

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**4th Day**

**Tuesday, February 19, 1963**

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

On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

**Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to draw your attention and the attention of the house to the fact that we have behind the bar a very interesting group from the Saskatoon campus and the Regina campus. I am sure I speak for all members of the house when I say we are delighted to have them here. We hope their visit to the capital city will be most enjoyable for everyone.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to welcome a group of high school students from Waldheim in the Speaker's gallery today. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Johnson. I am sure all members will want to join with me in wishing them a pleasant afternoon.

**COMMENTS ON MOOSE JAW CURLERS**

**Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I want to take this opportunity to make an announcement which I deliberately neglected to make yesterday because I didn't want to steal any thunder from the hon. Regina member (Mr. Blakeney) who was announcing the successes of the Regina Richardson rink.

**February 19, 1963**

I think by now members are aware of the fact that the Moose Jaw Millie Binner rink has been successful in capturing the Saskatchewan ladies curling championship. More recently the Denis Balderson rink from Central Collegiate Institute in Moose Jaw has captured the Saskatchewan school boys curling championship and is presently competing at Guelph for the Canada curling championship. More recently yet the Dorenda Stirton rink from Central Collegiate in Moose Jaw also captured the high school girls curling championship and it is very gratifying to me to note that these people are all from my own constituency, and in addition I had the honor of having two members of the Millie Binner rink, Mrs. Velma Starrick and Mrs. Binner herself as former classmates of mine at Central Collegiate where the other two rinks originate. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate them and I would point out to Regina members that they had best enjoy the title that they now hold as the Curling Capital of Canada because I suggest that this title is in jeopardy at this time.

**ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

**ADJOURNED DEBATE**

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Semchuk for an Address-in-Reply.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, my first remarks this afternoon must be to associate myself with the remarks which were made by the minister from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) in welcoming the university students who have come down to be with us today. There is an old saying, I suppose the hon. members won't mind me repeating it once again, that the young men and women of today are the leaders of tomorrow. Governments are playing an increasing role in the lives of all of us. We are indeed pleased that these young men and women have taken the time to visit Regina. I would also like to say that we in the opposition hope their visit will be fruitful and enjoyable.

Mr. Speaker, the primary task of the opposition in this legislature is to criticize. I think most people, regardless of their politics, would agree that good government requires an alert opposition, a hard-working opposition. It is our duty to the people of Saskatchewan to point out any weaknesses which there may be in legislation or in government policy. And I think from time to time it is our duty to propose practical alternatives. During the present session we shall continue to try and carry out these tasks, both methodically and constructively.

Perhaps on some occasions there are people who feel that we in the opposition have been unduly critical. Some people may even feel that we have been a little unfair at times. For that reason, I want to emphasize one point again. I believe that all political parties have pretty well the same objectives. There may be some in my party who are not so sure of that. However I think all parties want a better province; I think all of us want full employment; all of us want a better deal for the farmer, and so on. It seems to me that we differ not as to our main objectives but, rather, as to the road we are going to travel to attain those objectives.

My hon. friends opposite, the NDP, propose to build a better Saskatchewan by travelling the socialist road. Here we Liberals differ fundamentally. We believe that we can build a better Saskatchewan by using private initiative, private enterprise. As I said a couple of years ago when I first came into this house, I don't deny that some of my hon. friends may be quite sincere in what they are trying to do. But I remind the people of Saskatchewan that merely being sincere is not enough, particularly if your motives are wrong. If your philosophies and theories are misguided, sooner or later you can get a province into a lot of trouble. We believe that the socialists are in that position today.

Now, as this session meets, one issue is paramount amongst all others. It is the unpleasant but unmistakable fact that Saskatchewan has lagged and is continuing to lag behind the other provinces of this confederation in economic development. Only 20 years ago Saskatchewan was the biggest province this side of Ontario in most fields. Today the opposite is true, after two decades of socialist administration. Our province has been left far behind in most fields. Well, the hon. minister says 'untrue'. Let us first of all, as we so often do, look at population figures — the latest ones. The latest population figures show the gain that was made by each province last year. Here's the way they read: — I quote from the Regina Leader-Post, February 16, 1963, page 32, D.B.S. figures — last year Alberta increased by 2.8 percent in population; Newfoundland went up by 2.6 percent; B.C. was third by 2 percent; Quebec 2 percent; Ontario 1.6 percent; Manitoba sixth 1.5 percent; New Brunswick 1.3 percent; Nova Scotia eighth 1.2 percent; tiny Prince Edward Island nine .9 percent; and Saskatchewan, as usual under the socialists, last with .3 percent. We in effect, Mr. Speaker, since my hon. friends formed their administration, have become the 'poor relations' in western Canada. The Liberal party believes that, until we are able to get at the basic causes of this economic sluggishness, our province is going to continue to face such related problems as unemployment, educational needs, public welfare demands and excessive taxation.

**February 19, 1963**

What is the cause of Saskatchewan's stagnation? Liberals refuse to accept the proposition that our slow growth is caused solely or even primarily by a lack of resources. The last 36 months I have been able to travel all over the length and breadth of this province and I have become acutely aware of the tremendous potentials that we have. Our land resources are rich, varied and vast. Our water resources are not abundant but they are adequate I think, if properly conserved, distributed and utilized. Our timber resources have been hardly touched. We have almost unlimited supplies of oil, of potash, or uranium, of other minerals. Oh, my hon. friend over there is one of those socialists who always has his feet firmly planted in the air. Our tourist industry possibilities stagger the imagination. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that providence has been kind to our people. We in this province, and particularly my hon. friends opposite, like the biblical story of the man who buried his talents, have failed to develop, expand and utilize our resources and assets.

We Liberals say that the stunted growth and economic stagnation of the past two decades in Saskatchewan has been primarily caused by the theories of the socialist government opposite.

What is the political picture in Saskatchewan today? In two decades the socialists have shown us very clearly that they have no answers to the many problems which are facing Saskatchewan. I think as a result their political forces today are in disarray, they are in confusion, they are in retreat. In recent months they have lost their identity as a party, lost their leader, lost their premier, they have lost their former minister of health, they have lost their federal farm critic. The new premier's chief activity since he took over has been playing musical chairs with the cabinet. Five or six changes have been made. Yet, despite all this reshuffling, the same old faces remain. The same group — tired, colorless, unimaginative, bitter — carries on. The province of Saskatchewan suffers.

Since the election of June, 1960, the socialists have met four electoral defeats, each one by a larger figure. They lost the Athabasca deferred election by 171 votes. They lost the Turtleford by-election by 612 votes. They lost the Weyburn by-election — the seat of their former premier — by 874 votes. And in November last, by a resounding majority of 2,522 votes, they lost Prince Albert. We in the Liberal party think our win in Prince Albert was particularly significant. In the first place because we were delighted to have added such an experienced and capable M.L.A. as our hon. friend, Davie Steuart. In the second place we think it was significant because, for the first time in recent years, the Liberals won a major city seat where the trade union vote was strong, and where the civil service vote was strong.

I can tell you that the Liberal party was also pleased indeed to welcome Mr. Walter Erb to our party. Mr. Erb is only one of the thousands who, in recent years, have become disillusioned, frustrated with the stagnation and regimentation of socialism. And we think that Mr. Erb will add considerable strength to the Liberal team.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, to sum it up, the socialists have had five humiliating defeats since they won re-election back in 1960 with a minority vote of 41 percent. And, at the same time, Liberal strength in the legislature on this side of the house has gone from 16 to 21. Never in the past has any Saskatchewan administration lost a series of by-elections and then gone on to win the election. The lessons of history indicate very clearly that the days of the socialist administration in office are numbered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the ineptness and the inefficiency which has been displayed by my hon. friends in recent years, they have shown a great lack of courage. In recent months four provincial governments have gone to the polls several years ahead of time because some major issue was queried by the opposition, but in Saskatchewan it is a different story. Here is a government with a name and an alliance never endorsed by the people. Here is a government with a premier never endorsed by the people. Here is a government which caused almost complete chaos in the medicare crisis. Here is a government which is responsible for industrial stagnation almost beyond belief. Here is a government which has caused an exodus of population from Saskatchewan almost without parallel in Canada's history. Yet, here also is a government, like my hon. friend the Minister of Natural Resources, which cravenly fears to put its record before the people. Why? For only one reason — if they do place their record before the people they will be swept from office. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why the people of Saskatchewan are looking around for a party which can form an alternative administration.

