

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session - Fourteenth Legislature
5th Day

Wednesday, February 20, 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): — I would like to draw your attention and the attention of the members to the fact that again we have guests from the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon campus and Regina Campus. Some of the Saskatoon students apparently were delayed in the heavy traffic as they have sought to see the city before the business of the house starts. I should like to mention especially the presence of Mr. and Mrs. Harrington. They have become very well known all over the world as a result of their unusual interest in the international students who have come to Saskatchewan. I am sure members on both sides would like to say a special word of welcome to Mr. and Mrs. Harrington and the university students.

QUESTION ON SCHOOL GRANTS

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Minister of Education. Has the government received requests for school grants from private or denominational high schools or from any organization on behalf of such schools, and if so, has any action been taken?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! please. I would like to point out on the oral questions that our standing orders does not make provisions for oral questions but oral questions are tolerated for certain purposes. Beauchesne points out a number of questions that could be answered, but if you would care to look at Beauchesne on citation 173, sub-paragraph 2 — he points out that a question which could be inserted on the order paper is not allowed

on the orders of the day being called. In other words, he points out that any question, unless of an emergency nature, where a notice could not be given, should be asked by notice. I am not going to try to prevent the minister from answering this question, but I hope members will be governed accordingly and that we can cut down the oral questions to a nature of an emergency.

Mr. Thatcher: — Very respectfully, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that there is some degree of emergency to this particular question. I quite agree with you that only emergency questions should be asked but I think the minister should give consideration to giving a reply to this one.

Mr. Speaker: — I won't try to prevent the minister from answering this question, but I thought I should give you this information for the benefit of members.

Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member's question is that requests have been received for some years and it is not a new thing for this type of request to arrive. The first answer is yes, we are receiving such requests. The second part — is consideration being given — the answer is yes, consideration is being given and has been given for a number of years.

Mr. Thatcher: — May I ask a supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Has any specific action been taken to meet the requests up to this point?

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — Yes, there has been specific action. I would be pleased to discuss this in detail but I may refer to Moose Jaw, North Battleford and Saskatoon as specific places where specific action and specific relief has been given.

CORRECTION OF NEWSPAPER REPORT

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to correct an error in spelling. It appears on page 25, column 6 of the Tuesday, February 19 edition of the Leader Post. The name Whelan as it appears in the quotation from a letter contained in a return, should be spelled W-h-e-l-e-n. The person being referred to is Verne Whelen, a technical engineer, employed by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I am advised that the accurate Leader Post representatives in the gallery reported the spelling correctly but editorial writers, perhaps because of an off-hand reference

by the hon. member from Morse, (Mr. Thatcher), insisted on using the spelling of my name. I humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, that editorial writers of the Leader Post should know that on occasions the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is a bit inaccurate.

QUESTION RE AIR LINE ABANDONMENT

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to the premier. I note that he has recently convened a session with regard to rail line abandonment in Saskatchewan and elsewhere. I wonder if the government is considering any move with regard to air line abandonment. As you may know, we have had no air service from North Battleford . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! A member cannot ask a question and make a speech on it.

Mr. F.E. Foley: — Very respectfully, Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to qualify my question. Does the premier . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Questions are not supposed to have a preamble on them. You just state your question.

Mr. Foley: — Very well, Mr. Speaker, does the government plan on intervening on behalf of air service in the city of North Battleford area and in other cities similarly affected?

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the answer here so far as the provincial government is that it has not as yet attempted to intervene in this particular situation. I would point out a very considerable difference between the abandonment of the rail lines and the change in the air schedule which the hon. member is referring to.

COMMENTS ON SOUND SYSTEM

Mr. C.B. Peterson (Kelvington): — Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to personally express my appreciation, with your permission, for

the fine job that has been done by yourself and with the assistance of the Department of Public Works in installing this sound reinforcement system. There are some of the members of the legislature that do not hear very well and I can assure you myself that this is much appreciated. You are to be thanked for myself and I am sure the members in the house will join with me in expressing this appreciation. Thank you very much.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, not only do some of the members not hear very well but they don't understand too well after they have heard.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Foley: — Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I too would like to express appreciation for the new sound system and I would especially like to draw the attention of the house to the efforts that have been made in previous years to the veteran member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) with regard to the sound system and also the effort that he has made which has culminated in an air-conditioning system in this chamber. I think the hon. member for Arm River is to be congratulated in this matter.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

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

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon in the legislature and again last evening we had the pleasure of enjoying the company of a group of students from the campus of the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon and at Regina. This afternoon and again this evening we are very pleased to have representatives of the students here in the legislature and many of the members will of course, be pleased to welcome them at dinner this evening. I must at this point express my own regrets that it won't be possible for me to be present because of another commitment after dinner this evening. I will not be absent for the same purpose that some of our hon. friends across the way are — I can assure you of that — but I do know that the students will be well welcomed and received and cared for at that particular time. It is good to have them with us and we extend the warmest of welcome to the group that are here today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the few moments that I took yesterday afternoon in this throne speech debate, I took the occasion to first of all make an announcement, with regard to provision of fellowships for two students which will enable one student to attend for a year a university in Africa, one to attend for a year in a university in Asia, and following that to return to Saskatchewan to help to enlighten and interest all of us in people of other countries.

I also took the opportunity of making some comment on the words of the Leader of the Opposition both yesterday afternoon and the afternoon previous to that when he had spoken for a while. It will be recalled perhaps that my comment was based along three main lines. I did object, and will continue to object this afternoon, to the misrepresentation of the actual facts about Saskatchewan which the Leader of the Opposition has, I submit, too frequently indulged in. Secondly, I did object to misrepresentation with regard to the Saskatchewan government policy, particularly his indulgence yesterday in reading only a part of a memorandum, leaving out the operative portion of it, and failing to make any reference whatsoever to the main policy directive concerning which he was supposedly suggesting. Thirdly, I drew attention to the fact that while he had purported to tell us what Liberal policy was about a number of things, in fact he failed to enlighten anyone and we finished the afternoon about where we started it, as far as understanding what kind of an alternative the Liberal party poses. He announced that the Liberal party in Saskatchewan was going neither right nor left, and I think he managed to establish that fact — it went neither right nor left, nor upward nor onward, or any other particular direction so far as could be determined from listening to him.

Well, may I turn this afternoon to further comment on what he said and what he did not say, and on what the throne speech said about the province of Saskatchewan. It will be recalled that he endeavored to paint the blackest and the bleakest picture possible with regard to development in this province. He made use, as he frequently does, inside the province and outside the province, to alleged stagnation. I think he went a little bit further yesterday when he suggested that Saskatchewan was, if I caught his words correctly, the “backwoods of North America”. All of this supposedly, Mr. Speaker, has come about because of what has been done or what hasn’t been done during the last 19 years in the province of Saskatchewan.

Let me turn to some of the facts about Saskatchewan. I turn to facts which are available to anybody who wishes to read, and who is interested, as given by mostly the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the chief keeper of statistics for Canada, and by other federal government agencies. Let me recite some of these facts with regard to development within the

February 20, 1963

province of Saskatchewan, and I take the period which the Leader of the Opposition chose, namely the last 19 years.

I first of all comment on the extent of diversification in the economy, a diversification which has resulted not because of any decrease in importance or value of our agricultural industry, but rather because of the increased development in the non-agricultural sector of our economy. In 1944, less than 20 percent of the net value of commodity production in Saskatchewan came from outside of the agricultural industry. By 1960, this figure of less than 20 percent had increased to more than 50 percent of our wealth arising from activities other than agriculture. This I repeat again was not because 1960 was a poor year for agriculture, rather it was a good year.

