

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature
6th Day

Thursday, February 21, 1963

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

On the Orders of the Day:

SALE OF SAVINGS BONDS

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of day are proceeded with I would like to announce that the third series of Saskatchewan Savings Bonds will go on sale March 4th, 1963. The bonds are to be dated March 15, 1963 and will carry an interest rate of five percent from March 15, 1963 to March 15, 1969, and five and one-half percent from March 15, 1969 to the end of the term, March 15, 1973, with interest payments being made annually by cheque. And, of course, they can be redeemed at par any time after September 15, 1963. Only Saskatchewan residents will be eligible to purchase these bonds. This will include corporations and societies with head offices in Saskatchewan. The bonds will be available in denominations \$100, \$500, \$1,000 and \$5,000. The maximum purchase by any one person will be limited to \$10,000. They are, of course, non-transferable, non-assignable except by inheritance.

Because Saskatchewan savings bonds are redeemable at par at any time, there is a limit to the amount that should be outstanding at any time. Consequently, it will be necessary to limit the total sales to \$10 million. When the sales have approached this figure we will close off the sales campaign. The sale of these bonds will be handled by agents appointed by the Provincial Treasurer and these agents will include all branches of chartered banks in the province, major investment firms, Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Limited, and a number of trust companies. These bonds will again be a gilt edged investment for the people of Saskatchewan and will help to provide for further development in our province.

WELCOME TO GUESTS

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Prince Albert): — I would just like to call the attention of the house, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that we have in the Speakers' gallery a group of young men representing the Columbian Squires, led

February 21, 1963

by Mr. Lefroy, and I am sure I speak for the entire legislature when I bid them welcome and say that I hope their stay in Regina and in this legislative assembly is both pleasant and informative.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

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

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, before I continue with my address I would like to call the attention of the members of the legislature to two very important young people in the west gallery — my young grandson, Grant, and my young granddaughter, Norma.

I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the address-in-reply to the speech from the throne for the splendid addresses they gave and the excellent reviews of the accomplishments of this government that have greatly increased the opportunities for every section of the people of Saskatchewan. For young people, greatly increased educational opportunities, better school facilities; for the people of the north, more jobs, more chance for an education and more chance to improve their skills; for our senior citizens, more security, the removal of fear of hospital and medical bills, and for so many of them, some 5,000, more comfortable and safe homes and nursing homes at rents and charges that they can afford to pay; and for the farmers of this province, more of the comforts and the amenities of life; for labor, more protection and better working conditions; a much better deal for teachers, and again in the speech from the throne there is forecast further improvements in the teachers; superannuation. More varied opportunities for the business section of the communities. In fact, every section of the community has benefitted by the actions of this government. And these, Mr. Speaker, are things that I believe we on this side of the house have every reason to be proud of. The facts that were presented by the mover and the seconder of the speech from the throne and also the Hon. Premier I think should convince even the greatest doubters in the Liberal opposition of the energy and the ability and the competence of the CCF government of Saskatchewan.

And I was thinking also as I listened, Mr. Speaker, that the newest member of the legislature, the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart), whom we welcome here today, after listening to those speeches must already be beginning to realize how badly he has been misled over the years by Liberal propaganda. And I would like to congratulate the Hon. Premier on the masterpiece of an address that he gave here yesterday afternoon. By the time he had finished, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't one shred of evidence left anywhere to support the criticism of the Liberal opposition.

I also listened with a great deal of interest to the Leader of the Opposition and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, I had no difficulty whatsoever in hearing him — as far as he is concerned we didn't need a new sound system, but there were times when I think we did need ear-muffs. His speech, as usual, was full of sound and fury, and as usual it was sound and fury signifying nothing. Now, in the light of the veritable barrage of facts that the Hon. Premier presented yesterday, I never cease to wonder how the Leader of the Opposition and his followers can go around this province and in this legislature and make the kind of statements they do, that have absolutely no foundation in fact. But I have long since ceased to be very much surprised at anything the Leader of the Opposition says or does, even, as mentioned by the Hon. Premier here yesterday, when he tried to play king of the castle and start a legislative session all by himself. Now, in his speech, the Leader of the Opposition tried to leave the impression that this government was breaking faith with the Saskatoon agreement on medical care. And I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that if anybody is failing to keep their promises, if anyone is breaking faith with this agreement, it is not the government or the commission. I would like to remind you that there are two parties to this agreement.