As more and more CCF members leave their old party and join the Liberal party, some of our political opponents have suggested that the Liberal party is moving to the left and becoming just another socialist movement. I should like to make our position clear in this regard. There were some supporters of the old CCF party who never were socialists. There were others who were socialists but now see its futility. As individuals, people from both those groups have been welcomed on this side of the house. We had a Liberal convention in Saskatoon last November, a convention which incidentally had about twice as many delegates attending it as attended the NDP convention a few weeks previously. That convention went on record as unanimously rejecting any kind of an alliance between

**February 19, 1963**

the Liberals and my socialist friends opposite. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals unanimously feel, as they are on the verge of getting rid of one socialist party, they don't want any part of another. The basic philosophy of liberalism and the NDP are quite different. The NDP stands for socialism, for government ownership of the means of production, they stand for bureaucratic controls.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The Liberal party, on the other hand, is opposed to socialism. We believe in private enterprise and in personal initiative, and that at a time when the Social Credit leader and the Conservative leader are calling Liberals socialists, the NDP are branding us as reactionaries, right wingers, and even John Birchers. Actually the Liberals, as usual, are travelling neither left nor right, but straight ahead. We are a middle of the road party, a party which has a record which speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker, out on the hustings, I don't know whether the Premier and his associates will have the courage to do it in this house, but out on the hustings the Premier has been hinting that before too long we might have some kind of a redistribution bill. My hon. friends no doubt hope that a gerrymander of some kind might salvage their waning political fortunes. Perhaps some minor changes are needed to give the cities additional representation. However, the overall population of Saskatchewan has remained relatively static in recent years. Therefore, there is no reason for a wholesale change of rural boundaries. A general redistribution can only mean that the socialists are endeavoring to gerrymander the constituencies to save their own political hides. One point I would like to make to my hon. friends this afternoon whether they have a redistribution or not, whether they gerrymander the constituencies or not, nothing will save them in the next election. The people of Saskatchewan are fed up with socialism. And as I said a moment ago, all they are doing is waiting for an opportunity to vote these people out.

Now I should like to turn for a few moments to certain aspects of Liberal policy. As they desperately cling to office, the socialists have tried to spread dire warnings to the people of Saskatchewan as to what will happen when a Liberal government takes office. I think any unbiased person would agree that all governments have some good programs, all governments have some weak and ineffective programs. We give the socialists credit for keeping much of the good legislation which former Liberal governments brought in. And I am not going to detract too much this afternoon from the odd bit of beneficial legislation introduced by the socialists. At the same time we have no hesitation in saying that their useful

legislation is far out-weighted by the stagnation and lack of development which their poor legislation brought to the province of Saskatchewan. But I think the Liberals are neither so short-sighted nor so politically unwise that they would remove any good legislation from Saskatchewan's statute books simply because it was introduced by the socialists. However, so there will be no misunderstanding at this time, I would like to make our position clear on a number of matters.

First of all I turn to the civil service. The NDP are running around Saskatchewan saying "when those Liberals take office all the civil servants will be fired". Well, as I said a year or so ago, in the short time that I have been in Regina I have been impressed with the calibre, the ability of many of our civil servants; most of them are doing a conscientious job for the people of Saskatchewan and with those people we have no quarrel, we find no fault. When the Liberal government takes over the administration of the province no employee who is performing a useful job in a competent manner need fear dismissal. The Liberals propose no witch hunt. We will, of course, endeavor to eliminate jobs which are not needed, and we make no apology for saying that we will weed out the political heelers. And today there are dozens and dozens of these individuals in Saskatchewan, being paid out of tax funds, spending most of their time running around organizing politically for my hon. friends to your right. A substantial number of those individuals were up in the Prince Albert by-election and I can tell those gentlemen that we noted the number of them who were there. We give fair warning to civil servants who indulge in political activity on the taxpayers' time that they should do so realizing fully that they are jeopardizing their jobs in the future.

Back in 1944, Mr. Speaker, the socialists promised to take the civil service out of politics. Instead, they have put politics into the civil service. Advancement usually depends not on 'how much you know', but rather on 'who you know'. Today it seems that only the so-called 'pinks' or defeated candidates need apply for those jobs. Years of seniority and ability quite frequently have meant very little when my socialist friends are giving out the jobs. I say then that the NDP over the years has built their party organization on a patronage basis. But even though they have done that, apparently they are not satisfied because at the last NDP convention in Saskatoon a resolution was passed which, in effect, urged that all applications for civil service positions should be screened on a political basis. What audacity! Such an attitude is contrary to all proven and accepted concepts of good government. And yet the fact that this resolution was passed without any of the cabinet ministers objecting to it must mean that there is sympathy with it.

**February 19, 1963**

The Liberal party believes that civil servant's politics is his or her own business. But we also believe that whether it is a socialist government or a Liberal government or a Conservative government, civil servants should remain politically neutral on their jobs, and advancement in service should be made on a basis of ability and seniority, not as a reward for past political service.

Now I want to turn for a moment to the Liberal attitude on social welfare. What is the Liberal attitude? The socialists are telling people that if the Liberals form a government they might lose some of their pension cheques, or their mothers' allowance, or certain other social aid payments. Let me say at once that members of the Saskatchewan Liberal party are just as humane and just as interested in the unfortunate people of this province as anyone else.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We believe that any citizen, any citizen in our province and country, is entitled to certain basic standards of living. Governments at the provincial level and the federal level of course must guarantee those basic minimums, always providing that the individual who is able to is willing to work where a job is available. Many people drawing social aid in Saskatchewan today are doing so legitimately, either because of illness, because the husband has died, or because employment is unavailable. And that is as it should be. In a society as productive as ours, it is inconceivable that needless suffering and hardship should exist. As far as the unfortunate people in those categories are concerned, the Liberal party believes the government of Saskatchewan has a responsibility.

But I would also this afternoon say flatly to the Premier, I would say flatly to the Minister of Social Welfare, I would say flatly to this government, that there is increasing evidence that hundreds of people are drawing social aid today who are simply not entitled to it. Social aid in Saskatchewan is becoming a provincial scandal. There is evidence that social aid on an ever-increasing scale is being given to chisellers, to deadbeats, to drunks, to people who are too lazy to work, to people who are frequently not even citizens of Saskatchewan. Even people in the minister's own department are rebelling in disgust at the waste at the taxpayers' expense. Repeatedly people who have refused employment or who have other sources of income, are being put on the rolls of social aid. A recent blow-up in the city of Regina was only typical of conditions which exist elsewhere in the province. Several months ago the director of social aid in Regina threw up his hands in despair and resigned because of continued interference. When he and his associates who are trained social workers refused social aid to cases he believed were non-deserving, the mayor or Regina repeatedly compelled them to receive and approve some of the applications.



Some of the evidence which appeared in the Regina Leader-Post is almost unbelievable. I quote the issue of Wednesday, November 21. No one on the other side has denied it, so I suppose it must be right. I quote the first case.

Mr. Erisko, a social aid worker, said he was instructed by the mayor to offer monetary aid to an applicant. He conducted the usual investigation as to the eligibility of the applicant and determined the person was a self-employed business man, conducting a landscape business in the city. He further determined that the applicant was the owner of tractors, trucks, a cultivator, a front-end loader, and a Cadillac car.

Would the hon. minister say that gentleman was entitled to social aid?

I quote another case which was carried in the Leader-Post and was not denied, to my knowledge. Mayor Baker ordered the director to put a young married man on social aid. According to Mr. Supnyuk, this man has been on continuous aid since October 30, 1960, although the man was physically able to work, he chose not to work.

Another case has been drawn to my attention. A woman who lived down at Carlyle and moved to Regina, a single woman — a school teacher who says she does not want to teach. This woman was sent by Premier Douglas personally to social aid officials, and though she had a beach cottage and a car, he ordered her to be put on social aid, and since that time she has drawn \$72.50 per month.

Another woman in Regina a short time ago received \$10,000 insurance; despite the efforts of officials she has never been off social aid and today is drawing \$200 a month from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

About a year ago a farmer from the Odessa district applied and received social aid in Regina. When the officials investigated, they found that on his farm he had a full line of machinery and 3,000 bushels of grain in his granaries.

One could go on and on with cases of this nature if time permitted. As far as the situation in Regina is concerned, the Regina city council tried to do something about it. They were frustrated by my hon. friend, the Attorney General. He refused to sanction an investigation. Small wonder, because he was afraid perhaps of what might happen to some of the officials or the mayor. All my good friend, the Minister of Social Welfare, seems able to do is call conferences around

**February 19, 1963**

the province and gloss over what is being done, and send blizzards of propaganda out from his office. I hope my hon. friend, the Hon. Minister of Social Welfare will do something about cases of this kind.

Ten years ago in Saskatchewan there were 7,800 people on social aid in March, 1952. In March, 1962, ten years later there were 27,600. In March, 1952 the total expenditures for social aid were \$1.7 million; last year they were \$6 million.

Surely the lessons of history show very conclusively that continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration which is fundamentally harmful to the national fibre. We say that the welfare program of my hon. friends opposite, in addition to being tremendously costly to the taxpayer, is also terribly wasteful of the most precious of all human resources — human beings.

The Liberal party believes that ways must be found that will allow the government to prevent hardship, but in such a way that the great virtues of self-reliance and initiative and ambition are not defeated. When we form a government we will constantly concentrate on building an “opportunity state” — not a “welfare state” — a province where the great majority of our people will have good jobs, and not be dependent on social aid cheques. We make no apologies for saying that a Liberal government will have little sympathy for those who are too lazy to work, where jobs of any kind are available.

What about some of the other social welfare measures, such as mothers’ allowance, supplementary old-age pensions and so forth? I repeat, where there are cases of genuine hardship this party is just as interested in humane treatment as anyone else; but we also believe that all social welfare measures must be related to the economic abilities of the taxpayer. We think there is real danger to the taxpayer when any political party, using the taxpayers’ money, recklessly endeavors to buy political favor by outbidding the other parties in the social aid benefits it will pay.