With regard to the agriculture industry itself, it has shown increasing diversification and we are glad to be able to report that a number of the policies of this government have helped in that diversification. During the ten year period from 1952 to 1962 income from other than grain in agriculture increased from \$133 million to \$187 million – in other words an increase of some 40 percent. The speech from the throne announced additional investments in our basic industry of agriculture.

Let me say some more about the non-farm production and its net value for the people of the province of Saskatchewan. In 1960 non-farm production was five times that of 1944 — \$5 worth for every \$1 worth in 1944. That 1960 production amounted to more than \$500 millions. Let's look not just at total amounts but let's look also at the rate of increase in Saskatchewan as compared to the rates of increase in other provinces of Canada. Again I choose the period in which the Leader of the Opposition addressed himself to — 1944 to 1960 — and my source for figures and for proof or evidence is the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. This source provides us with the statistics to show that only in one province in Canada has there been a greater rate of increase in non-agricultural development than in the province of Saskatchewan. Only in one province has there been a greater rate of growth. The percentage increase in the value of non-farm commodity production in Canada during that period was 213, in Saskatchewan it was 430. In other words the Saskatchewan rate of growth was twice that of the national average. If one breaks down the reasons for this rate of growth it can be shown that our growth in mining was the highest in Canada, the rate in growth in electrical power and in manufacturing the second highest in Canada, the rate of growth in construction in Saskatchewan the third highest in Canada.

Then there were comments too on the extent of investment as a measurement of confidence and interest in Saskatchewan resources. Here I wish to submit some figures with regard

to the public and private investment in this province as compared to that in other provinces. I know that on occasion some members of the opposition have objected to us including the amount of public investment as one part of this measurement. They are, of course, quite willing to include private investment in power and gas, and even in some cases telephones in other provinces, to establish the extent in those provinces. So I submit that the only adequate measurement is to include both public and private investment. In this regard the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures go back only as far as 1948. At that time Saskatchewan was sixth among the Canadian provinces with regard to public and private investment per capita. We exceeded in Saskatchewan only the Maritimes. We were 20 percent below the national average. I shudder to think what public and private investment was in the days of the real stagnation in this province in and prior to 1944. By 1962, however, we have moved from that sixth place, below the national average, to a place of third among the provinces of Canada. The investment in that year was exceeded only by the investment in the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia. It was at that time, in fact, 11 percent above the national average.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on with a considerable number of additional statistics to indicate the measurement of the real growth in the province of Saskatchewan in that period. I have said enough to indicate that there is hardly the stagnation which the Leader of the Opposition tried to make us and the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada believe. There is certainly nothing there to suggest any reason or propriety in his use of the term “backwoods of North America” so far as this province of ours is concerned. I have said enough I think Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the extent to which the Leader of the Opposition will go in an attempt to besmirch the reputation of our province and fulfil his own political ambitions; and I suggest to him and to those who sit with him that it is precisely because of statements of this kind that he has not warranted, and others in his group have not warranted, the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan before, and that is the reason they still sit on that side of the house. I have said enough, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate that one of the biggest handicaps to even more industrial development in this province is the misinformation contributed by members of the Liberal party who sit opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Premier Lloyd: — If more evidence is needed with regard to this handicap, I want to have reference to other statements in recent years, to call attention to contributions made again by this same gentleman. It will be recalled that several years ago in the province of Saskatchewan a number of our own businessmen, together with

others from outside of Saskatchewan and assisted by the government of Saskatchewan, established a steel plant. This plant had a very difficult time, let there be no doubt about it, but it was a plant of very considerable importance in the province of Saskatchewan. And what kind of assistance, what kind of contribution did the Leader of the Opposition make to the good and welfare of this plant? I quote you, for example, his remarks on June 6th, 1961, as reported in the Leader Post when he commented that he had it on good authority — he is fond of saying he has things on good authority, usually proven to be wrong authority before he is finished — that the plant would appear to be bankrupt. He went on to suggest that the government's dealings were approaching a provincial scandal. He went on to suggest that 75% of the plant's products were being rejected by its customers. This was tremendous assistance from a man in a position of some public responsibility in bringing industrial development to this province. I expressed my opinion, and I want to read it again, Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 9, 1961, and I quote:

Mr. Thatcher may consider that reckless, irresponsible statements of this kind serve some useful political purpose, but they do nothing to assist the industrial growth of this province and can only undermine the patient and persistent efforts of the men and women who are working hard to see that this basic industry succeeds.

May I add that the value of those patient and persistent efforts have been well demonstrated in recent months and the speech from the throne refers to the very sizeable order which that plant has recently obtained. We know that this means putting to work a large number of people in this city, we know that because it was there it was possible to establish another industry in connection with it and this industry has also received a sizeable order. May I say that the opinion which I expressed at that time was shared by some others. The leader of the Conservative party in this province, June 12, Leader Post, pointed out his opinion that "Liberal leader Ross Thatcher had directed an unwarranted attack on this basic industry". Then the leader of the Social Credit party:

Liberal leader Ross Thatcher is leaving the impression he does not care what he smashes in defeating the C.C.F.: Social Credit leader Martin Kelln said Monday in an interview.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is further evidence that the Leader of the Opposition doesn't present the whole story. What do some businessmen have to say about the attitude of this government to industry, the assistance and the services which this government makes possible in industry? Let me just bring

to the attention of the legislature statements by three of them. First of all, the statement of the manager of one of Canada's banks, quoted on March 21, 1962 — about a year ago — in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix were these words:

Investors, he said have shown no hesitancy in moving into Saskatchewan and industry that has moved in from other provinces and the United States has had good results.

This hardly corroborates the sort of thing which the Leader of the Opposition is trying to make people in this province and out of this province believe.

Secondly, the president of a company which has invested in excess of \$40 million in the development of our potash industry, speaking at the official opening of that plant in September of this year said this, and again I quote:

How lucky we were to find an appreciation in your wise government of the economic laws with which a company must operate. How fortunate we were to find understanding and a sound gauge of the risks we had to take, to be encouraged to take this very long term gamble with special financial consideration that was given, with the wisdom, the care and the judgment and the experience which your government here in Saskatchewan provided and, too, to realize a host of services from your government in many other ways.

And again this contradicts flatly the situation which the Leader of the Opposition tried to reflect.

I read a third statement published in the Financial Times, November 19, the author of the statement Clyde G. Kissinger, president of Kissinger Petroleums Limited. He, speaking from his Denver based offices is quoted as saying this:

That the incentives for operating and for continuing to operate in Saskatchewan include favorable prices for that provinces crude, a healthy market and, (in direct quotations, Mr. Speaker) 'good governmental atmosphere'.

He attempts, that is the Leader of the Opposition, to bolster his argument with regard to development in this province by reference to population. Well, he fails to mention, of course, that the population of Saskatchewan began

to decline in the year 1931. A Liberal government had just left office, a Conservative government had hardly more than begun its term of office. He doesn't suggest whether or not that was the fault of the Liberal government or the Conservative government just in office. If it was the fault of the Conservative government, why did it continue after the Liberal government was returned to office? Again I submit, he omits to give the whole picture. Saskatchewan has by far the largest proportion of farm population in Canada. The farm population has been declining all over Canada. The rate of decline in the last ten years in Saskatchewan almost exactly parallels the total rate of decline in all of Canada. Obviously, since this is the situation, the great impact would be here in the province of Saskatchewan. The size of farms in Saskatchewan have increased in the last 20 years about 45 percent. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that one real reason for the decline in farm population has been the agricultural and trade policies of Liberal and Conservative government in Ottawa, and, may I add, if one accepts the position of one Otto Lang, the chief organizer for the federal Liberal party in Saskatchewan, that farmers must look forward to being paid in part by the fact that there is all sorts of fresh air, then we can't expect too much change from the Liberal party in the future.

