are told two different stories by the Minister of Health?

Friday March 2, 1962

Hon. W.G. Davies: — On a point of privilege I did not contradict myself or make two different statements on two different days.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well it may not have been exactly in words but the intent was directly the opposite. It certainly was.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, the statement I made had to do with I.B.M. machinery and I said that these machines were not necessary to the success of introducing a medical care plan, and that statement is true.

Mr. Gardiner: — Then Mr. Speaker, the next day the minister was asked by the Leader of the Opposition if there had to be special training given to employees or whether the present staff could handle the situation and the minister stated that the present staff they had gathered together could carry out the operations of the plan effective April 1st. Today he gave as one of the reasons the fact that staff had to be trained.

Now Mr. Speaker, I don't want to contradict the Minister of Health too much. I know he is new in his job and of course mistakes can be made by a new minister who is not too well acquainted with conditions. I am quite sure after his original statements he was corrected by his department, and told that after all they didn't have all the staff to start this plan, that after all there were certain technical difficulties and certain machinery that would have to be obtained and people trained to operate it before the plan could go into effect, as he read here today on behalf of the commission. I would say this to the credit of the commission that they at least appear to know more about the operation of a medical plan than does the Minister of Health or the government of this province.

I just want to make quite clear again before I leave the field of medical care insurance. I want to make quite clear that I don't think and from the information that I have received after the announcement by the minister that it was quite fair for him to leave the impression in the minds of the people of this province that the new actions of the government with regard to the provision of out patient services in the hospitals of this province that the new actions of the government with regard to the provision of out patient services is

the hospitals of this province was going to provide immediately care and treatment in the various fields that he mentioned to the residents of this province free of charge under the hospitalization plan. If I am wrong in that particular statement . . .

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Again I must say that that statement was not made. I did not say that these would be provided immediately, and I did say that discussions with the hospitals would be held as soon as possible. Again I must say . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Well I don't care whether it is today or sometime in April. I am told they couldn't provide them at the present time and with their present staff. They have also been told by the provincial government of this province that they can't increase their operating costs to the hospital 3 per cent over last year and they are not going to establish the price of X-ray and laboratory services on a policy of that price that the government of this province holds at the present time.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — So Mr. Speaker there are going to have to be other changes made in policy. I just want to suggest again to the minister and to the government — you know simple things quite often, the bill last fall I suppose is classed as a simple thing, but it was a most difficult thing. A very simple bill could have been written up that would have provided service to the people of this province in the field of medical care, but my friends across the way always have to pick the tough way of doing things, and they have picked a way which is going to make it certain that the people of this province are not going to receive the services that the members of this legislature voted to them that were to be effective April 1st. So now we find we have an increase in tax of 1½ per cent on the education and health taxes of the province, we have an increase of 1 per cent on the income tax, and 1 per cent on the corporation tax, which was placed on the people of this province at the last session with the promise of this government that they would be receiving services for those taxes which were to be collected on April 1st.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we told the government at that time, that they should set aside this money.

Friday March 2, 1962

The Minister of Health and the Provincial Treasurer tell us today that this money is going to be turned over particularly with regard to this one service that I have mentioned, in regard to X-ray and laboratory services, some of that money will be used up in that manner. Well, that is what I gathered from his remarks. The minister told us that these funds would be used for medical purposes — medical purposes, and I want to congratulate the minister on even going that far. It may take them out of the hold some places, he may be able to find in that way some of the money to carry out some of the other promises that have been made by this government in regard to medical services, due to the fact that he is going to save money for the next three months when this plan will not be in operation. I congratulate the minister for at least being able to make certain that this money is going to go for medical services. But here is no guarantee that it is going to go for the services that were guaranteed to the people of this province last fall. There is no guarantee that it is going to go for a medical insurance plan. It is going to go for medical purposes but not necessarily for the carrying out of the actions of this legislature, placed in legislation by the members of this body last fall.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like for a moment to leave the field of medical services.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Before the hon. member leaves medical services would he accept a question? I think you said a few moments ago that there haven't been any questions asked of members across the way while they were speaking, and I said if you have questions to make or you want to make your own speech at a later date, I will be quite willing to listen to yours.

First Mr. Speaker, I want to clear up a matter in my mind.

Mr. Gardiner: — All right go ahead if you want to ask a question.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The hon. member mentioned that among other proposals made by the opposition was that a special fund would be set up to which the tax money would be dedicated. Would he tell me, tell the house, the type of organization and who would administer the fund?