Over the next several years, in attempting to remedy conditions in Saskatchewan, we have no intention of trying to outbid the socialist with promises which are not in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan. The Liberal party has been in the past, and will continue to be in the future, the only real party of social reform in Canada. We will continue to extend social welfare measures within the limits dictated by sound principles and the ability of our people to pay.

**Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation):** — Would the hon. member permit a question before he goes on? I wonder would he be good enough to identify these specific cases as mentioned and give the minister a chance to fine out . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Yes, Mr. Minister, I have the names here. I rather hesitate to make them public, but as soon as I finish my remarks I would be pleased to give them to him personally.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now to the attitude of the Liberal party to crown corporations. The member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) and certain other members had something to say about this yesterday. Socialists are saying that when the Liberals form a government, they plan to scrap all the crown corporations, or sell them to private industry. What is our position, as far as crown corporations are concerned? I think I should make it crystal-clear that the Liberal party believes in private enterprise and is fundamentally opposed to socialism. We believe that, generally speaking, repeatedly it has been shown that private individuals can run a business better than a government can. I must follow, of course, if that is so, a Liberal government will call a halt to further socialistic experiments in this province.

Moreover, it will stop the expansion of government competition with private business and industrial enterprise in this province. We will do everything we possibly can to encourage private enterprise, so that it will locate in Saskatchewan, pay taxes and then create jobs for our young people, perhaps jobs for some of the young people who are down today from the university. Almost half of the original crown corporations which were set up have gone broke or have been disposed of for one reason or another; usually at heavy financial loss to the taxpayer. Most of the crown corporations which remain do so because they are heavily bolstered by some sort of a monopoly or some kind of a special privilege. Under a Liberal government I would say that all crown corporations will be vigorously investigated. By this method, and for the first time in their rather sorry history, we will discover and disclose the truth about their operations. One thing I am sure of, there will be an end to the steady looting of the treasury to provide fictitious bookkeeping profits for these corporations.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** —Having said that, let me make it very clear that we have no intention of disposing of the remaining crown corporations at fire-sale prices, none whatever. The Liberal party has always maintained that there are certain limited fields where public ownership can best serve the people's interests. This is true of utilities, such as the power corporation, and the telephone company which, after all, were started by a Liberal government. Naturally we will continue to operate companies in this category. That is Liberal policy. However, we think both of these utilities should be thoroughly investigated,

perhaps the management should be pretty thoroughly investigated. We will urge that a good deal more of the expansion should come from revenues and not from excessive and heavy borrowing. We don't mind saying that we are very concerned about the slap-happy way the power corporation officials are spending the taxpayers' money. I read a speech of the hon. member for mineral resources (Mr. Kuziak) down in Moose Jaw the other day. Why, he said, the province is out of debt. How peculiar — the power corporation's debt alone stands at \$350 million! I can read a balance sheet. In 1961 the power corporation gross profits were \$13½ million. Yet when all expenses were taken into account, the net profit was only about \$1 million. To put it another way, the return to the taxpayer was about one-third of one percent. Well, if the Liberals take office, I can assure you, Sir, that we will demand, without any equivocation from the power corporation management, a more adequate return on the taxpayers' investment. And if the present management can't bring the operation into a more profitable position it will be replaced by a management team which can. We will use some of the profits to pay off some of the fantastic debt.

What is our attitude to other crown corporations? Our attitude when we form the government will be determined by a number of facts. First, whether the crown corporation is losing large sums of the taxpayers' money. Secondly, whether it is rendering an essential service to the public or not. It for instance, might be giving the kind of service that we would continue even if it was losing money. And we would consider the effect of the particular industry as far as employment is concerned. Liberals are interested in creating and maintaining jobs, not in destroying them.

Now, having enunciated these general principles, I should like to specifically mention a few of these crown corporations. The hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) last session stated our position as far as the timber board is concerned. Since 1944 we know that many private operators were forced out of business by the timber board. And most of them are now operating in Alberta and Manitoba. Well, the Hon. Minister of Mineral Affairs is shouting as usual. However, he must admit we are one of the few provinces in Canada which has been unsuccessful in obtaining a pulp mill. Oh, it is true that every time we go into an election the socialists promise us one. As a matter of fact, most people on this side of the house think that the minute they start announcing a pulp mill, look out for an election. Our timber production in Saskatchewan under the timber board today is about 40 percent of the figures that it was back in 1944 under private enterprise. Oh, the timber board has been able to show paper profits, bookkeeping profits, but in the process its monopolistic features are slowly strangling development in the north. Let no one doubt

that a Liberal government will institute and maintain a sensible system of conservation. We will keep the timber board, at least for the time being, but we will expect it to compete.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Private operators will be allowed to buy and produce on a competitive basis. Liberal policy will permit the producer to sell his timber where he can obtain the best price. We think that such action will increase returns to the producer. We think it will augment employment, will increase revenue to the people of Saskatchewan, and it will promote in more rapid development of the north.

I would like to say a word about the Saskatchewan Government Printing Company. We believe that the government is paying more for its printing today than is necessary, because it does most of it in the government plant. We believe that you could get cheaper printing done if you called for private tenders from various printing plants around the province. The vaunted profits of this company are largely fictional. And I may say, if the Liberals form a government, and we keep this company, it will have to stay and stand on its own feet.

I know that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) is anxious for me to say what we are going to do with the government insurance office, the guarantee and fidelity company. If the government insurance office can in truth bring about actual insurance rate reductions, after paying its full operating costs and its fair tax load, in line with what private companies have to pay, we would agree that it is performing a useful public service. However, we know that much of the government insurance office's business today is obtained by compulsion. Most of the departments of this government are forced to take their insurance from the government insurance office. And I believe it can be proven that the company owes its entire profits since it was formed to the kind of handouts that I have just mentioned. Under a Liberal government, the government insurance office would have to stand on its own feet and compete. As far as mandatory public liability automobile insurance is concerned, we'll keep it, but we will let the citizens of Saskatchewan buy their insurance anywhere they like so long as they do buy it.

This, then, Mr. Speaker, is the crux of the Liberal attitude toward the crown corporations. Again, it represents the middle road. We believe in private ownership and private enterprise wherever feasible or possible. We believe in government ownership only where the public interests require it.

I would like to say a word about the Liberal attitude to labor. Our socialist friends in the opposition are attempting to run around the province, and particularly the various cities,

**February 19, 1963**

saying that the Liberal party is anti-labor and that if we form a government many of the gains which they have obtained over the years will go. The NDP boastfully, and I have heard many of them on platforms, say that the old CCF party brought in the best labor laws that exist anywhere on the North American continent. Well, if that's true, surely one would think that this province would have been a Mecca for workers from other provinces, from the states, from all over. But this stampede of workers from elsewhere has not come about — indeed the stampede has been the other way — outward not inward. Workers by the tens of thousands have turned their backs on this so-called great labor legislation. You will find them in cities all the way from Victoria to St. John. They have gone where industry is located. They have gone where there is less government intervention. They've gone, Mr. Speaker, where there are some jobs.

The socialists, over the years in this province, have made the province of Saskatchewan a guinea pig for labor legislation which is designed to buy them votes in Ontario and Quebec. Such legislation, time and again, has cost this province badly needed industries. No one in the Liberal party suggests that the clock should be turned back as far as basic trade union rights are concerned. Certainly, the economic welfare and job security of our workers should be protected, but in the name of Heaven, let us make those benefits real. Let's not substitute sham paper benefits for efficiency, for job security, for good wages. There is no justification whatever for labor legislation, rules and regulations which unnecessarily hamstring employers. Because when you hamstring employers, sooner or later you are going to hamstring employees also.

I am reminded today of some of the decisions made in recent years by the labor relations board. Usually when those decisions have been taken to the courts it has been found that workers in the province of Saskatchewan, certainly many whom I talked to in the Prince Albert by-election, are beginning to realize that what is needed in this province is fewer fancy labor statutes and more industries to provide work. The Saskatchewan Liberal party is not anti-labor, neither is any other party in Canada today, unless it is my socialist friends who drive out industry from a province and take employment away from workers. As a matter of fact, most of the good labor legislation on the statute books today, either in Regina or in Ottawa, was put there by a Liberal government. The Liberal party believe that the main need of our working force in Saskatchewan today is for new industry which will create additional jobs at good pay. And when this socialist government is voted out of office and the Liberals take over, our people will see the greatest influx of business and industry ever witnessed since 1867. If we are to expect industry to locate in Saskatchewan and provide jobs, it seems to me that we must

make sure that employment conditions are at least not worse than they are in Alberta or Manitoba. No one section of our society would benefit from reasonable, sensible labor legislation more than the working people of Saskatchewan.