Let me just compare what has happened population-wise in Saskatchewan with what has happened in some other parts of North America which have resources, climate and settlement pattern very similar to ours. My reference is to North and South Dakota. From 1950 to 1960 the North Dakota population increased by about two percent, South Dakota by about four percent. During roughly the same period Saskatchewan's population increased by about 11 percent. Now I would point out that there was no socialist government in either North Dakota or South Dakota during that period. As a matter of fact I don't think they even had a Democratic government. I think for the most part they had a Republican government which has a philosophy much more comparable to that of the Leader of the Opposition than any I can think of. May I point out that the population figures which are most relevant, which give the most adequate interpretation to industrial growth, are those figures which apply to our urban areas. May I take the period for urban growth in Saskatchewan from 1951 to 1956 — unfortunately 1961 figures are not yet available. During that period Saskatchewan had, in our urban centres, the second largest rate of growth in Canada — well above the Canadian average. We do have available from D.B.S. later figures with regard to cities only. In the period 1956 to 1961, we find the same story with regard to growth. In other words rate of growth in Saskatchewan is second, exceeded by only one province in Canada. It is the rate of 21 percent as compared with 16 percent for all of Canada.

With regard to industrial development, Mr. Speaker,

the program of the government in the past has been one of encouraging and assisting resource development, consequently of diversifying and strengthening the economic base on which the cost of our social services may be based. This has taken a number of forms. There has been available financial assistance by way of loans and of guarantees — usually criticized by the opposition. There has been economic research and promotion — almost always criticized by the opposition. There has been a fair amount of scientific research — totally ignored by the opposition. There has been a tremendous development of our power and gas which are basic to industrial development. Insofar as the opposition talks incessantly and complains incessantly about money borrowed to make this development possible, are we not justified in saying this too has in a sense been opposed by the opposition? Because if we followed the logic of their argument we certainly couldn't have had power and gas development.

This assistance has also taken the form of providing incentives in our mining industry based on the special characteristic of that industry. With federal assistance, not from a Liberal federal government, we have been able to put roads into northern Saskatchewan, thereby encouraging development in that area. The speech from the throne, Mr. Speaker, announces a program of consolidation and extension of existing programs. In addition it announces more facilities for research. It points out that there will be more surveys of the mineralized areas of this province and additional incentives to mineral exploration. It announces that there will be changed regulations to meet changed circumstances in the petroleum industry. It points out there are added technical and vocational facilities under construction. More northern roads are being added. It refers to added power development.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks, on Monday I think it was, made mention of the possible use of water resources in the province of Saskatchewan. It seems to me that every Liberal in the house and throughout the province ought to blush at this reference. I say that because the people of Saskatchewan won't soon forget the record of the federal Liberal party in Canada in not developing the South Saskatchewan River project. It was dusted off in every federal election campaign for years, then put back on the shelf again as something which wasn't in the national interest or the time wasn't right, or some other kind of excuse. Their main contribution was to negotiate a deal which placed on the people of Saskatchewan a greater part of the cost of this project than any other part of Canada had been asked to bear before. Even so, it wasn't until an angry Canadian public booted them out of office in 1957 that there was any action on it. Certainly in regard to this project they went neither left nor right. How could they when they were so busy marking time?

How different the situation is today. The mighty Saskatchewan River was our first main transportation route in the province of Saskatchewan. It later became a barrier to transportation. Now at last it is well on the way to becoming again the servant of the Saskatchewan people. This year for the first time power produced from the waters of the Saskatchewan will flow from Squaw Rapids into the farms and into the industries of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some of the Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Premier Lloyd: — Very soon, from a source not far distant from that plant, more power will flow. Shortly power will come from the South Saskatchewan River project more in the central part of Saskatchewan. The speech from the throne pointed out that recreational areas were being developed along and adjacent to the banks of this reservoir. The years of Liberal government in Ottawa and in Saskatchewan simply didn't deliver with regard to either of them.

Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne with regard to industrial development mentions new programs and old ones brought up-to-date. It indicates new opportunities for Saskatchewan people to participate. In spite, I suggest, of the hindrance of the opposition those programs will succeed.

Some of the Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Premier Lloyd: — May I turn now to a second matter with which the speaker of yesterday purported to deal; that of Social welfare. Here again, I suggest, that he was guilty of using statistics without consideration of the facts behind them and guilty of not saying what his program would be to deal with this very difficult problem. For example, he compared 1952 statistics of the social aid load to those of 1962. He didn't bother to point out that the 1962 figures include groups or categories which were scarcely represented in the previous year which he used for comparison. One of the big reasons for the increase in the number of people on social aid has been the shift in the responsibility so far as financing the program is concerned, some of which took place in 1956, some of which took place in 1959. In 1956 some federal sharing of provincial costs came into effect. The municipal share at that time was decreased to 25 percent. There was some increase in the social aid load at that point. In 1959, the municipal share was decreased to less than, on a net basis, less than 10 percent, and this remaining load of less than 10 percent was more adequately distributed among the municipalities.

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this relief of the financial burden from the municipalities made it possible for municipalities to deal more adequately with the needs of their

residents. That is one reason for the increased case load. I suggest furthermore that one result of this was that a sizeable additional number of people who were receiving old age pensions, war veterans' allowances or mothers' allowances were able to apply for and to receive necessary social aid as a supplement to these other allowances which were clearly inadequate.

The Leader of the Opposition would have us believe that this increase is something peculiar to Saskatchewan when in fact it is something that has happened all across Canada, and if he wants some really good figures he should look at those in which there are Liberal governments to compare them.

He went on to launch into what seemed to me to be an almost full-scale attack on the mayor of Regina. I couldn't quite understand why the leader of a municipal government should be brought into the discussion in this house. I couldn't help but wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether it had anything to do with the fact that the chief instigator of the local attacks on the mayor is expected to be a Liberal candidate in the federal election.

I submit Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition in what he said yesterday attacked, by inference at least, every social aid officer and every municipal council in the province of Saskatchewan. You will recall his reference to the fact that "hundreds of deadbeats, drunks and chisellers" are getting social aid. Now may this house be reminded, the Leader of the Opposition ought to know, that for the greater part those persons who receive social aid do so as a result of a decision of a social aid officer, appointed by a municipal council and responsible to that municipal council. The council can establish the rigidity of the tests to be applied. They can consider the decisions made by their employee who is responsible to them. If the applicant is turned down, he can appeal to a committee of that council. If he is unsuccessful there, and wishes to, he can appeal to a provincial committee. The provincial committee is made up of representatives of the rural and municipal association, the Department of Social Welfare and one other person representing in general the public. Last year, I am informed that there were 35 appeals to this provincial group and only 8 of them resulted in reversals of decisions of the councils.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is I know difficult to all, to devise a program which deals adequately with human needs. I want to express on behalf of the government our appreciation to the municipal councils of the province and the social aid officers for their attempts in this regard.

Some of the Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Premier Lloyd: — Now there are many of us in this province who will remember

the harshness and the political judgments applied by a Liberal government in programs of this kind when they sat on this side of the house. The days of the relief inspector, the old age pension inspector . . .