Mr. Gardiner: — The fund, of course, would be under the control of the legislature. If you had accepted our second amendment which I suggested when dealing with the medical care insurance bill.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Who would administer the fund?

Mr. Gardiner: — The legislature.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The doctors?

Mr. Gardiner: — The legislature would be responsible.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Sure, you don't want to say it.

Mr. Gardiner: — The legislature would be responsible for the expenditure of the special fund.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Intentions . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Of course as soon as the special fund was established the legislature of this province would be responsible for deciding who would administer it, whether it would be the commission or whether it would be some other body appointed by the legislature. It is our responsibility to see to the expenditure of these funds and no one else's in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now Mr. Speaker I think if you were listening you would have heard the explanation of that particular point in my address, but the minister is too busy listening to his seat mate, the Attorney General there, with his little gibes and comments, that he can't hear the remarks of the speaker when he is speaking.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want for a moment or two to relate to some of the things that are important to my own constituency, some problems that have arisen which I think the government should be cognizant of, in the area that I represent in the legislature.

The first has to do, and I just want to say a few words with regard to it, has to do with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and that has to do with the implementing of the gas program, and I regret the minister is not in his seat at the moment, but I hope

Friday March 2, 1962

someone else will convey my remarks to him. There are three communities in the constituency which I represent that have made application for gas service in the program this year, some of these communities had almost been assured of service last year, and I understood from the minister, had been cut off the program at the last minute because of necessary economy. One of these particular centres, and I think two of them, made application for service two or three years ago, when the main line was first constructed to the city of Melville, and the city of Yorkton.

I would like to indicate to the Premier and to the minister and to others in the house that those three centres between them represent a reasonable sized population, that two of those centres are as large as many towns that have received that service in the province of Saskatchewan, that are no closer to main lines than are those particular centres, and I would ask him and the government to keep in mind when they are putting into effect their programs, to keep in mind the fact that those three centres deserve service, the village of Abernethy, the village of Neudorf and the town of Lemberg, which happen to be in the centre of these three, and I would respectfully submit to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation that I hope he will see to it that the work will be carried out this year which was not carried out because of necessary economies in the program of the Power Corporation last year.

The other item of importance that I think I should say a few words about today, is the question of continued long distance toll service to the city of Melville. I am not going to say too much with regard to this question at the moment because there will be a resolution or has been today a resolution placed before the members with regard to this question, but I would like to relate some unfortunate happenings of ten days ago with regard to an incident that took place in the city of Melville in my constituency.

I would appreciate it Mr. Speaker, to be allowed to read from the script that I have before me in order that no error can be made in the statement that I am about to make. It is very easy for one to realize when a government is losing. Cabinet ministers have short tempers and are not prepared to accept criticism. One of the latest examples of this, which is not the only one that has taken place in the last few months in this province, took place in my constituency only the other day.

This only came about through the refusal of the government, I can remember my friend the member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley), stating yesterday that the government had refused to meet with a delegation from his district. Well I am glad at least some other place is given the same treatment as the city of Melville, because they also refused to meet with officials from the city of Melville. Their excuse was that from the first of January . . .

Premier Lloyd: — The statement that we refused to meet with officials from the city of Melville, is categorically untrue.

Mr. Gardiner: — I am told by the chamber of commerce that their request was to meet with the Premier and the members of the cabinet here in Regina, and it was suggested to them that it was not your usual course to meet with delegations between the first of January and the opening of the legislature and you would instead send the Minister of Telephones and the Attorney General with members of the staff down to Melville to meet them. It was the wish of the officials of the city and the officials of the chamber of commerce to come here to the city of Regina, that was their request, to meet with the government, but the government wouldn't accept that request — they said no — we will come out to the city of Melville and we will send some of our officials out there, but the Premier did not come along. He sent two of the cabinet ministers in order to represent the government as such.

So this is the second case, and what was he doing in that particular week, or what was he doing the week before when they at first wanted to meet him. He was going to be too busy that week meeting with members of the CCF party, having a party talk to discuss political matters. He was going to be too busy in that way in order to meet with a delegation to consider the problems of a city in this province.