Now, for a moment I would like to turn to the Liberal attitude toward medicare. Our socialist friends are running around the province saying that if the Liberals are elected they are going to throw out all the health schemes that have been developed over the years in this province. I would like to state flatly, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues and associates, that this simply is not true. Almost everyone in Saskatchewan is in favor of medical health insurance. The people are, the doctors are, and certainly the opposition Liberal party is. The dispute in the chaotic month of last July was not "medicare" versus "no medicare". The basic issue, certainly so far as the opposition was concerned, was a coercive type of government plan versus a scheme which was acceptable to all concerned, including those providing the services. In this connection, it is almost unbelievable that any government, even a socialist government, would first antagonize, then coerce, and finally harass the very ones upon whom the success of their pet scheme depended.

I stated last year that this Medical Care Insurance Act was not correctly named. It had none of the characteristics of insurance. Rather, it was a statute to establish state medicine. Time has not lessened the accuracy of that interpretation. I remind the house and I remind the people of Saskatchewan that the act was introduced in violation of a solemn election pledge given by the socialists that any scheme would be satisfactory to those providing and those receiving the services. The Liberals opposed those tactics at the time. The Liberal party took exception to the regimentation and coercion inherent in the act. It still does. But let me repeat, we do support the principle of a prepaid medical health insurance plan.

Now since the last sitting of the legislature the medicare situation appears to have steadily deteriorated. I stated yesterday in the house what I believe was the main reason that it has deteriorated; the fact that almost 150 doctors have left the province since the controversy began indicates that there is continuing unhappiness and dissatisfaction among the medical profession. Distrust is everywhere. Medical care commission members criticize publicly doctors and public bodies who think differently than they do. The good doctors appear to be those who think politically like the NDP do, as far as the commission members are concerned. The profession has reached the point where they feel that the word of this government is absolutely meaningless. And they feel particularly that ministers like the Minister of Agriculture fall in that category. People are beginning to wonder if the socialists are trying to make a medical desert in the province of Saskatchewan.

**February 19, 1963**

Surely by this time even members with the mental ability of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) must realize that a medical scheme can't be truly effective if he hasn't got the co-operation of both the patient and the doctor. Mr. Speaker, despite the bitterness and chaos of last July, the socialists have shown little desire to be conciliatory, little willingness to compromise. Quite the contrary. Doctors week after week have complained that the commission was not paying their accounts without long delays. And they have complained that, in payment of accounts, there is discrimination against doctors who are practising outside the medical care act. For example, in January there was a clinic in Prince Albert which said publicly that only 15 percent of accounts submitted had been paid. Another clinic in Moosomin reported publicly in January that payments made so far, or up to that time, by the commission wouldn't even cover the office expense, and that they would have to leave the province unless some improvement was made. Repeatedly doctors have complained that they have had to borrow money to carry on their office expense. Surely that kind of a situation is deplorable, Mr. Speaker.

I am very pleased to note that, since the opposition said we were going to try and call the commission in front of the legislature if things didn't improve, conditions have picked up somewhat. I hope they will continue to improve. But you know, Mr. Speaker, this government has been collecting from the public very heavy taxes for this plan for fourteen months. It has always been noted for its tardiness in paying ordinary accounts. Surely the present situation is inexcusable. Either the long delays are due to deliberate harassment of the profession or the commission is displaying unbelievable inefficiency and ineptness. We in the opposition would like to know which is correct. Unless there is a continuing improvement, at an appropriate time we shall endeavor to have the commission called before some committee of the legislature. The department continues to refuse to treat doctors who are radiologists and pathologists in the same manner as other members of the profession. Under the voluntary schemes, such as M.S.I. and G.M.S., formerly many of these charges were paid by the private plans. Now there are extra charges in many cases. The taxpayers of Saskatchewan simply cannot understand why this should be so. I ask the Minister of Health (Mr. Blakeney) why in view of his past commitments, he is so tardy in resolving their problem.

Mr. Speaker, when the Liberals form a government, my colleagues and I will work to perfect a medical care scheme that will be a credit to the people, to the medical profession and to the government of Saskatchewan. It will not be framed in a hurry in order to acquire votes, or to win an election. We have emphasized time and again that, of course, it will be a comprehensive scheme which will be available to all. But, in addition, we shall take every feasible step to make it



acceptable to the profession. We will take politics out of the health program of our people. We will make the medical care insurance commission, if it continues to function, a strictly non-political commission. In short, the Liberal attitude to a health insurance scheme is simply this. We will produce a health plan for the people of Saskatchewan that will work.

Now Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn for a few moments to the Liberal platform and program, as we prepare ourselves for an election when my hon. friends get courage to call one. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party has no illusions. Any new government taking office in the province of Saskatchewan will face the most serious economic and financial problems brought about by two decades of socialist administration. Probably no government since Confederation, provincial or federal, has been obliged to take over such an economic mess as the next government of Saskatchewan will face. And we know that such chaos cannot be cleaned up overnight. We do not promise any miracles. The Liberals do not claim to have any simple panacea or magic formula. But we will make a supreme effort to nurse our province back to fiscal, industrial and economic health.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I have had some people ask me, What is the primary aim of a Saskatchewan Liberal government? Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the major objective of our party can be very simply stated. Liberals wish to restore good government to Saskatchewan; Liberals want to get Saskatchewan moving again economically. I said a moment ago that Liberals had an annual convention in Saskatoon last November. More than 1,100 delegates attended. Those delegates began hammering out, in a democratic manner, our program for the next election. Personally, I was indeed pleased with some of the resolutions. There was evidence of strong feeling that a government, like a well run business, should live within its means. There was a firm belief that under normal circumstances, governments should aim at a balanced budget and lower taxation. The delegates from all over the province repeatedly urged our M.L.A.'s to strive for a return to thrift, economy, and efficiency. However, as I have already stated, in the months ahead the Liberal party does not intend to try and buy political favor by outbidding the socialists in various give-away programs. We do not intend to seek election by trying to out-promise the NDP. We think our people have had enough of socialism, and are prepared to face economic facts.

We believe that the Saskatchewan people have the initiative and have the ability to manage their own affairs, without the constant interference of big governments. We will, in the Liberal party, conduct a campaign which will challenge the initiative and the pioneering instincts of our people. We will not merely bring in additional measures that will increase the burden of taxation in the province of Saskatchewan.

**February 19, 1963**

In line with the thinking of our convention, the first commitment I would like to make on behalf of our party is that we will attempt in a major way to curtail waste, extravagances and unnecessary government spending here in Regina. Surely the recent Glassco commission, reporting on waste and inefficiency in Ottawa, indicates how necessary such a periodic review is for any government. If it was necessary in Ottawa, how much more necessary is some kind of an investigation here in Regina. Anyone who wants to take the time, anyone who wants to look at public accounts, can easily find the total government spending under my hon. friends, overall spending, has gone, since they took office, from about \$33 million to \$350 million.

You can find, despite what my hon. friend, the new Provincial Treasurer says, that the provincial debt in 15 years has gone from \$135 million to \$533 million. If you look through those public accounts you can find that the size of the cabinet has gone from seven to 15 members, with each minister having new deputies, new research workers, and huge office staffs. Then you find that even though you have all these cabinet minister, they have set up a lot of boards to do most of the work anyway. The economic planning and advisory board, \$121,000 a year; the budget bureau costs the taxpayers \$136,000; purchasing agency, \$110,000, and so on. Public accounts are studded with expenditures which simply aren't necessary. I think for a moment of the Agricultural Machinery Administration Act, where my hon. friend the minister wastes \$156,000 annually of the taxpayers' money.

I also think of the centre for community studies, where my hon. friends, the theorists, waste another \$135,000. I recall a return which was obtained by the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) a year ago, which showed that in Saskatchewan at that time the government was operating 3,700 automobiles. The Liberal party will consider setting up a motor pool for all provincially-owned cars, similar to the pools which operated in some of the states in the great union to the south of us. I think we would likely have a car auction where hundreds of these surplus cars could be sold and the taxpayer save money. I could mention the public service commission — it has gone up from 1944, \$8,500 to \$143,000 in the past year, or an increase of 17 percent. I say then that the socialist government has, in the matter of two decades, built a bureaucratic colossus. It has established a Frankenstein, which it is now having trouble controlling. It has set up boards, bureaus, commissions, offices and agencies to meet every imaginable whim of the theorists' offices.

You know as we talk about waste, consider the recent action taken by my hon. friend, the Attorney General opposite. He has found a new way to waste the hard-earned cash of the Saskatchewan taxpayer.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — According to newspaper reports, he is now sending lawyers and government personnel from Saskatchewan in order to intervene in a dispute between a labor union and the British Columbia government. I say that this dispute is none of the Attorney General's business.

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

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

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't mind raising a point of order and giving you the authority, but I would ask that the primary point is for my hon. friends opposite not to discuss a case presently before the courts.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Oh! Oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I think the point raised by the Attorney General is well taken, and matters which are before the courts cannot be debated in this house. I would ask all members, when any member rises on a point of privilege, to remain silent so that I may hear the point clearly.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I have said most of what I want anyway so that is all right. This isn't the first time that the Attorney General has butted into the affairs of other provinces. Surely this government could spend its energies and its monies better right here at home looking after some of our problems, rather than butting into the affairs of labor unions and provincial governments elsewhere.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition is following my ruling. This must not be discussed while it is before the courts.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — All hon. members are bound by the rules of the house, and if the hon. member is going to be allowed to make his speech, I can make one that is much more effective I assure you, much more relevant.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**An Hon. Member:** — You overrate yourself, Bob.