One of the Hon. Members: — Oh! Oh!

Premier Lloyd: — An hon. members over here says, “Boo” or something. Let me tell him one story of which I know personally and I don’t intend to generalize on this but since he has raised his objection let me state it. It is a story of an old couple who were visited by an old age inspector under the Liberal government. They happened to have cooking on the stove some chicken brought in by a relative from the farm. The comment of the old age inspector was “You people don’t really need a pension, you can have chicken for dinner”. This was the standard of treatment by the Liberal party, some of them at least, in their application of this kind of thing.

Some of the Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Premier Lloyd: — And if the hon. members want to deny it, let me tell them this, let me tell them this. The people I speak of were my own mother and father, and I know it.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the Liberal party and the way in which it handled relief in this province is one that will not be erased from the history books for generations to come. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, we must continue to look and to look hard for a more perfect application of the principles necessary in meeting human need in this way. In this regard I want to congratulate the minister and his department on the series of meetings which it organized this fall with the councils of the province in order to provide better understanding and more opportunity for discussion of this important problem. And I want to ask the Liberal party some questions because they didn’t answer any of them yesterday, in this regard.

Do they, for example, favor the return to the 1952 arrangements when the old age pensions and the war veterans’ allowances and the mothers’ allowances weren’t, and in many places could not be, supplemented by the municipalities? This will decrease the size of the social aid roll.

Do they object to the reduction of the municipal share to 25 percent as it was in 1956? Are they complaining that this policy permitted the social aid rolls to grow in size? Do they oppose the new policy of a per capita assessment of municipalities and, consequently, the 100 percent reimbursement of the outlay of municipalities? Do they object to the fact that municipalities can now deal more effectively with the actual needs of their less fortunate residents? Finally,

what is it again that they actually propose in regard to this program?

I repeat the question with regard to labor legislation. You recall that the Leader of the Opposition had some handsome remarks about this yesterday but that he, while presuming to state Liberal policy, stayed away from any specific statement. What he did do was to add to his long list of inaccurate statements. You will recall his weeping generalization, that every time the labor relations board had a decision taken to court, that decision was reversed. Let's look at the score in 1962. There were seven decisions of the labor relations board referred to court, and five of them were upheld. This is what the hon. Leader of the Opposition says "every time a decision goes to court it is reversed". And for the remainder of his statement again, Mr. Speaker, he didn't go right and he didn't go left; he bowed in one direction and he bowed in the other; he ended up exactly where he started having said nothing about anything.

Some of the Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Lloyd: — He did, of course, refer to what he called "irritants" which he claimed "harassed" and discouraged industry. Why didn't he go on and say what these irritants were? Which ones did he mean? Which labor laws and which labor regulations? That is what he was talking about. Why doesn't he make a clear, clean statement? For example, what about holidays with pay? Good or bad? Something to be abolished, or something to be kept? What about the level of minimum wages? Good or bad? What about workmen's compensation board regulations and laws? Good or bad? It is time he said something about where he stands instead of these vague statements — but he won't.

May I turn now to another topic of which he undertook some discussion yesterday. That is the topic of medical care insurance. And I repeat again the statement of yesterday, that nobody knows where the Liberal party of Saskatchewan stands on this issue. It is certainly going neither left nor right. What the history of Canada does reveal in Saskatchewan and throughout the rest of the country is a lot of Liberal talk, demonstrating that in fact Canada was going nowhere with regard to medical care so long as we had Liberal government throughout. May I recall to this house, Mr. Speaker, that even with regard to hospitalization it wasn't until the Liberals got kicked out of Ottawa that there was any federal participation. Again, the Liberals talked about it. They weren't in any hurry, like the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. It wasn't in the national interest, or they weren't ready. Later, you know — after the next election. And they have got it back on the election program now I notice. I think it is fair to say that the presence of a Liberal government in Ottawa delayed participation by the federal government in hospital care by five or ten years.

February 20, 1963

Well, the Leader of the Opposition you know said yesterday they would have a program of medical care but they wouldn't be in any hurry about introducing it. Well, of all the unnecessary comments that were ever made in this House!

Back in 1919, as we have frequently been reminded, Liberals in Canada first started talking about that. I have here the speakers' handbook which came out of that meeting in 1919. You know they talked about tariff reduction. So, what happened there too? Well, let me read one of the resolutions:

The interest of the delegates in the policy in the party was evinced by a mass of resolutions from which those adopted were carefully selected by representative committee. They expressed the ideas of the great body of delegates in the aims of the Liberal party.

I was sort of concerned about why they should need this mass of resolutions, Mr. Speaker; I found out when I discovered that they didn't have another convention until almost 30 years afterwards in 1948. They had to have a lot of them in 1919. Then they went on to say this:

Be it resolved that an adequate system of insurance against sickness should be instituted by the federal government in conjunction with the governments of the several provinces.

You know they talked about old age pensions in that same convention. These did come in part in 1927 — nine years later, and some in 1951. They talked about unemployment insurance. This finally came in 1940, 21 years after their first resolution on that. They remained in office until 1957, a period of 28 years, and never got around to implementing their platform on sickness insurance. For you know I was chatting with the Minister of Health last evening and he reminded me of this 1919 position of the Liberal party and raised the question of how many years of Liberal government we have had since then. I thought it rather interesting to find the answer to that question and I am glad to communicate it to him now. Well, from 1919 to 1963, 44 years of Canadian history passed by. We had a Liberal government in Ottawa for 31 of those years. But they weren't in any hurry as the provincial leader suggested — no medicare. It is in the 1963 platform. They were going neither right nor left in marking time and making speeches. But in addition — oh, up and down perhaps, but not straight ahead. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we've had in Canada since that time 221 years of Liberal governments in the provinces. Take the Liberals at Ottawa and the Liberals in the provinces, it adds up to about 260 some years. In other words,

we have had more than 2½ centuries of Liberal government, either in the provinces of the dominion, and not one of them has got around to doing anything about a resolution passed in 1919.

Some of the Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, one thing that can be said with certainty is that the Liberal party is timeless when it comes to things like this.

Well, now of course the Saskatchewan Liberals weren't to be outdone. They got into the act also, and in 1934 they were out of office and even in a little bit of a hurry. I read from the Western Producer, January 25 of that year; the speaker was Dr. Uhrich, who had been the Minister of Health before and who was to become the Minister of Health again and later who became our Lieutenant-Governor. Here is part of his statement:

If the government can assume and discharge the duty of providing for the education of the youth of the province, surely it should assume and discharge the even more important and primary duty of safeguarding the health of the people. State medicine and state health insurance is assured when the Liberal party is returned in Saskatchewan.

Now, not medical care insurance — state medicine and state health insurance is assured. That was in 1934. One can understand what the leader of the Liberal party in the province now means when he said, 'no, they are not in a hurry'.

Well, Liberals in some parts of the country seem to be getting in a little bit more of a hurry. May I refer to a report in the Hamilton Spectator of January 26, 1963, which comments on the Liberal convention in that province. It says that:

Ontario doctors at this meeting renewed their opposition to a — note the words — “universal, government-controlled medicare insurance plan” as the Ontario Liberal party yesterday approved the convention working paper on medicare. The first plenary session of the party's two day policy overrode amendments by delegates in a lively debate which extended into the evening. As the debate intensified, Vernon Singer, Ontario legislature member for York Centre demanded that “people who have come here to deliberately scupper us should leave”.