Now the excuse given to the city of Melville as I state was that the government does not meet with delegations after the first of the year and before the opening of the legislature. Instead Mr. Speaker, it was suggested that the government would send Mr. Williams, the Minister of Telephones, and Mr. Walker, the Attorney General, to Melville, along with officials of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones, to meet the council and the chamber of commerce, to discuss the matter of telephone service. However, as well as the meeting with

Friday March 2, 1962

officials Mr. Williams asked that a public meeting be called at which the government could explain their policy to the people. The council and the chamber of commerce told the government that they did not approve of a public meeting and they would not call such a meeting. The Hon. Mr. Williams then said that if they would not call a meeting, he would, and proceeded to do so, using the taxpayers money to rent a hall and advertise the meeting open to everyone to discuss this important matter.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour and Telephones): — That is not true . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — The original meeting — who is going to pay for it?

Hon. Mr. Williams: — I am.

Mr. Gardiner: — The original meeting was requested for the previous week, but I have a feeling that the Hon. Mr. Williams may have felt there was more chance of my not being present if the meeting was held the day before the legislature went into session. However, when I heard of his action in calling a public meeting I felt that I as a member of the legislature, and representative of the people of the city, should be present to speak for the people, and against the actions of the government if I felt it was necessary.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — They told you of . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — I therefore journeyed to Melville and attended the meeting. Do you want to read the editorial? They tell you what they think of you too. I listened very carefully. At least the one gentleman who got up at that meeting had the decency to write me a full apology to the fact that he rose and said anything at that meeting after he thought it over, that is more than the Attorney General has been prepared to do.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . apologize.

Mr. Gardiner: — I listened very carefully, Mr. Speaker, to addresses

by both cabinet ministers and also to the manager of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones. This took the better part of an hour and a half. The chamber of commerce then presented their brief which was well documented and supported by a petition of more than 2,000 names. Following this the minister, Mr. Williams, asked for comments from the floor. Again I remained seated until I felt that nothing was being gained by the discussion, and that the meeting was an attempt on the part of the government to embarrass the chamber of commerce and the city of Melville by having many of their political group attend the meeting and applaud loudly when the ministers answered questions and spoke, thereby creating the feeling that the city residents did not support the act of the city council and the chamber of commerce.

As well, statements had been made by both speakers that had definite political overtones and I felt they could not go unchallenged. As well I felt that officials of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones, and this is nothing new, the ministers should know from my actions in this house before, that I do not approve of government ministers taking out officials of their department to public meetings to accept responsibility for government action in the province. The fact that I stated that seemed to upset the minister very much, as it should. As well, I felt that officials of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones had been placed in the unfortunate position of having to defend government policy at a public meeting, which action I have always opposed and will continue to oppose in the future, as long as I am a member in this house.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Speaker: — If it is a point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — The speaker is giving incorrect information. He says the telephone officials were there in a political way.

Mr. Gardiner: — I didn't say they were there in a political way. The minister made it quite clear in his remarks that it was

Friday March 2, 1962

after the recommendation of the officials of his department that this move was being made. He placed the responsibility on the officials of the department and not on the government for the actions which were taken by himself, and the manager of the corporation, when he stood, also accepted responsibility in the statements that he made to the officials of the corporation for the actions which were being taken, which was political, no matter what the minister has to say on the particular matter. When I went to the front I could immediately see that the two ministers were in no humour to have me heard. I had no sooner started than Mr. Williams was on his feet interrupting my remarks, just as they have been doing in the house this afternoon. I no sooner got him settled when the Attorney General jumped to his feet, charging me with bringing politics into the discussion.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

Mr. Gardiner: — Oh sit down Bob.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I must say Mr. Speaker, that it is just as tiresome for me as it is to other members of this house . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, that is not point of privilege. No point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well how about you calling him to order.

Mr. Speaker: — What is your point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — My point of privilege is Mr. Speaker, that I at no time tried to prevent the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) from making a speech. What I did say was, Mr. Speaker, after the hon. member from Melville had repeated for the ninth time that the Attorney General is trying to prevent . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, the rules of debate are quite clear that one cannot rise on a point of privilege to make a correction to a statement. You may rise at the conclusion of his remarks or when you join in the debate, but that is not a point

of privilege to correct the statement . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — To proceed with my remarks. It is quite easy to see . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order . . . one moment until I get this settled.

Mr. Gardiner: — I thought you had it settled.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The hon. member has attributed words to me that I did not use.

Mr. Gardiner: — I didn't say that. I said you interrupted me.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The only remarks I made to my hon. friend . . .

Mr. A.H. McDonald: — If you want to take part in the debate do so; if you don't sit down.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I am trying to get order here. If the members would all follow the rules that when the Speaker rises members must take their seats it would be much easier for me to get order.