**February 19, 1963**

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — It's over, it's past. As a matter of fact it never was Saskatchewan's case anyhow. He stuck his nose into . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have ruled this is not to be discussed while it is before the courts.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the previous cases of this nature, I have often wondered just who the Attorney General was representing. Has he been representing little Tommy Douglas? Has he been representing the Canadian Labor Congress? Is he no longer interested in the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan? Just one additional way that money is being wasted. May I say also, Mr. Speaker, that many of my hon. friends in the cabinet opposite have been trying to build little empires, a horde of civil servants around them. The Liberals believe that millions of dollars can be saved if that kind of waste and extravagance is eliminated. For that reason, when a Liberal government is formed, we will set up an independent body of some kind, in the nature of a royal commission. We will set up some kind of a commission to inquire into the organization and operation of all departments in the provincial government and all agencies. This commission will carry out a politically-independent, competent investigation. It will be requested to make such recommendations as in the judgment of the commission will provide for economy and efficiency in the conduct of government.

Now, I come to the second Liberal pledge as we go into the next election. The second pledge has to do with taxation. The history of the socialist administration for 18 or 19 long years has been a long and steady increase in virtually all old taxes and the imposition of hundreds of new taxes and levies. It is just about impossible to think of any opportunity or any excuse for taxation which has not been fully exploited by this government. We were talking yesterday about municipal taxes. Back in 1944 this government was going to take the taxes off the farmer and put them on the mortgage companies. Instead, since the war municipal taxes across Saskatchewan, on an average, under their administration, have gone up three and a half to four times. I think back in 1944 of all the speeches my hon. friends made about the wicked two percent sales tax. Why, they said, elect us and we are going to eliminate the sales tax, when we find new sources of revenue. Instead, first of all they put it up to three percent, and then a few months ago they put it up to five percent. People in Alberta or Manitoba pay no sales tax; this government makes the people of Saskatchewan pay five percent tax and that fact is causing major hardship

I think of the gasoline tax which under the Liberals was 7¢ a gallon. My hon. friends now have it up to 14¢ a gallon. I think of the six percent surcharge that they put on income tax. A lot of people are just filling out their income tax forms now and realizing the penalty they are paying for living in the province of Saskatchewan. The one percent increase in corporation taxes, hundreds of others of these levies could be mentioned. I recall a return that was made a little more than a year ago in reply to a question by the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), the question was very simple, “How many levies and taxes were there in Saskatchewan in 1944?” “How many levies and taxes are there in Saskatchewan in 1961?” When he got the reply we found that there had been 600 completely new taxes and levies introduced by the socialists and 650 tax increases in old taxes and levies introduced by the socialists. The results of these hundreds of new taxes has been a crushing burden on our people. Last year we obtained the dubious honor of being, if not the highest per capita taxed people, certainly very close to being the highest.

I’ve enjoyed some of the speeches being made by the Hon. Premier when he runs around this province. He says, these dirty old Liberals, they are saying that we are the highest per capita taxed people in Canada, in fact we are not. He holds up D.B.S. figures, which are the latest figures, and claims they show that we are not the highest per capita taxed people, we are the fourth. But of course what he forgets to tell his audience is that since those figures were issued he has put in some new major taxes . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . for medicare. When you add on those new taxes there is certainly a different story to be told.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan can’t help remembering, as they pay these 1,250 new taxes, more or less, that this is the government which, in the last election, said, Elect us and we will give you “more abundant living”.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Is there any group in this province that is getting more abundant living? I don’t know who it is, unless it is my hon. friends opposite. As far as the Liberal party is concerned, we believe that private enterprise system is based on the incentive provided by profit. If we are to preserve the growth necessary to finance even the present areas of demand, that incentive must be preserved, expanded and encouraged. Any system of taxation which removes incentive will be self-defeating, and end in a reduction rather than an increase of governmental services sought.

**February 19, 1963**

Therefore, I say a primary, consistent and determined purpose of a new Liberal government will be to introduce major tax reductions. We believe specifically that some way must be found to reduce the tax on land and property. We believe specifically that some way must be found to reduce the five percent sales tax; we believe specifically that personal and corporate income taxes should be reduced — if possible to a point where rates are lower than in other provinces, but certainly to a point where they are no higher, as they are today in most cases. We believe that there should be sweeping tax changes in other fields. Our second pledge then to the people of Saskatchewan is that tax reductions of this nature will be undertaken by a Liberal government as soon as we have had an opportunity to assess the situation and eliminate the waste and unnecessary spending that we believe now exists.

Our third pledge has to do with industrial development. We are going to take every available step to stop industrial stagnation at long last in Saskatchewan. Whether my hon. friends wish to admit it or not, it is a fact that Saskatchewan's growth is slower than in any other province in the Dominion of Canada. I think the population figures which I tabled earlier show this. Even though our natural resources are greater than those of provinces where the rate growth is fast. Time and again industries have by-passed this province after looking it over, to locate in Alberta and Manitoba. All the socialist government can do is to fill the air with apologies and excuses. When one talks about pulp mills, they tell us that recently freight rates are too high to permit the establishment of pulp mills in this province. It is funny they aren't too high in Manitoba and Alberta also. Forest industry inventories have shown that we have enough timber for six pulp mills in perpetuity. Then we talk about the oil companies. Socialist apologists say that the oil companies have forsaken Saskatchewan because it is less costly to seek oil elsewhere. Yet a short time ago, the now Provincial Treasurer was boasting that the ratio of producing wells to wells drilled was the highest on record. The giant of an industrial development office labors mightily to bring forth a mouse in the shape of a handful of minor industries.

I was somewhat amused last November when an announcement came out from the Minister of Information's office to the effect that his deputy minister had been chosen as the senior expert on a United Nations mission to go and establish industries in the United Arab Republic. The minister stated in his release "No man could be better qualified and experienced for the task". Well, if the deputy doesn't do better for Mr. Nasser than he did for the people of Saskatchewan, Heaven help the Arabs!

Perhaps we shouldn't blame the industrial development office entirely for our lack of new industry because, while the personnel of that office are trying to get industrialists to locate here in Saskatchewan, the socialists are making speeches, blasting and condemning the very men they want to come here.

A Liberal government will substitute action instead of apologies, and we will try to adopt constructive measures which will wipe aside obstacles to our progress. I think the mere defeat of the socialist government would do more than anything else to remove obstacles because it is the scourge of socialism, the threat of expropriation, the repetitious resort to the Marxist attack on the owners of property and business that keep business out.

Now Mr. Speaker, there are fifty states on this continent and there are ten provinces. Fifty-nine of those states and provinces have governments which believe in private enterprise. In only one of these 60 jurisdictions — Saskatchewan — is there a government which, in effect, has declared war on private ownership of capital and the making of profits. Is it any wonder that our industrial development is lagging? Is it any wonder that Saskatchewan is the industrial backwoods of the whole North American continent? Real economic growth can only come from new investment capital. Investors, no matter where they come from, don't like socialists who constantly attack the making of profits as an unforgivable sin. It is quite obvious that my hon. friends opposite are never going to change their outlook, even though they change their party name. The only alternative then is to change the government, so that the gates may be opened to let in new industry. If Saskatchewan wants new industry, there must be a financial reward for initiative — foresight — energy, and for the risking of money invested. Moreover, the constant fear of expropriation and government control, either directly or through confiscatory taxation, must be eliminated. The last two decades, Saskatchewan has come to be known as the province where industry never gets a break. Liberals will reverse this attitude. Liberals will work to make Saskatchewan known as the province where private enterprise is wanted and appreciated. It will be our task to provide the kind of political and economic climate where business can thrive.

As I said yesterday, Liberals believe that private enterprise has given the workers and people of Canada one of the highest living standards in the world. We, therefore, when we form a government, will encourage responsible enterprise with every means at our disposal. This doesn't mean to say that we are going to surrender our province to the domination or the control of big business, any more than we will give it up to the control or influence of big trade unions, as my hon. friends opposite sometimes have done.

I believe that industrialists will come to this province for only one reason, because it is profitable for them to do so. It seems to me that if we want them here, we must make it more desirable and more profitable for them to locate in Saskatchewan than it is in either Alberta or Manitoba.

**February 19, 1963**

Now we are going to have to pay the price which this socialist government for two decades has cost us. We think the time has come to face up to that fact and get on with the job. So the Liberals, instead of childishly attacking the making of profits as a major evil of society, will encourage profits. We will do this for the simple reason that, otherwise, we shall have no industries. They will go where industries have some common sense.

What specific legislation will we introduce to attract new industry? First of all, we will introduce tax concessions to new industries or mines locating in the province. If it is necessary, we will consider a tax holiday of from five to ten years for new corporations. This formula has been very successful in other countries, like West Germany and France, and Puerto Rico. If my hon. friends were not too tied to a dogmatic theory, maybe they would study what has gone on in those countries.

In the second place we will try to make sure that royalties on natural resources are made competitive with those of the other provinces. We will avoid the kind of situation that occurred last year when Kerr-Addison mines almost left the province because of irksome mining regulations imposed by the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources. The Liberal government will see that electric power and natural gas rates are made competitive with the rates of other provinces for industry and mines.