It is amazing that the Leader of the Opposition who claims to be in favor of medical care should use up so much energy, take so much trouble to try to stir up all the trouble he can. He referred to one clause and part of a clause in the Saskatoon agreement and I would like to refer to some other clauses — if he is going to refer to one, then there are one or two others that I think are quite important in the Saskatoon agreement. And I am going to read to you clause 9 and then clause 11. Clause 9 reads this way:

The government is concerned that the interests of all citizens when they are sick shall be properly safeguarded, whether they belong or do not belong to voluntary health insurance agencies. This means that doctors shall work together as good colleagues whether they are or are not enrolled in medical care schemes. It means also that voluntary health insurance agencies must conduct their affairs on the highest possible standards of public efficiency. The College is in full agreement with these points.

And then I would like to read section 11:

There must be no discrimination against any doctor in whatsoever way he practices. In particular there must be no discrimination against any doctor in the matter of hospital privileges and attachments, referrals from one physician to another, or other professional

February 21, 1963

activities involving assistance and co-operation between physicians. The College endorses this view. It is no wish of the College that there should grow up divisions between physicians and it will exercise its full influence to prevent discrimination in matters of professional practice. Accordingly the College undertakes that in advising on applications for hospital appointments, applicants shall be judged solely on their merits.

And this agreement was signed on behalf of the government by W.S. Lloyd, on behalf of the college by Dr. Dalgleish, witnessed by Dr. Portnuff, Dr. Peacock, members of the cabinet and members of the commission. I felt that if the Leader of the Opposition thought it wise to acquaint the public with one clause of this agreement, it would be well for the public to have a little more information on a few of the other clauses. I wish to tell the Leader of the Opposition that in spite of all he can do to sabotage our medical care plan, certainly he left no stone unturned to sabotage, and he hasn't been too particular about the methods he's used, in spite of all this, the medical plan is here to stay. The writing is on the wall and soon medical care plans will be spread all across this country. Now, some provinces may start with limited plans in one group, but this is just the beginning. As the people see the advantages to that group, all other groups are going to be asking for medical care plans — and they will get them. And it is, Mr. Speaker, because our CCF government had the courage to stick to its guns through a very difficult period and because we won our battle, Canada before long will have a medical care plan all across this country. It will, I believe, be jointly financed by the federal and provincial governments. It will, in the long run, include everybody. It will be a godsend to the people of this province and of all of Canada, and I believe to the medical profession as well, and I think the day will come when they will realize it as do most of the doctors in Great Britain today.

Turning now to some of the facts presented by the Hon. Premier in his address yesterday, and in particular regarding the industrial and mineral resources development in this province. This great diversification that he described didn't just happen. It wasn't just luck. It didn't just fall from a clear blue sky. It came about because from the very day the CCF was elected it started out to create conditions that would encourage and assist and enable industry to locate in this province. And the speech from the throne forecast further incentives to industry in this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are the very last people in the world that should talk about lack of industrial development. They had the government of this province for a good many years, and how much industry and how much natural resource development did we get? What did

they do to encourage industry to come in this province. We know, as the Premier mentioned yesterday, what happened to our forest potential. It was almost ruined and has taken years of a vigorous re-forestation program to reclaim the forests. Now, they like to compare as between provinces so I will do a little comparing as between provinces during their regime.

During the Liberal regime, in Manitoba, Winnipeg was rapidly going ahead and becoming an important industrial centre. The same was true of Edmonton and of Calgary. But how much activity was there in Saskatchewan or Regina? I would like to remind them again that during the war years there were tremendous plant expansions going on all over the country. We had Liberals in power in Ottawa, Liberals in power in Saskatchewan. Now then, even from the viewpoint of national defence it would have been an excellent thing to have spread some of this industry over the country and in the west, and in the east and a little bit on the west coast. But did they do it? The answer is no. And if they had it would have given Saskatchewan a shot in the arm that was needed and, if they had, we would have at least had some plants here ready for reconversion. The Leader of the Opposition said something yesterday about population. I think he said our population was static, maybe stationary was the word he used — as usual a gross exaggeration. But one thing is certain, Mr. Speaker, the population wasn't stationary during the period of the Liberal regime. That was the time when by thousands the people of Saskatchewan left the province and went to other places. And it is only since the CCF government has been in office that there has been any significant industrial and natural resource development.

Now, Mr. Speaker, industry needs power, plenty of power and our CCF government has provided that power. It has tripled its generating capacity in a few years and when the Saskatchewan Dam power comes in, it's going to be quadrupled. And remember, we had to get rid of the Liberals to get any action on the South Saskatchewan Dam.