I think your point of privilege is not too well taken. You must raise the question you have when the hon. member finishes speaking or during your debate, when you enter the debate later on.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much your ruling, and I am quite certain hon. members can see what I was up against in Melville last week. It was much the same thing. I never said the minister tried to stop me, I said he didn't look like he was in the humor to hear me, and then I said he interrupted my remarks which he cannot deny. He remembers quite well that he interrupted my remarks and said he did not bring politics into this meeting when I accused you of doing it, so I no sooner got him settled when the Attorney General jumped to his feet, charging me of bringing politics into the discussion. I feel that the actions of any government are always political.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Friday March 2, 1962

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I said no such thing. The hon. member . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — That is what you said after I was called a certain name and I will get to that in a few minutes.

I don't care what he tried to do Mr. Speaker when he spoke, he spoke for about three quarters of an hour, I could have jumped up 15 times at that meeting and corrected him as I could have the Minister of Telephones, as I was there through most of his address. He has indicated since that he thought I wasn't there through most of his address but I was. I came in in the early moments of the meeting and I heard most of his address and I heard all of Mr. Walker's and I heard all the statements of the chairman of the telephone corporation. I feel that the actions of any government are always political as my friends across the way know, so I don't know why they are so tender, when a member of this legislature who is in opposition to them dares to stand up at a public meeting and state facts which are not just exactly the same as the ministers would like to agree with, that are there representing the government. Any government action is always political and must contain within it partly political matters, and as long as I am a member for the constituency of Melville, anytime there is any problem relating to the government of this province, or to the affairs of the people of my constituency I am going to insist on the right to be heard and to speak on their behalf.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — And when any minister will charge me for bringing politics in I am going to say I am very proud to admit that that is exactly what is being done because the purposes of government are political from beginning to end.

The ministers thought it was all right for them to plead economy to prove their point to the citizens of Melville, but when I spoke of the building of the new office building in Regina, at a cost of \$2 million, they felt that was sacrilegious and unfair. It was then that the name-calling commenced, any such actions from the Attorney General, one could excuse, because it is expected that this is the sort of action that he would resort to when he is beaten, but I hardly expected such a reaction from the Hon. C.C. Williams, the Minister of Telephones,

for whom I have always had the greatest respect. Had he taken any other minister with him to Melville than the Attorney General he might have escaped the difficulty that he found himself in at that particular meeting. The first name-calling came from the Attorney General, who got a little disgusted and of course in this case he had some right to and he turned around in a very angry voice and he said go ahead you big blabber mouth. Tell me, coming from a minister of the government at a public meeting, will he deny that? No, he won't deny that Mr. Speaker, that is an action of the minister of the crown in this province. I am quite certain that an action of that type does not fit well with the people of this province, to have ministers of the crown going around making remarks about members of the legislature when they speak on behalf of their people to vilify them with remarks such as was made by the Attorney General.

As I said I ignored that completely at this particular meeting but I thought that the Attorney General had gone scot-free with this whole thing and he should accept some of the blame and responsibility along with his fellow minister since he attended that particular gathering. I explained to those at the meeting that I was not surprised at such a remark but because it was his usual practice in the legislature to begin name-calling when he could not prove his point and was meeting opposition and difficulty. However, when after a brief flurry the Minister of Telephones called me a name which I would not want to repeat in this house and was called on the matter by the vice-president of the board of trade, who was sitting in the front row, and then attempted to deny that he had said anything, I could stand it no longer.

The name-calling was not important, but the fact that the minister of the crown would blatantly deny that he had said something that people had definitely heard him say was too much. I then turned and accused the minister of lying. He turned to the Attorney General who also backed up the lie and said he had not heard the statement. I then said that under the circumstances and after the conduct of the minister I was not prepared to continue my remarks.

Mr. Speaker: — A point of order has been called.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — He has no right to call me a liar. Is that not an unparliamentary term?

Friday March 2, 1962

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, it was at this meeting that I called the hon. Attorney General a liar, not in this house. This is a report I am making to this house on what was said at that meeting.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — He and I should have gone out behind the barn and settled this.

Mr. Gardiner: — You've done that before.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The hon. member has made that accusation, I would suggest . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The rules of the house are quite clear and you cannot call anyone else a liar and I suggest those remarks be withdrawn.

Mr. Gardiner: — I will repeat again Mr. Speaker, that this is a report on a meeting that took place in Melville; it has nothing to do with this in particular in the sense that it is a report. I have heard others stand up and make reports and statements and read statements that others have said in the past that are much worse than what I am reading now.