We will remove unfair competition from government-subsidized crown corporations and, in co-operation with municipal governments, we will endeavor to provide land for industries at cost, and sewer and water on a local improvement basis.

And, Mr. Speaker, while safeguarding all the real rights and privileges of our workers, we will eliminate from our labor legislation those irritants which have harassed and discouraged industry from locating in this province. Saskatchewan is rich in natural resources and has a good future if it can get the "curse" of socialism off our back. We have a lot of catching up to do, but the industrial challenge is one which the Liberal party is prepared to accept.

Now I would like to say a word or so about what we would like to do for agriculture. Down through the years the socialist administration has always said, or has always claimed, that they are the "farmers' best friend". Yet, since I have been in this legislature, I have noted that every time there is a problem to be solved the Minister of Agriculture gets to his feet and screams for assistance from Ottawa. Under the administration of my hon. friends, the tax load on the farmer has steadily and sharply increased in almost any field you want to mention.



In the current year we are just going to be discussing in a few weeks, out of a total budgetary expenditure of \$174 million, the socialists only exempt \$7.4 million directly on agriculture. In other words, 4.2 percent of their budget was all they considered the farmer was worth. I can tell you that a Liberal government will investigate this situation and take whatever corrective measures are necessary. All my hon. friends may laugh. That is their general viewpoint as far as the farmer is concerned.

Now, our provincial program will be directed toward a greater diversification of agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan. We will give particular attention to increasing our cattle, our hog, our sheep and our poultry population. We know that European Common Market policies have raised some very serious questions about the future of wheat markets in Europe. We also know that the Chinese market which has been a kind of relief in the past year or so is very uncertain. Everything would indicate that Saskatchewan wheat producers may have heavy surpluses in the next decade. However, the future of the cattle industry looks bright. No branch of agriculture is as healthy as the beef cattle population in industry. The population of both Canada and the United States will go up in the next decade by about 37 million, or 24 percent. Almost every farm expert in Ottawa, or even in Washington, believes that this increased population will absorb the increase in beef cattle which we can have.

In 1961, I was interested to note, Saskatchewan population figures in cattle, for the first time, went over the two million, and for the first time we passed Quebec in cattle production. We are even starting to catch up to Alberta. There is no reason, as far as I can see, why Saskatchewan should not become the No. 1 cattle producing province in Canada, and with this objective in mind a Liberal government will attempt to give more vigorous and imaginative help to encourage livestock production.

Assistance and encouragement will be given to ranchers and farmers for the development of privately-owned pastures, feed lots, etc. Community pastures will be enlarged and extended. Small irrigation projects will be encouraged and expanded. Fodder reserves will be enlarged.

In the year 1960, the government gave freight assistance for the moving of 328,000 tons of feed and fodder from Alberta, Manitoba and northern Saskatchewan. It cost the taxpayers almost a million dollars. I suppose the department did not do a bad job in that respect and I give them credit for it. However, it does seem to me that in the future we would be much wiser to build up our reserves within Saskatchewan for irrigated projects and normal developments. For instance, the South Saskatchewan irrigation project will soon be complete. The Squaw Rapids development project will soon be complete. I believe that some substantial quantities of land around those

**February 19, 1963**

projects should be put into irrigated hay land, and fodder reserves built up for emergency years. I can tell you that the Liberals will press for a veterinary college at Saskatoon. We are waiting with great interest for the Minister of Agriculture to tell us how effective he has been in his negotiations with other provinces in this respect. And we will set up an independent board to allocate leases of crown land. We think far too often, when these leases are given out, politics enter into it, whether it is the Minister of Agriculture's politics or one of his deputies, I don't know.

Now, as far as hog production in Saskatchewan is concerned, we think something might be done to help increase hog production. The Liberals will seek an expansion in this field.

Sheep production has slipped even more drastically in Saskatchewan in recent years. Much of our mutton today is coming from Australia, or it is coming from New Zealand. We propose that a major effort should be made to encourage an expansion in this branch of agriculture.

We are of the opinion that the federal government ARDA program for agriculture offers some valuable features which can be adopted and used in this province. We believe that the provincial government should match and make full use of the federal ARDA grant of \$6.3 million which has been offered for a 2½-year period. If the terrible burdens of socialistic experiments are taken off the backs of the people of Saskatchewan we will have the funds available to take advantage of this kind of program. This would put our money to work in agriculture in a productive way. A Liberal government will accept and use to the full any such federal government offer.

I want to say a word about farm credit legislation. Farm loans in Saskatchewan today, if we are to keep our young farmers on the farm, must be made on a more extensive basis, lower interest rates and for longer periods. The Liberal party will take action to make better credit facilities available. Personally I would like to see extensive loans made through the banks and the credit unions. Today, in urban centres, when a young man wants to build a home, he can go to the bank and borrow the money, the money in turn is guaranteed up to 90 percent by the federal government. I see no reason why the same scheme could not be adopted here in Saskatchewan as far as farm land is concerned. I would hope that legislation could be introduced where a farmer could borrow the money from the bank, and his provincial government would guarantee it up to 90 percent against loss.

There is another field where loans are badly needed in Saskatchewan today. As far as I know, there is no place where a young farmer can borrow money, either provincially or federally in order to get into feeder cattle. We are going

to try to persuade our farmers to feed more of their cattle right here at home, then there should be some kind of credit facilities where they can get loans for that purpose.

I have one other suggestion to make as far as agriculture is concerned. Several weeks ago the Saskatchewan Jubilee Committee met to discuss ways and means of celebrating this province's centennial. And on that occasion I suggested that we should hold a World's Agricultural Fair in this province in 1967. Back in 1933 we held a World Grain Show which was most successful. It seems to me in 1967 we should emulate that example but instead of having a grain show, we should include also cattle, sheep, poultry, hogs, farm machinery, and so on. Not only would such a show be a tremendous stimulus to agriculture, but I think it could bring hundreds of thousands of tourists to this province. So I hope that the centennial committee will give consideration to this particular suggestion.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in short, I would like you to note that the Liberal party is prepared to use every feasible step to promote and strengthen the stability and prosperity of agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan.

The Liberal party consists of men and women whose first interest is to see Saskatchewan forge ahead. This is the province where most of us have all our material possessions, and our very future rests on Saskatchewan's progress and advance. If our families are going to remain at home, if our young people are going to remain at home instead of going elsewhere, there must be new opportunities. Those opportunities in my opinion, cannot be given by the socialists. In our aspirations for Saskatchewan we have no axes to grind for any narrow ideology, like my hon. friends opposite. Our primary concern is to be entrusted with the government of Saskatchewan so that our province can take its rightful place in confederation as one of the fastest growing areas.

During the past few years I believe the Liberal party has established itself as the only practical alternative to socialism in Saskatchewan. In the past three by-elections, it is interesting to note, neither the Conservatives nor the Social Creditors even named a candidate. It is also interesting to note that in all three cases, the Conservative leader and the Social Credit leader urged their followers to do otherwise. But members of the Conservative and Social Credit parties at the grass roots were adamant. They felt it made sense to make common cause with the Liberals and defeat the socialists. For too long my hon. friends opposite have been getting elected with a small minority vote. Looking over the figures the other day — I had to be up in Meadow Lake to nominate a candidate — I noticed that the sitting member (Mr. Semchuk) had been elected last time with 32 percent of the votes. The member for Nipawin (Mr. Perkins) 34 percent of the votes. The member for Last Mountain (Mr. Brown) 35 percent of the votes.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — What was the majority for the member from Morse (Mr. Thatcher)?

**February 19, 1963**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The member for Morse was elected with a lot better majority than that, and the next time it will be even better.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Now, very respectfully, I want to suggest to every anti-socialist in this house, to every anti-socialist in the province of Saskatchewan, that it is their duty in the next campaign to get behind the private enterprise candidate who has the best chance of defeating the socialist. Now, with 21 members in the house, and more coming, surely the Liberals are the only realistic alternative. Maybe Mr. Pederson and Mr. Kelln won't agree with this, but I think most of their followers will.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Four-way splits in every seat in the next provincial campaign can only help the socialists. People are too sensible to do it again. But even if there are four-way splits in every seat, we are not too worried, because we think that what happened in the city of Regina in the last federal election to the former socialist leader will happen in most seats provincially all over Saskatchewan. By the time the next election campaign is announced, the Liberal party will have a roster of candidates such as no other party can match, certainly not the aging groups at your right, Mr. Speaker. We are going to have men and women of experience, capability necessary to lead a great crusade in this province. When we form a cabinet, we are going to have a few men of business around, something that has been lacking across the way since 1944. We are going to have some farmers; we are going to have men and women experienced in local government; we are going to have teachers; we are going to have lawyers and professional men; we are going to have former mayors, aldermen, reeves, councillors. We want the people of Saskatchewan to compare these candidates with my hon. friends opposite. We won't have to go and import outside experts to run Saskatchewan's affairs as this inexperienced group opposite you have had to do. Trained and experienced Saskatchewan men and women will take over the control of our provincial affairs, guide our province with skillful hands and steadfast purpose to its manifest destiny.