If the Leader of the Opposition in Saskatchewan had been there he would have been asked to leave. And the paper went on to say that the plan would be financed by a combination of premium and taxation; it would meet all medical costs for services rendered at home or for hospital, and if the P.S.I. which is the counterpart of M.S.I. in this province, didn't co-operate they would set up their own plan as a carrier of the insurance system. There is a picture here, Mr. Speaker which must be commented on. It shows a picture of the leader of the Ontario party making use of a walkie-talkie to keep in touch with his party policy-committee during the convention. Well my comment is, Mr. Speaker, it would need something much more powerful than a walkie-talkie to keep in touch with the policies of the Liberal party.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in a more serious vein, I want to raise in this legislature the question of the part which the Liberal party played during the difficult weeks of 1962. I want to raise the question of how they feel they assumed their responsibility as part of the system of parliamentary government in this country. I raise particularly the part played by the Leader of the Opposition. You know, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition wasn't even satisfied with the ordinary K.O.D. organization, he organized his own private K.O.D. club. He was the president, and the only member, and I doubt if he gets any more new recruits. His K.O.D. club was called the "kick on door club".

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, you will recall that just before officially opening this club, he had requested a meeting of the legislature. He wanted the legislature to meet about two hours after he had made his request known to the public. I said at the time, and I repeat, this appeared to me to be an attempt to make a farce out of parliamentary procedure. It was a spur of the moment decision, designed to curry some favor with a meeting which was supposed to include some thirty thousand people, which ended up with about 10 percent of that number, including those who were paid to come. It was a decision which he hoped would embarrass the government. It was a decision which could have contributed nothing. It was a decision which was communicated to me by letter.

May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker, of myself, because I am the only one that can answer it as yet? How was this letter delivered? The way in which this letter was delivered to the government is an interesting comment on the respect or otherwise of the Leader of the Opposition, presuming it came from him, for parliamentary tradition. Remember this, it was a supposedly important document. It was going to set in motion the machinery to settle the medicare problem. It should have been very important. The Leader of the Opposition should have been anxious

that it get as quickly as possible into the hands of the government. It came into my hands, Mr. Speaker, after my secretary happened to notice an envelope lying on the floor, in the inner part of the office. Here is, or was, an important document, apparently slipped under a door that in nearly twenty years I have never seen opened. Get the picture — somewhat paunchy and frequently petulant Leader of the Opposition padding along the halls of the legislative chamber with a letter tucked underneath his arm. He looks surreptitiously around to see that he isn't observed, and he slips, cautiously, an envelope under an unused door and scurries away to prepare for his official act of kicking another door. He didn't look right nor left, but he manages to get under doors. This is the procedure used to deliver an important document by a man who suggests that Saskatchewan people entrust him with the principles of Saskatchewan government.

May I say this, there was a point during this summer's difficulty, never recognized, so far as I know, by the opposition, which was a bigger one than medical care itself. I refer to a matter affecting the very basis of responsible and representative government. In comment on this I want to read words printed in the Saskatchewan Bar Review, September, 1962, by Dr. Mabel Timlin, formerly professor of economics, now retired, at the University of Saskatchewan. This is an article which treats with the way in which British constitutional government has operated in the face of some unexpected and difficult matter. In the concluding paragraph she has this in part to say:

In the recent medical care controversy, it was not a single clause in a statute, but a whole statute that was in jeopardy. The duly elected government of Saskatchewan, in the face of this situation, showed the same flexibility of practice as had infused the actions of the various cabinets of the government of the United Kingdom. By its concessions and its offer to further negotiate, the government of Saskatchewan undoubtedly went as far as a responsible and duly elected government can go.

She goes on to comment about some of the problems with regard to medical care, she says:

Beyond all these temporary dangers to the community there lay a greater danger to its long-term well being. A danger lying beyond political affiliations of persons. It is a genuinely shocking thing that it was not recognized as such by a greater portion of the community.

I suggest it is particularly shocking that it wasn't recognized by those who form a part of this government as Her Majesty's loyal opposition.

The article goes on to say that while we can face these kind of difficulties, what we

cannot face without incurring greater dangers is a breakdown of our democratic system of government. If the government of Saskatchewan had capitulated to the demands of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, this would have meant an abrogation of responsibility, if one government of one particular persuasion were to be forced today to capitulate to one highly organized group, then another government of a different political persuasion is likely tomorrow to be forced to capitulate to another such group. The parliamentary system of government may not always work perfectly, but government under law and the constitution of today's society, is the only guardian we have for the interests of the whole against the special interests and excess of organized groups.

Might I submit, come cognizance must be taken of this by the members sitting opposite.

Before proceeding, Mr. Speaker, with my next point on medical care, I want to draw your attention and that of the public, and that of the opposition, to the fact that the throne speech document made no reference to medical care insurance. I'm not anxious, Mr. Speaker, to add to the many public utterances that have been made in this regard, but the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks yesterday made accusations, which are both, I suggest, improper and inaccurate, and these must be replied to.

He suggested, you will recall, that doctors throughout the province are not being paid. The government is in hearty agreement with the fact that there should not be this situation. We are pleased to learn from the commission that they are now on what can be considered a current basis with regard to payment of bills. But the Leader of the Opposition wasn't content to leave it at that, he went on to describe this lack of payment, which he referred to, as being because of deliberate harassment by the government or inefficiency of the commission. I reject both, I reject them emphatically. His suggestion of deliberate harassment is complete and utterly false, and will be recognized as such by every fair-minded man and person in this province. Insofar as the approved agencies are concerned, it will have been noted, I am sure, that the complaints in the press are largely emanating from one of those agencies, mainly M.S.I.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the commission has had some administrative problems; undoubtedly it hasn't conquered all of them yet. I do want to submit that many of these administrative

problems were not of its own making. To begin with the difficulties following the decisions to use the approved agencies, make unavoidable difficulties. To mitigate the problem the commission made advances available to the agencies, which could in turn have been advanced to doctors who were members of their group. More use could have been made of these advances. A good part of the difficulty could have been removed by an agreement to use a common claim card. I must point out the M.S.I. at one point agreed that they would use a common claim card and later on withdrew that agreement. There has been some improvement in the form of the card, but it is still true that instead of being fed directly into computer cards, they have to be sorted manually. This process has added delay; it has made necessary the employment and training of additional staff; it has added tens of thousand dollars to the cost of the plan. The Leader of the Opposition who professes a loving concern for the public purse, is evidently willing to support this sort of an arrangement.

I just add this, that it was recently revealed that some claims received by the commission had been in the hands of the agencies as long as 90 days before they were sent by the agency to the commission. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition and doctors who are having difficulty might well look closer to home for the source of at least of some of their problems, before accusing others so freely and so unfairly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I go on to deal with the matter raised by the speaker of yesterday with regard to crown corporations. He had, of course, something to say about a number of them. I submit again, we don't know what the Liberal policy is in regard to crown corporations, after listening to him. You will recall what he said in regard to power. They are going to expand the power corporation but are going to borrow less money; are going to raise more revenue but are going to lower rates to industry as well. Now he says he is not going to out-promise anybody. Well, one promise he didn't mention. He didn't mention anything yesterday about returning contributions to the farmers. This, as I understand from what was said in the newspaper, was dropped by the Liberal party at the convention last year, at which he spoke. When my hon. friend, the leader, was asked why it was dropped he said "It didn't get any votes; what is the use of keeping it".