After thinking the matter over Mr. Walker admitted having heard the minister make the remark attributed to him and the minister also admitted at the end of the meeting that the remark that had been made was not meant for myself but it was meant for some other purpose. Of course, it was not the way that I heard it but when I heard him make it or I would not have turned around and aimed the attack on him, that the papers indicate that I did. I have already said, of course he was condemning me at the time, he said he was actually condemning the fact that the discussion had been turned into a political battlefield instead of the nice quiet meeting it was before I got on my feet and of course you can see Mr. Speaker that we were having a very quiet meeting here until I got on my feet too and I don't know why my friends across the way wherever I go insist on trying to prevent myself from being heard, but I usually manage to be heard anyway.

However, I do feel that I should apologize for this legislature and government for the deplorable actions of two ministers of the crown . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And your own.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . in interference and ungentlemanly conduct at a meeting which was attended by people, citizens of this province and then resorting to the personal invectives which would not be allowed, even in this chamber. The Minister of Telephones partly redeemed himself in my eyes and did make a partial apology to the meeting and myself although it is not yet completely satisfactory but the Attorney General has never expressed regret of his actions which were just as deplorable and caused most of the difficulties that did arise.

I regret at the same time that at last a few people in Saskatchewan now realize the type of thing the opposition is continually up against in the legislature in this province. The only reason for making this statement is the fact that one of the papers refused to print the correct version when it was sent in by the reporter, the first version appeared on the front page of the paper and the correction appeared on page 2 and so I feel that there were many who probably did not read the reason why I almost struck one of the members of the government on the other side of the house and many people have asked, "It must have been an awful thing to make you feel that you should strike a minister of the crown", and I said, "Yes I have."

Hon. C.C. Williams: — On a point of privilege, I think this is a point of privilege, physical characteristics are being mentioned here and I think that if the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) insists on adopting these tactics we'll get the ex-Premier in here.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! there is no special mention of physical characteristics at this time.

Mr. McFarlane: — He is calling for help already.

Opposition Member: — Ex-Premier of where?

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, the only thing on that particular question that I want to say in concluding my remarks on that particular affair are this, that I only wish that it was the Attorney General that had made the remark and I might have struck him.

Friday March 2, 1962

Now Mr. Speaker, to continue the remarks in regard to the Melville constituency and some of these again concern my friend the Attorney General and with his department have to do with the matter in which this government has continually refused to provide protection to the people of this province, against those who would go out soliciting money from the people of this province in the way of shares for building or the construction of industries or anything else in this province. The people of my constituency, and I am going to say here, that I am probably a little gullible and I am going to admit it myself, that when the representatives of this company came along to me they wanted me to buy shares. I have a good excuse for not buying shares and that is that I don't think any member of this legislature should purchase shares in any organization that might possibly be doing business with the government of this province at any time. I was told that this particular organization was going to apply for a loan from the Industrial Loan Fund of the province of Saskatchewan and so I turned down their offer to buy their shares. I am interested and I am going to say this quite sincerely that I am interested in any business that could be brought into my area and I think anyone in this province should be, but I am quite certain that I will never feel that I was free to as long as this government remains in office in this province after what has happened with regard to the cheese factory that was to be constructed in the city of Melville a year ago.

I couldn't Mr. Speaker, as long as this government remains in office in this province I would never assist in the promotion of any industry that is being backed by material signed by the Premier of this province and sent out by the provincial government. Unfortunately when I refused to buy shares they said how about encouraging others to do so and I said I wouldn't do that. Well then they said how about giving us a letter and they brought out a letter signed by the Premier of the province to show me that he had said that he would like to encourage business in the province and hoped that all the people of the province would and so on and it was signed by the Premier of this province. It wasn't asking anyone to buy their shares.

Premier Lloyd: — I wonder if I could ask a question? Could you give me the date of the letter to which you refer?