This, in essence, then, Mr. Speaker, sums up the aspirations of the Liberal party. This, in essence, is the kind of leadership which Liberals propose to provide after the next election.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to join with the others who spoke earlier this afternoon and, indeed, with the Leader of the Opposition, in saying a word of welcome to the guests, the university students from the campus of the university at Regina and at Saskatoon. I am extremely pleased in the confidence which university students are trained in analysis and as a result are able to weigh and place some judgment on that which they heard. I am going to have a chance to say something more to the university students later so just say again how pleased all of us are indeed to have them with us at this time.

I want also to congratulate, and I do so most heartily, the member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) and the member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) on their very distinctive and, I think, distinguished addresses in this house yesterday. There are many of us who have sat here for a long time and there are many of us who will be here for a long while yet, but I doubt very much if we shall ever see a performance any better than that which we had yesterday from those two men.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — I want to join too with those who have already taken the opportunity of extending congratulations to the newly-elected member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) who took his seat at the opening of the session, Mr. Speaker, to say that like others I trust that he enjoys his years in the house. It is with some regret I can't express the hope that they will be long, or the belief that they will be long, but I do hope that he does enjoy them. Certainly we will extend to him every courtesy that it is possible to extend to one who represents a group of people in the province.

May I turn for awhile, Mr. Speaker, to the words of the Leader of the Opposition in a general way this afternoon. I say for awhile because I do not want members to forget what he said yesterday afternoon, much of it in an entirely different tone than today, may I say. Much of it must be commented on and which I will try to do later on in the afternoon. The Leader of the Opposition undertook this year, because, I suggest, of continuing urging by the government that the people deserve to know where the Liberal party stands, to outline something of the Liberal party's program. I listened very carefully for the last hour and a quarter or hour and a half and I would have to say that I really can't be much more informed now than I was before he started.

I have heard substantially the same speech, with something of the same boastful form, in this house as far back as following the 1948 election. I would remind the members over there, who are rejoicing in their present 21 members,

**February 19, 1963**

that that is precisely the number they had in 1948, and that they came back in 1952 with about half that number. So before they starting putting the brand on the unborn calf in this regard, I suggest that they think just a little more carefully about past history as well.

I listened intently as the Leader of the Opposition spoke of a number of things to try to find out what the Liberal party would do and I suggest that no one in this legislature at this moment knows what the Liberal attitude is towards medicare insurance. There is nothing whatsoever the Leader of the Opposition said this afternoon that shed one bit of light on what a Liberal party proposes with regard to medical care insurance, not one single word. Oh, he said, we are going to do something — but he didn't say what. And I suggest it is high time that the people of the province knew about it. And I think the same remark is applicable with regard to what he said about labor. There are some good labor laws, there are some things that need doing, but he didn't say what the Liberal party stands for with regard to labor legislation. He proposed nothing definite whatsoever in regard to those programs.

And the same thing was true when he spoke of the situation with regard to social welfare; a number of very vague generalizations suggesting in part I guess that the provincial government ought to take over the decision making from the municipalities, but outside of that he, in fact, said nothing with regard to what their policy is in that regard.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Were you asleep, Woodrow?

**Premier Lloyd:** — I wasn't asleep but I might just as well have been for all the good it did me sitting here listening to what was going on. I can see better pictures and hear better words in my dreams than I heard this afternoon.

Let me just say a word or two about two topics which illustrate the way in which the Leader of the Opposition approaches his responsibilities as Leader of the Opposition. Hon. members will recall that in this legislature last year he made the statement that this province of Saskatchewan was the most highly taxed per capita of any province in Canada. He was contradicted at that time, he went about this province continually for months afterwards making the statement all over again in many parts of the province. Today, after having misled the people of the province for a period of twelve months he admits that his statement was wrong. This year he doesn't say it's the most highly taxed; he goes back to my statement of last year when, quoting statistics from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, it was possible to show that we were not the first, not the second, nor the third, but the fourth highest. He

omits to say that in the same statement I went on and said “this is before medicare taxes”, but that even after you add the medicare taxes to it we are still not the first but only the third, and that situation is true today.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No it’s not.

**Premier Lloyd:** — But that is exactly what he said last year, Mr. Speaker. He forgets this . . . He forgets this . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I still say you can’t talk yourself out of those taxes.

**Premier Lloyd:** — I’ll talk myself . . .

**Mr. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — . . . out of anything.

**Premier Lloyd:** — . . . into the description of the actual situation when I have the statistics with me tomorrow. But I submit that it is not fair to compare the tax level per capita in Saskatchewan, which pays for medicare costs, with a tax level in other provinces which does not pay for medicare costs, because people in the other provinces have to pay for that too, and a large number of them are paying more than the majority of the people in Saskatchewan are paying for it. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition, in fact, owes an apology to this legislature and to the people of the province for attempting to mislead them last year, and all during the last twelve months with regard to the level of taxation in this province as compared to other provinces. He knew better; he was told better; he persisted in giving the same erroneous information in place after place in this province.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It is not erroneous.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Well, he just said this afternoon it was erroneous, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It was nothing of the kind. You are saying that.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Secondly, I want to refer to what he said about the Glassco commission. I submit that, judging from what he said this afternoon, the hon. member has never taken the trouble to find out why the Glassco commission was set up and has never taken the trouble to find out what it recommended. He is using a word which he thinks to be a popular word but I submit that he hasn’t bothered to find out what they tried to do or what indeed they recommended.

**February 19, 1963**

He went on immediately afterwards to repeat the railings of year after year about the size of the staff of the planning board. He will find that the Glassco commission recommends an increase in size of the staff of this kind. He went on to be critical of the purchasing agency. He will find that the Glassco commission recommended the federal government do something which we did almost 20 years ago — establish a purchasing agency. He went on to criticize the size of the budget bureau. He will find as he reads the Glassco commission report that to do what they have recommended they will need an agency or agencies like the budget bureau throughout the government of Canada. He had something to say about the number of cars owned by the government. He will find out when he reads the Glassco commission that the recommendation there as to when the federal government should own cars is exactly the measurement that has been applied to this government for years — that when the use of the car comes to or exceeds 10,000 miles a year, it is cheaper for the government to own them, rather than have them in the hands of individual owners.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is typical of the Leader of the Opposition. Even more typical were his attempts yesterday. He has indicated, it seems to me, a kind of desperate hope and a desperation because of the extent to which he is willing to go, either to invent non-existing situations or to inaccurately describe situations which do exist. And particularly in his remarks of yesterday afternoon he sought to raise in this province strife and confusion, division between groups, to set one group against another. He attempted to set co-operatives against others in the business world; he attempted to set doctors against doctors; he attempted to set the people who support the concept of the community health clinics against those who make use of other methods. Most of all, of course he attempted to set all of them against the government.

He went on today to continue the path he has followed for years of setting people generally against Saskatchewan. He had something to say again about stagnation, about Saskatchewan being known as the place in which business never gets a break. And he gave again inaccurate impressions with regard to taxation loads here as compared to the rest of the provinces. He did this in defiance of evidence. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is one of those rare types of birds willing to foul his own nest because he has not hesitated to give Saskatchewan the worst name possible in this province and outside of this province.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You did that. Nobody else did that.

**Premier Lloyd:** — There was a lot of very real concern throughout Saskatchewan and, indeed, throughout Canada during the last year because of the unfortunate and regretful results of the use of the drug



thalidomide. Somehow or other the Leader of the Opposition has got hold of something I call mental thalidomide, because otherwise he couldn't possibly give birth to all the distorted brain children which he has been capable of doing this year.

May I turn more specifically to some of his remarks which he made yesterday. I want particularly to turn to his reference to purchases from co-operative organizations. Because, again, I think the people of the province, and I think members of his own party, Mr. Speaker, deserve to know something about the way in which he made use of a part of the information he had, but did not make use of, all of the information which was available to him. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that he said this. "There are indications today that this government is paying substantially higher prices in some cases for merchandise that it gets from the co-ops than it otherwise might have paid if making those purchases from private businesses." And he was asked to prove this, and he read something, and he went on to say "Would you say, Mr. Minister, that I have proved it". Well, let's see the kind of procedure which this gentleman, who suggests that his party is one that ought to govern in this province, followed yesterday. He read a letter from Return No. 3. That is, he read one paragraph of a letter, one paragraph of a letter. There are two questions — it wasn't the pertinent, it wasn't the operative paragraph. Wait till I read it — we will see. Why didn't he, if he wanted to give an accurate description of the position, why didn't he read the letter of basic policy from the power corporation which he was dealing with in regard to this matter? This he didn't read because it wouldn't have suited his own petty little purpose at that particular time. Let me read the letter which went out in regard to this matter and which the hon. member had at his disposal. It is a letter from Mr. Mollard, a memo from Mr. Mollard to Mr. Stahn of the treasury of that corporation. Pardon me, it is the other way around — Mr. Stahn to Mr. Mollard.

We are enclosing herewith a purchase authorization card issued by the Federated Co-operative Limited for use in connection with the purchase of petroleum products. We are advised that co-op products and service are available in all large centres in Saskatchewan and in many of the smaller centres, and we trust that the employees authorized to make purchases from credit cards will patronize co-op service stations to obtain a reasonable proportion of their total gas, oil and automotive requirements.