One of the greatest incentives to industry is natural gas. Well, the Saskatchewan government has provided that natural gas. In ten short years, from 290 customers the province now has 88,000 natural gas customers. So that the power demand of this province has been met.

Now, industry also needs highways. What kind of highways did we have under the Liberals? We have good highways today and when you consider the number of miles of highways we have to build in this province, our record in the field of highways is second to none in the dominion of Canada.

February 21, 1963

Now I know what the opposition is going to say — well, sure, it's all right, but you have had so much more money to spend than we had. Well, we agree with you, that is absolutely true, we agree, although it is not nearly as much as the Liberals would try to suggest because it takes over two dollars now to do what a dollar would do in their regime. But I would like to ask them one question. Why is it that we have more money in Saskatchewan today? Why? One of the important reasons is this, that this government got busy and diversified the economy to broaden our economic base and because they did, millions of dollars of new money now come into this province and some of it goes into the provincial treasury. This is why we have more money.

The member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) mentioned the other day the action of the CCF government in the northern part of the province and what it has done — opened up the northern areas, set up Saskatchewan Government Airways, radio communications in the north, staked prospectors to develop mining areas, its road to resources program, the very important geological surveys it has made which is great help to industry, setting up a core laboratory here which is used extensively by people who are interested in mining and oil. Then, of course, there was the industrial development office who have made intensive surveys as to what kind of industry can succeed in the province of Saskatchewan, and they have been a great help to industries locating here. And then the excellent brochures which they have prepared to encourage tourists to come here, and, last year, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan had an all-time high in the tourist traffic.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, smaller industries need some assistance to get started. Our CCF government has given that assistance, only to be criticized by the Liberals. The thing about it is, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals not only didn't do anything themselves to encourage industry, but they oppose and object to almost everything we've done to encourage it. And they are still doing it. I was quite amused when the Leader of the Opposition got up here and started sniping at the statement in the speech from the throne that there is to be further encouragement to industry, sniping at it before he even knew what that encouragement was going to be.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — He talked about death-bed repentance. This was a death-bed repentance! Well, one thing, Mr. Speaker, as far as the Liberals are concerned, they died before they repented. And when people die before they repent, you know where they go.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, not only did the Liberals do nothing themselves but they object to everything we have done. They object to our natural gas program, to our rural electrification program, to the fact that we have increased generating power — they are against it. They object to the

building of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation building to house this expanding industry — a building that will bring all the activities of the power corporation under one roof and make for more efficient operation — a building that will mean greater convenience to all the power customers, and a building that has provided hundreds of jobs, directly and indirectly, to the people of this province at a time when unemployment is high, and I will also say, Mr. Speaker, a building that is going to be a source of pride to the citizens of this city and this province. But they object. There is no use saying they are not against these things, they've proved over and over again that they are because they go all around this province screaming about the debt for power and telephones. Now they know full well that neither Saskatchewan nor any other province in this dominion could carry out this tremendous power program without large borrowing. They also know that the money borrowed for these utilities is a self-liquidating debt, that is that every year it pays the interest on its investment and retires the necessary amount of capital. And they know that if this province is going to continue to expand, it's got to have tremendous expansion in power. Still they object. So there is only one conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that anyone can come to, and that is that they are against the government taking the necessary action to meet the power needs of this province. And they talk about industry. What hypocritical nonsense they talk.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a few minutes to my own constituency, the city of Regina, that I have been proud to represent in this legislature since 1952. I have lived in Regina for most of my life. I used to think I knew every nook and corner of our city — but not any more. Regina has grown beyond recognition. Our population has doubled in just a few years, and the whole face of Regina has changed. We have seen an industrial development here and an expansion never dreamed of a few years ago. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Liberal party try to corral their leader and all together they go for an extensive tour around the city of Regina. But first I would suggest that they take their blinders off — maybe that word dates me, Mr. Speaker — but I suggest they open their eyes and look around about them and I hope they take in what they do see.

I have a few clippings here that I thought might interest the members of the opposition.

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Take them as read.

Mrs. Cooper: — Oh, I won't take them as read. I know you would like me to. Here is one regarding the growth of Regina.

February 21, 1963

Regina's growth rates third spot. City planner, John Preston, Tuesday said that according to records of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics of all Canadian cities that had a population of 100,000 or more in 1962, Regina grew the third fastest since 1951. Only Calgary and Edmonton had a faster growth.