In looking at the power corporation it is rather interesting to note, that when the Liberals left office in this province, the provincial power system at that time had a deficit of \$230,000, since then it has an accumulated surplus of over \$23½ million dollars, and I suppose the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) will say this is not true either. He went on to refer to the decrease in timber production and of course he blamed all of this on the timber board. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one excellent bit of evidence which should be accepted by the members opposite, with regard to why timber

February 20, 1963

production had decreased in the province of Saskatchewan. I want to read an excerpt from the submission made by the Hon. W.A. Patterson, when he was Premier of this province.

To the special committee in the House of Commons on reconstruction and re-establishment, Wednesday, April 19th, 1944.

Here are in part, the hon. Mr. Patterson's words:

If our present rate of consumption of timber continues, then our virgin and mature stands of white spruce and fir, suitable for saw lumber will be exhausted in 10 years.

I will repeat that:

If the rate of consumption of timber continued at the 1944 rate, then the virgin and mature stands of white spruce and fir would have been exhausted in a period of 10 years.

It has been estimated, (he went on to say) that the average annual depletion in the accessible forest area, during the past 10 years has been as follows:

By use — 37.6 percent. By fire — 45.7 percent. By insect, disease and windfall — 16.7 percent

Now, one of the first and early acts of this government was to have an inventory taken of our forest resources. On the basis of that study and it became apparent that the cut of timber had to be very drastically reduced, in order that there might be some timber left to harvest after the period of 10 years, which Mr. Patterson predicted would be the end of it if we didn't do something about it.

There was some reference made to printing company. I don't know what he is going to do with it. I say this with regard to the printing company. It is paid prices by the government to the Queen's Printer, at exactly the same level as we pay to other printing companies. It has accumulated some \$800 thousand since it began operation on government advances of about \$275 thousand. It has even added flexibility and necessary convenience.

Very interesting, I thought, that the Leader of the Opposition delicately desisted from any mention of sodium sulphate. Whether this could be because it happens to be in his constituency, I of course don't know, but since he left it out I have a right, I think, to do some rather strong guessing.

Well, with regard to sodium sulphate, I would like

to remind him, since it is in his constituency, that the government made advances of roughly \$1.085 million. The industry has accumulated surpluses of almost \$2½ million; it has paid royalties to the government of close to \$750 thousand; it has paid \$3½ million in salaries and wages; it has paid grants in lieu of taxes of some \$70 thousand. It has in addition stimulated economic activity in the community, employment on the railroad and unlimited results. No wonder the Leader of the Opposition overlooked it.

Then he went on to government insurance. Again, I admit we don't really know what the policy of the Liberal party is. He said they would still require people to buy public liability insurance. As I understood him, they may or may not buy from S.G.I.O. He hinted some other changes. Well, let's take a look at the record of S.G.I.O. as appraised by somebody outside of the province, outside of this legislature. My reference is to the Consumers Union, a reliable independent agency, operated to give guidance to consumers in their purchasing of various services, and goods. A statement of theirs, was re-printed in the Vancouver Sun on August 9th, 1962, and I want to read that statement to the legislature:

A study by the Consumers' Union in the United States, a non-profit organization which evaluates products and services, shows the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund of Saskatchewan is the most economical on the continent. .82¢ out of every dollar goes to pay claims. The other .18¢ goes for expenses. By comparison, for every dollar paid into private U.S. plans, 52¢ goes for expenses and only 48¢ is available to reimburse claimants. In the average Canadian province (except Quebec where claims and insurance rates are astronomically high), 60¢ of every dollar collected by private insurance companies is paid in claims and the remaining 40¢ is eaten up by expenses.

I suggest the Leader of the Liberal party, and those who support him, might well be a little more specific as to what they intend to do to interfere with this kind of a record.

Let's consider some evidence of cost with regard to certain vehicles in Saskatchewan. I might use just two, to refer to the 1962 costs here in Saskatchewan and in other provinces:

1960 Chev. Sedan driven for business and pleasure; the driver over 25 years of age, having had no accidents in the past 3 years; the package policy and the compulsory insurance taken together, in the cities of Regina, Saskatoon or Moose Jaw, would cost \$73.00. To get something comparable in the city of Brandon, would cost \$88.00 — \$15.00 or 20 percent more than in our Saskatchewan cities.

To get something comparable in the city of Calgary, would cost \$104.00; \$31.00 more or 40 percent more than Saskatchewan.

A 1956 one ton farm truck, the cost in Saskatchewan, \$26.00 — in Manitoba \$30.00 — in Alberta \$44.00. I suggest again, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman opposite better be a bit more specific as to what they intend to do before they interfere with the operations of the plan of this kind, and I add, we still don't know very much about the plan of the Liberal party policy in this regard.

As usual there was something said about taxation. And here I go back to the beginning of this discussion between the Leader of the Opposition and myself, yesterday. I submit again that he owes an explanation to this legislature for flagrant misrepresentation of the taxation situation in Saskatchewan as compared to other provinces. I submit that the real facts do deserve to be known. Even more emphatically I submit, the fact that the Leader of the Opposition is willing to ignore the facts, and is anxious to misrepresent his own province. This, too, needs to be known. I would refer members of the legislature to my remarks in the speech from the throne last year. I am not going to read it all, I simply point out what I said at that time, in correction of what the member from Morse, (Mr. Thatcher) had said earlier, — that the rate of provincial taxation per capita in Saskatchewan was not, as he said, the highest in Canada, nor was it the second highest, nor the third highest, it was the fourth highest. I went on to say that admittedly this was the situation before the addition of special taxes for medicare, but was third among the provinces of Canada, still not “top of the heap” as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would have us believe.

The Leader of the Opposition interrupted and said “those are your figures, not D.B.S.,” and I said “those are D.B.S. figures”, and he said “no, they are not”. The same words were said yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

Now, may I go on to the situation this year. May I ask him again, if he will be so good, or if he will observe some responsibility in the next twelve months, and not go out and misrepresent this across the province as he did during the last twelve months.

For the year 1962-63, the figures with regard to taxation in Saskatchewan and other provinces places the per capita level in Saskatchewan as third among the Canadian provinces. These are ascertainable from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics Report. If we measure it in terms of the percentage of income taken up by taxes, Saskatchewan then stands at fifth among Canadian provinces. This, may I point out, includes special taxes for medical care. Let's not forget we were paying

medical care bills two years ago as well, even though they weren't included in our tax bill. Let's not forget that in other provinces in Canada, they will be paying up to \$150.00 per family for medical care insurance from private agencies, if they can get it. This is an amount paid to obtain services, which were included in Saskatchewan in the tax bill. A comparison of the actual levels without reference to the services given is most inadequate.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is an old trick of those who basically oppose the extension of public services, to argue that the tax dollar is somehow different, more than any other dollar and to argue that public services, simply because they are public, cost more and are second class as compared to others.

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse): — Would the Premier permit a question? May I ask him the basis of the figures that he has just obtained when he suggests that Saskatchewan is third in per capita taxation.

Premier Lloyd: — I pointed out that these were ascertainable from the reports of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. You will find the total figures, with regard to total taxation in the provinces, in a document entitled "Financial statistics of provincial governments", you will find in another report the population and a little bit of division will give you the answer.

Mr. Thatcher: — Could I ask the date of these particulars?

Premier Lloyd: — This is a summary of estimates, first analysis for 1962 and it is published for the fiscal years ending March 31st, 1963, and November, 1962.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, then those figures are not up to date.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, this hon. gentleman says they are not up to date. There will be no further changes in taxing levels in any province of Canada after November, 1962.