That was the basic policy. The Leader of the Opposition didn't bother to read that. He read instead a memorandum between two officials of the power corporation — he read this paragraph.

**February 19, 1963**

I am informed by Mr. Whelen that gas construction has been adhering to an understanding that purchases of motor fuels should be made from co-ops where possible and has been paying as much as 26¢ for diesel fuels at co-ops when it is obtainable from Imperial on a charge basis for 17¢.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Was paying up to that time.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Now he is beginning . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . this non-socialist stuff.

**Premier Lloyd:** — In the words of the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) he is beginning to weasel a little bit. You will remember when he said “I am informed by Mr. Whelen”, he made some remark to indicate that the hon. member from Regina (Mr. Whelan) was appearing in this. He might have noticed, been courteous to notice that the name is spelled differently from that of the hon. member for Regina, but this doesn't stand in the way of this driving ambition of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Why doesn't he read the operative part? I hope the members of his own group take notice of this. They need to know about this gentleman too. The operative paragraph is this.

I do not believe there is any intention that there should be a differential favoring the co-ops that would exceed any credit which might accrue through patronage dividends. The intention as I recall it was that the co-ops should be given favorable consideration where possible, meaning that if price and quality of service was acceptable the co-ops should share equitably in our business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit if the Leader of the Opposition deals with the legislature in this way, how is he going to deal with the public? Does he suggest that business people in the province of Saskatchewan, or investors in the dominion of Canada would trust a political party whose leader stoops to that kind of tactics, and I must say stoops . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That's more than it does yours.

**Premier Lloyd:** — . . . because there isn't any other way of describing it.

Here is a man who stood up in this house, who omitted to read a letter which basically described the policy, who took a paragraph out of another memorandum which was put there for purposes of illustration only, who failed to give the whole information to the house, and he expects that he is going to be believed after that kind of performance.

May I go on to a second matter which he raised yesterday, and for which I suggest again he must stand guilty in the eyes of this legislature and of the public of Saskatchewan of distorting a situation.

You will recall that in his address he had reference to the recruiting of doctors for the province of Saskatchewan. As he said, one of the compromises was that there would be no further recruiting of doctors from Great Britain. That, Mr. Speaker, is definitely not true. And he read from the very document that proves it to be not true. Because the paragraph to which he was referring has this to say:

There may be places where few, or no, doctors have enrolled for direct payment by the medical care insurance commission, so that patients are denied the choice of such doctors. It is not for the commission to appoint doctors in such places, the remedy is in the hands of the citizens themselves. They can establish premises and invite doctors who wish to enrol for direct payment to rent such premises and set up practices in them. If citizens wish advice about establishing such premises and assistance in choosing such doctors this can be made available by the medical care insurance commission.

Now I suggest this entirely disproves the one part of the statement which the Leader of the Opposition made, that there would be, according to him, no further recruiting of doctors in Great Britain. Every right is accorded to those people in the province to establish themselves into an organization which is called Community Medical Care Clinic, or something like that, to recruit and to get a certain kind of assistance from the commission in doing this. But I suggest that, if anything, the commission has made less use of this part of the agreement than they might have made according to any reasonable interpretation of it.

However, may I go on to the other part of his statement, because there again he sought to give the impression that there were something underhanded or something wrong in regard to the use of Saskatchewan House by the people who are interested in these clinics in Saskatchewan in order to get clinics. Let me read an advertisement too, and this is in the October 3 issue of Lancet:

Saskatchewan, Canada. General practitioners are required for rural centres, with hospital facilities, in south-western Saskatchewan. (Then it goes on to state the qualifications and to state the income possible.) Appointments are offered immediately. Applications in writing should be addressed to the South-West Regional Hospital Council, in care of 19 Chester Mews, London, S.W.1

Now, members of the legislature will note the address is identical to the one which the Leader of the Opposition gave yesterday; this one is to the South-West Regional Hospital Council, the other one is for another group. The application is the same in essence as the one which he referred to yesterday. I use this to point out something which I am sure most members of the legislature know: that the services of Saskatchewan House, as it is called, and the agent general are there and are being maintained there by the people of Saskatchewan for a number of purposes. One of those purposes is to facilitate whatever work any legitimate Saskatchewan organization may have of any assistance. And that is what they have been doing. It isn't a new thing for them to do this, in the past, Mr. Spry, the agent general, and his staff, have assisted in recruiting doctors for the Medical Arts Clinic in Regina, and are very happy to do so again. They have assisted municipalities in recruiting doctors for their services, very happy to give them the facilities of the space there if they wish to again. They have assisted all sorts of businessmen, school districts, hospitals, and I could go on and on. And this, Mr. Speaker, they will and they ought to do. If there is an organization, a legitimate organization in the province of Saskatchewan that has some kind of business to transact in the United Kingdom, the people of Saskatchewan maintain there some facilities available for their use, to help do their business. This is entirely legitimate, entirely above-board.

It hasn't been any secret. I told much of what I have said here to the council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Mr. Graham Spry told it to some of their representatives a few weeks ago. Nobody has any apologies to offer; nobody needs to offer any apologies.

The Leader of the Opposition sought to impress this legislature that something was happening by the back door. As a matter of fact he even used the expression "something was coming in the back door of the residence maintained by the government in England". The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this place, Chester Mews, has been occupied and owned by the government of Saskatchewan by a lease-hold arrangement ever since March 25, 1958, three years ago, and the address and the facilities have been used constantly by the office there and by the people who went over. As a matter of fact, the hon. leader of the Opposition might very well have been in it when he visited London not so many years ago, and the agency general was glad some facilitation was possible to extend to him during his visit over there.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what I want to point out is again the Leader of the Opposition sought to give to this legislature, and sought to give to the people of the province an impression that was entirely inaccurate, and that part of

the time at least he had the accurate information in his own hands. But, for some reason or other, he did withhold that in order to make his speech, he thought, sound better. I think that the facts deserve to be known, and the fact that the Leader of the Opposition had proceeded in this way deserved to be known also throughout this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — I want to turn for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, to make a statement which I think will be of general interest in the province, and which I hope will be of particular interest to the students who are our guests here this afternoon. It has to do with a decision of the government of Saskatchewan to recommend a new program which at the moment can be called a program to provide Saskatchewan international student fellowships, or Saskatchewan student international fellowships. These fellowships are designed to encourage and to advance the thinking of all of us regarding our responsibilities to people in other parts of the world. I suggest that a greater awareness of what we can do in our country, and of what we should do, in order to fulfill this responsibility, is an obvious need.

I suggest also that it is obvious that our various programs of education are one of the means by which this greater awareness can be created for all. As a result, the government proposes to make available this year funds which will enable a student to spend one year in a university in Africa, and another student to spend a year at a university in Asia. During the following the year the students who receive the fellowships will be expected to return to Saskatchewan, here, during the second year, they will be employed in sharing their experiences with others, and in particular with students on our university campuses, in our colleges and in our high schools. Obviously, public funds will be necessary to support the second year activities as well. It is proposed that the administration of the program, including the selection of the students and the second year activities, should be placed in the hands of a committee. The committee will consist of three persons, selected by the university, two by the World University Service Student Organization on the campus of the university, one by the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, one by the Saskatchewan School Trustees; Association, and two or three to be selected by the government. In addition, the government has invited Dr. W.P. Thompson, formerly president of the university, to act as chairman of the committee. May I say that the proposal has been discussed with all of the groups referred to; all of them have been very willing to take part.

The specific criteria and the method of selection will be left to the committee. However, it is apparent that maturity, extensive interest in other people, a background of understanding concerning relationships between people and nations, are factors to be considered. So, too, of course, is the ability to take part effectively in what may be called

**February 19, 1963**

the extension activities of the second year. This ability is obviously of very great importance. There are many existing activities and interests which can make use, and which I feel sure will make use, of the second year program. There are several student groups on university campuses now interested in international relationships, and in the human relationships between people from different parts of the world. For a number of years the adult education division of the Department of Education has assisted in sponsoring a United Nations seminar for high school students. Seminars for high school students in school units and in cities are possible. Our co-operative movement and our trade union movement has already engaged itself in various ways regarding overseas programs. Our farm organizations are vitally concerned with the development in countries on these continents, such as we talked about; so too are our commercial organizations. A wide range of possible activities suggest themselves. It is, however, our hope that the interest of the student group will be given priority.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that a great many beneficial results are evident to all the members. It is not enough, I urge, that other people visit us in our country, that students of other lands study in our institutions. It is equally important that we exert more effort to understand our role as a people and as a nation in a world in which too many barriers remain, and in which differences in opportunities are too great. This argument is strengthened by the growing, and properly so, influence of nations, such as those to be visited, in world affairs.

It is the belief of the government that this program of fellowships, plus a year's extension work based on the experience gained, can make a contribution to more enlightened relationships between nations and people. Consequently, we propose it for the support of the legislature and the people of Saskatchewan. I hope I may elaborate somewhat on this program later this evening.

Mr. Speaker, with that, may I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:39 o'clock p.m.