Mr. Gardiner: — I haven't got the letter, it was in a book; I didn't take down the date of the letter. The individuals in the company had the book there; they took out the letter; they showed it to me; I read the letter. A year and a half ago this took place. If you think I can remember after the hundreds of letters that I have read in the past two years what exactly was in it word for word, but the letter was there. I gave him a letter stating to the farmers and to the people of my constituency and area that I felt that any industry of this type would be a good thing for the area in that province if it were to be constructed and if it could be successfully put across. I don't know if it was ever used, possibly it wasn't but I hereby want to apologize to anyone that might have purchased any shares because of the fact that I wrote that letter and he read it and thought it was a responsible organization, because I did it in good faith, I did it with the hope that the people of the city of Melville that I represent would have a cheese plant and I think that is a business or industry that is possible in this province. We're looking for industry and trying to get them in, but as long as the Securities Commission and the government of this province continues to allow the type of thing that has been taking place year in and year out to continue, when people lose thousands of dollars of their life savings to organizations of this type, if we can't guarantee protection to the people of this province it is time this government got out of office if they can't do and let somebody get in there that will.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — And I say that in all sincerity, there was over \$30 thousand taken out of the pockets of the farmers and rural people of my area in this investment.

Mr. McFarlane: — Are you defending that Toby?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No.

Mr. Gardiner: — It just seems very odd that the man who closed out the cheese plant was a former member on the government side of this house, and had been working for sometime for this particular organization selling shares. It was Mr. Harry Wall, the former member for Qu-Appelle-Wolseley in this house, who was actually selling shares and finally ended up president of this company after the people in my particular area had lost thousands of dollars.

Friday March 2, 1962

Now surely Mr. Wall must have been definitely convinced by a department of government in this province that he was on good grounds going out and helping to promote the operations of this particular company. I want to say to the Attorney General that I hope that his particular department will see to it in the future that actions of this type, are not allowed to take place, and so Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks I am not going to repeat many of the statements that have been made in the house by other speakers on this side, I believe that with regard to this amendment that I have made here this afternoon to the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne that we can indicate to the people of this province the fact that we have no longer confidence in the government in this province to carry out the business of the people of Saskatchewan and I am quite certain that others on this side of the house will join with me in supporting the amendment and ask others on the other side in the house, you know it is not too bad to change your views and ideas, and of you on the other side of the house, one of the greatest of the Christian apostles, Paul, changed his. It was only in a matter of three days and he changed his ideas, he changed his ideas from battling Christianity to ideas of promoting Christianity.

I hope Mr. Speaker, that we wouldn't condemn actions of that type, I know that we in the Liberal party, didn't particularly condemn any of my friends across the way who were Liberals at one time, who happen to leave the flock so I don't know why they want to put up such a roar about Mr. Argue deciding to change his political affiliations. I say tonight that I hope many on the other side of the house will join with us in voting for the amendment and voting no confidence in the government of this province.

Mr. Speaker: — When this amendment was presented to the chair I signified to the house that I would not make a decision on it until I had a chance to peruse it a little further. I have now had the opportunity to discuss it with the Clerk and check it against the quotations in Beauchesne. Quoting Beauchesne page 142, citation 170, it definitely states that amendments to the Address are moved by way of additions thereto. This one does not add to the motion; it could be constituted as a separate motion. After discussing it with the Clerk and looking through Beauchesne I shall have to declare the amendment out of order.

Mr. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member for Kinistino has moved to adjourn the debate. Is it the wish of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. Thatcher: — I am sorry, did I understand you that you called our amendment out of order?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, I ruled this amendment out of order.

Mr. Thatcher: — Very respectfully, I will have to appeal your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — We will leave the adjournment of debate in abeyance until we settle this. The ruling of the chair has been appealed, Mr. Thatcher has appealed my ruling.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would repeat your reasons for ruling this out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — I have checked with the Clerk and Beauchesne page 142, citation 170, says amendments to the Address are moved by way of additions thereto. This is not put as an addition, this could be taken and introduced in the legislature as a separate motion by itself. An amendment, Beauchesne says, must be put as an addition thereto.

Mr. Thatcher: — Make it an addition then, we don't mind how you have it.

Mr. Speaker: — This isn't worded as an addition, and may I also point out that if it is a minor technical change the Speaker has the authority to make that change. The Clerk and I are of the opinion that the way it is worded that the Speaker should not assume responsibility to try and rearrange the wording of this to put it in order because in so doing we would upset the general meaning of this.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, if it is just a technicality, we will just let it go and change the wording for Monday.

Mr. Speaker: — My ruling is that it is out of order. If the opposition wish to introduce an amendment they could consult with

Friday March 2, 1962

the Clerk or with the book so it is in order. Are you withdrawing your challenge from my ruling?

Mr. Thatcher: — I will withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: — I have ruled the proposed amendment is out of order. The member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) has begged leave to adjourn the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the orders of the house I would like to announce to the house that the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) has just become a proud father of a baby daughter and he promised me that he would distribute cigars on Monday.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:20 p.m.