Mr. Thatcher: — The rates . . . with these high taxes, . . . no matter . . . how you try it . . .

Mr. Lloyd: — The figures that he protested last year as not being correct are now up to date and they are precisely what I said they were last year. These are obtained from the same source. Now

Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Socialist arithmetic . . .

Mr. Lloyd: — . . . services and taxes, it is better than no arithmetic at all. When we are talking about services and taxes and comparing situations within the province, let's remember that there are other services in a similar category to that of medical care; in other words paid for in Saskatchewan out of taxes, but paid for outside of taxes in other provinces. I had a visit recently with a friend from British Columbia. He tells me that in the last two years he paid \$1,500 for cancer treatment which would have been paid for by the public had he been here in Saskatchewan. Another acquaintance of mine, in British Columbia, had the misfortune to have to make use of an air ambulance flight and he had to pay a fair amount of money to get back to a place where he could have treatment. Something which would have for the most part been paid for in Saskatchewan, out of public funds. A visiting acquaintance in Ontario just recently, someone who had gone there from Saskatchewan, some surprise was evident when they discovered that certain of the costs of mental health treatment given in Saskatchewan out of public funds would be charged against the individual in the province of Ontario. Well, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Opposition referred again to another old movie that he regularly trots out from time to time — the great number of new taxes that he suggests has been added since 1944.

Well, as I said last year, Mr. Speaker, a great many of these taxes represent new services and developments which weren't present in Saskatchewan in 1944. For example, we didn't need any schedule of royalties in regard to potash in 1944 — not potash under Liberal government. We didn't need any regulations or fees with regard to pipe-lines — no pipe-lines under the Liberal government. We didn't need a whole series of fees for students at a provincial technical institute — no technical institute. We didn't need a series of fees for persons taking apprenticeship training — no apprenticeship training. We didn't need charges for the inspection of oil burners — no oil burners operating. We didn't need seventy different fees to make some charge for appliances for handicapped persons at nominal costs in 1944. Handicapped persons went out and got them where they could, and paid what they could. We didn't need 375 different items in this schedule of fees to provide for payment to the cancer program, almost entirely applicable to persons outside of the province of Saskatchewan. We didn't need 51 different royalties on telephone and power poles in 1944 — no power pole production. I submit again, it is simply astounding the extent to which the Leader of the Opposition is willing to go in his attempt to paint Saskatchewan in its worst light.

But you remember, Mr. Speaker, he emphasized again

he wasn't going to out-promise anybody and then he went on to promise decreased property taxes; decreased sales taxes; decreased gasoline taxes; decreased income taxes; decreased royalties and possibly a special tax holiday for industry. No promises. And later on went on to promise some additional services.

Now, of course, he said his party would make some savings which will provide for the payment of these. Well, how is he going to make these savings? Well, as nearly as I could follow it, he was first of all going to eliminate six different agencies. He would eliminate the purchasing agency. Well, this reminds some of us of the days before purchasing agency of a little story about the purchase of purple dye; very carefully purchased by the Liberal government. He talked about purchase by tender and the only tender thing about purchasing purple dye was the hide of the Liberal party when the whole thing was exposed.

The public service commission is another one which he thinks we don't need so much of. Well, I admit that in 1944 you didn't need many people to take care of personnel policy. There was no classification of employees. There was no pay scale. There was no collective bargaining. There were no examinations to determine relative merit. There was no machinery for weighing qualifications of applicants. The main thing required was the initial, on the application, of the right party.

Then the budget bureau and the planning board staff. These are going to be decreased or done away with, but he went on later to talk about the Glassco commission. As I reminded him yesterday one of the precise recommendations of the Glassco commission was that services like the budget bureau and the planning board should be increased and strengthened. He was going to save some money by government cars. He talked about the Glassco commission. The Glassco commission's recommendation with regard to ownership of government cars is again, that the government ought to own those cars which are driven more than 10,000 miles a year; almost precisely the policy of this government for many years.

They are going to abolish other things. They are going to abolish the agriculture machinery administration; something which is an extremely valuable service and appreciated by many of the farmers in this province, and indeed gets some business from governments outside of the province of Saskatchewan.

And then his usual little talk about the size of the staff. Let me say this about the size of the staff in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, measuring it against others by using the reference of numbers of civil servants per thousand population. Using that reference there are only

three provinces in Canada who have less by way of public service staff than do we here in Saskatchewan. This, despite the fact, that there are generally speaking, more services in Saskatchewan requiring a larger number of employees. I make reference to the institutions for the aged, the institutions for the mental health care. This, despite the fact, that there is a more wide-spread distribution of Saskatchewan population. It takes more people to maintain a highway system in Saskatchewan, which I think has as many miles as Manitoba and Alberta put together in our neighboring provinces. It takes more people to serve our agricultural industry, because of that distribution.

Another interesting view is, that if you take all of the six agencies which the Leader of the Opposition suggested might be abolished, you would make a saving of about \$800,000, less than one-half of 1 percent of the budget.

Now, what taxes is he going to reduce. Well, he can reduce the education and health tax by .02 percent, or he can reduce the gas tax by less than ½ percent per gallon or he can reduce the income tax by less than ½ of 1 percent. But he is going to set up a Glassco type commission to look into things and save all sorts of money. May I say this, in general the Glassco commission made about 40 main recommendations and about 30 of these can be found in whole or in part as well established parts of policy of the government of Saskatchewan and we have had them for years. Some of the remainder are not applicable to a provincial government, because of the difference in the size of the departments. Some of them, such as the recommendation that parks of the country ought to be put on a strict profit and loss basis should be rejected.

Before he starts this commission though, the Leader of the Opposition has announced that he is going to abolish some of the agencies and procedures which his commission would certainly recommend be established when they get finished. Well, he didn't make any promises. I suggest that you analyze carefully what he said; he is quite correct, he didn't make any promises.

It is quite correct, Mr. Speaker, that taxes have gone up in Saskatchewan, provincial taxes and other taxes. So have many of the services, which can be more effectively purchased through taxes than individually. Taxes have gone up in every province in Canada. In 1944, it is true, there was only one province with a higher rate of taxation per capita than Liberal Saskatchewan; that was Liberal British Columbia. I have forgotten, maybe in 1944 they didn't have a Liberal government in British Columbia. They either had or they did shortly afterwards to into coalition with the Tories out there, in order to defeat the CCF. It is history now to note that neither the Liberals nor the Tories have been the same since the experience. They have never recovered; the union evidently produced nothing.

From 1944 to 1961-62, only one province in all of

Canada had a smaller rate of taxation increase than Saskatchewan. Only one in all of Canada, that one the province of New Brunswick, whose rate of increase was 4, Saskatchewan's just slightly more, 4.2, and the rate of increase for all the Canadian provinces taken together, 5.8. Speaking of financial situations in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, there is a rather interesting comment in the February issue of the Financial Post and I quote from that paper:

Recent Dominion Bureau of Statistics estimates, for example, predict that for the year to March 31/63 provincial governments combined will chalk up deficits totaling \$385 million. Only one province — ironically socialist Saskatchewan — is expected to finish with a balanced budget.

On several occasions, both last year and this year, ever since the Leader of the Opposition was abroad, he has talked about West Germany. He refers to it as being a mecca for industrial development. It has had very gratifying growth in its economy. He suggest this has something to do with a taxation plan such as the one he would like to put into effect. There is an interesting article and table in the Canadian Tax Journal for the months of May-June, 1961. They take a number of countries of the world and they show the relative weight of taxation in these countries, measured in terms of the percent that the taxes are of the gross national product. It shows, by the way, that Canada stands 12th from the top of that list. It may be added that most of those who have a greater weight of taxation measured in this way, have had a greater rate of growth than Canada.

The point I want to make is that the cost of services have not necessarily been a deterrent to growth, as some people would have us believe. As a matter of fact, I submit that good social services must be considered as part of the stimulant to industrial development. Now, West Germany isn't in this table, but the comment on page 201 of the narrative is this:

West Germany's absence is particularly notable as it is one of the leading western industrial nations and figures from other sources indicate that its tax burden is among the highest in the world.

This is the mecca of industrial development which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition likes to refer to.

He had something else to say about Germany, you know Mr. Speaker. He referred to the Berlin Wall on Monday and suggested it was there to keep residents from the East from moving into the West and wondered what about that. Well, as you

February 20, 1963

know, he could have found part of his answer as to why people move in that direction in the Leader Post of February 18, 1963. That particular statement tells us of the re-election and a landslide victory of the democratic-socialist mayor and the government of West Berlin. Just read it:

Mayor Willi Brandt led his socialist party into a landslide victory in West Berlin municipal election on Sunday, as the voters demonstrated with ballots their dislike of the communist wall.

Some 62 percent of the popular vote supported Mayor Brandt and his socialist members. It simply goes to demonstrate again, Mr. Speaker, that the real opposition to the growth of communism, the real prevention to this spread of communism, is in the election of democratic socialists to positions in government.

May I just say a word about one statement announced in the speech from the throne, which has particular interest to many people. I make references to the Public Administration Research Institute, which the speech says will be set up. May I make mention that the continuation and extension of efficient and effective public administration is not, I submit, achieved by a one-shot effort such as a royal commission. Rather, good public administration is dependent on proper goals of government, on continuing study of methods, on the availability of competent staff, and on the general interest of the public. And it is to first of all facilitate the clarification and extension of these that we propose the establishment of the public administration institute in Saskatchewan. It is part of our submission, Mr. Speaker, that this institute will be of interest and value, not only to the provincial government but to local government authorities as well. It is part of our belief that it will stimulate a greater degree of interest and activity in public administration workings, and the study of public administration in our universities.

It will attract, we hope, both professors and students and as a result the pool of information and people, available for application to the problems of public administration will increase and improve. In addition, it's activities will provide more information for the public, concerning these problems and again I say that an informed public is one of the best guarantees of good administration.

Saskatchewan, as is well admitted, Mr. Speaker, has developed an excellent reputation across this country, for progressive and effective public administration policies, based on the best traditions of parliamentary institutions. I would not like to let this minute go, without paying a very sincere tribute to the staff of the government of Saskatchewan, for having enhanced and made that reputation possible. It is our submission the development of the Public Research Institute,

will still further enhance that reputation.

Just in closing, Mr. Speaker, may I take a brief look backwards again, along the road, at some of the miles of which I have talked about this afternoon. Out of the disillusionment of the 1920's, when some people thought we had reached a sort of permanent plateau of prosperity, and out of the ferment of the 1930's came the political movement of which, we on this side, are proud to be representatives. That movement decided to use a road different from that which was followed then or is followed today by the older, more traditional political parties. I recall and want to repeat the words of America's poet Robert Frost, who died just a few weeks ago; he wrote a poem about a man choosing a road and in part said this:

Two roads diverged in the wood
And I, I chose the one least travelled by,
And that has made all the difference.

The fact that, that group of which I spoke, choose a different road, has made a tremendous difference in the province of Saskatchewan and throughout Canada.

It's first leader, it is interesting to note, was a teacher in this city, Mr. M.J. Coldwell. After Mr. Coldwell went on to the House of Commons, he was succeeded by a farmer, George Williams. An early vice-president was one of Saskatchewan's most beloved physicians, Dr. Hugh McLean of Regina.

This group who set all this in motion, believed that there could be more justice, more opportunity, more freedom, if people decided to pool their strength, to so achieve. They believed strongly in the principles and practices of co-operation. They didn't restrict the application of co-operation to the commercial aspects of buying and selling. They applied it also to the relationship between people. They say not just quantity in measuring human value, but insisted that standards of living have a qualitative aspect as well. Scarcely ten years after their organization as a formal political movement, their representatives formed in 1944 the government of the province of Saskatchewan. They began the development of a co-operative commonwealth; a society in which public, private, and co-operative enterprise, could each in its proper sphere contribute to the development of our province. A society in which the aim of development would be to serve the needs of the people of our province. Along that road we have consistently moved; along that road the speech from the throne suggests we shall continue.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support the motion for an address-in-reply.

February 20, 1963

Mrs. Cooper (Regina): — Wasn't that a grand speech we just listened to? I feel that anything that I could say at this moment would be an anticlimax, so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION RE DIVISION OF RADIO TIME

Premier Lloyd: — moved:

That the matter of division of radio time arranged for the current session be referred to the select standing committee on radio broadcasting of selected proceedings, the said committee to report their recommendations thereon with all convenient speed.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution is self-explanatory. It requests the house to approve that the matter of division of radio time, shall be referred to the select standing committee on radio broadcasting of select proceedings. This, of course, has been the procedure followed for a number of years. My information is that we have never actually moved the proper motion to refer it to the committee and consequently it is suggested that this motion be passed at this time. I really don't think it needs any added explanation of that, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank, (Provincial Treasurer) the above motion.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION RE AMENDMENT OF STANDING ORDER

Premier Lloyd: — moved:

That Mr. Speaker with members of the select standing committee on standing orders be constituted a select special committee to consider and report with recommendations the advisability and desirability of amending standing order 46 to provide that the mover of the budget motion for committee of supply be given a reasonable opportunity to exercise his right to close the budget debate.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, again I think the motion is self-explanatory. It is simply a motion to refer a matter to the select special committee on standing orders. It asks this committee to consider and report its recommendations on the advisability and desirability of amending standing order 46 to provide that the mover of the budget motion for committee of supply, be given a reasonable opportunity to exercise his right to close the budget debate.

The problem at the moment, Mr. Speaker, is that when a few years ago, we injected into the standing orders a specific time at which the vote must be taken on the budget debate, we made it difficult and at times impossible to give the mover of the motion the right to close the debate. It had, previous to that, always been the policy in this legislature, at least, that the mover of the motion, the Provincial Treasurer, did have the opportunity if he so wished, to close the debate. This resolution, of course, doesn't say that this will happen; it simply asks that we refer to the committee on standing orders, the question of studying whether this should be done or not, and how it should be done. I so move, seconded by Mr. Brockelbank.

Mr. Thatcher (Morse): — I wonder if the Premier would agree to let this particular motion stand until tomorrow. I have no personal objection to it, but I happen to know that the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) has some rather strong views on it, and he happens to be unavoidably detained elsewhere in the province today. If the Premier has no objections could we hold it over until tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, as the person concerned, if this is delayed for a little while it won't come into effect for another year, and I am sure my hon. friend will want to hear the Provincial Treasurer's reply at the end of the debate this year.

Mr. Thatcher (Morse): — Well, one day's difference, Sir, I wouldn't think it would make very much difference if you could agree to hold this for one day.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! If you want to debate the motion, it can be moved that the debate be adjourned, but we cannot have a crossfire this way on it.

February 20, 1963

Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — All right, I'll move the debate be adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

The assembly adjourned at 4:26 o'clock p.m.