And he goes on to say — of course — I'm going to read it, he goes on and says:

Of course if they had taken the population of 95,000, Saskatoon would have been the third and Regina fourth.

But at least there are two Saskatchewan cities almost at the top of the list in population growth.

And here's another clipping from the Leader Post. "Regina Assuming New Role", and it talks about the opening of the new \$300,000 Qu'Appelle Room in the Hotel Saskatchewan, culminating a \$2 million CPR program to improve facilities for its multi-faced operations in Regina. And he says:

All these developments bespeak the faith of one of Canada's largest enterprises in Regina's future.

And then he talks about the new convention facilities. He says:

The new Qu'Appelle Room, with accommodation for 700 for banquets and 1,100 for meetings, and 14 other small rooms, is now available and will now provide facilities for conventions unexcelled in the prairie west.

And I can say from experience that this is true. We had a wonderful convention in that Qu'Appelle Room on Monday night. Those 1,100 seats were filled and people were flowing out into the corridors. But he goes on to point out that with these new facilities, Regina is going to replace Winnipeg as a convention centre.

And I have something here that I do wish the members of the opposition would read. It is excellent reading. I wish I had time to read it myself but I have got to watch the time so I will only give you a few highlights.

It says that in 1962 the development of Regina — and this is from the Industrial Development Office — 1962 has stimulated another progressive year for this city. With a population increase averaging 4,500 persons annually, Regina is expected to surpass the 120,000 mark by 1963. New employment opportunities in industry, transportation and distribution

facilities are constantly supporting this trend. Construction has held up well and retail sales have surpassed the budgeted expectations. Generally, the economy has been prosperous, the future looks bright.

Then he goes ahead and lists important and expensive additions to existing industries, and there are a lot of them. He talks about nine new companies established in 1962, employing over 100 people. He mentions the transportation field, the new \$650,000 CPR merchandising warehouse and Reimer Express Lines \$125,000 terminal warehouse. There are pages of it which I haven't time to read. I hope you will. He mentions eight companies that have established in the Ross industrial district. He says construction activities have been good, building permits \$30 million last year, third highest in the history of Regina. He talks about the power building, the telephone building — \$12 million for industrial construction, and so on and so on. But he says this — the most exciting development in the recent history of Regina is the comprehensive plan for Wascana Centre Authority, including the University of Saskatchewan Regina campus. Construction of the first university building, estimated to cost \$6 million, will commence early in 1963 and is expected to be completed for enrolment of 1,200 students in 1964. Think what this means, not only to the students but to the economy of our city.

He mentions a million dollar shopping centre in Regent Park. A million dollar apartment building on Scarth and 15th. A 148-room motor-hotel and a \$2 million expansion for the Leader-Post. And then he says this:

Undoubtedly, Wascana Centre will have a tremendous effect on the economy of Regina. It is probable that the construction phases will unfold sufficient new markets for such items as building projects, lighting and recreational accessories and furniture to stimulate the growth of several new industries in Regina.

He says, “new techniques from the potash industry may put Regina in the thick of the mining program” and he doesn't forget this, the \$4.75 million contract with Inter-Provincial Steel Company, which will be a definite benefit to our city, no thanks to the Leader of the Opposition.

Now, before I leave Regina, I would like to have something to say, Mr. Speaker, about the hospital situation in our city. Because of the rapidly rising population in here, as well as well-equipped hospitals, Regina finds itself with a serious shortage of hospital beds. And I have a suggestion to make, Mr. Speaker, in this regard, that I hope will be given very serious and favorable consideration by the government.

February 21, 1963

Now, it is a well-known fact that approximately 50 percent of the patients that use the hospitals in Regina come from outside the city. They come from all over the province, particularly from the southern half. Now, these people are not Regina taxpayers, and this always has been somewhat of a sore point here. There is a growing feeling that this situation imposes an unfair tax burden on our citizens of Regina, and I myself feel that a hospital that serves to such a large extent people from all across the province should be financed by the people as a whole through their government, and I am, therefore, suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the government build, equip and staff and be responsible for the operation of a new hospital here that will provide for the additional number of beds and facilities needed.

The university hospital in Saskatchewan has been a great boon to that city and it has relieved the people of Saskatoon of considerable financial burdens. Now, I realize that the hospital was built in Saskatoon in connection with the medical school as a teaching hospital. But, like Regina, the patients come from all over Saskatchewan, and in particular from the northern half of the province. Now, I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that a new hospital would necessarily need to be as large or as extensive as the hospital in Saskatoon, the university hospital, but it should be adequate for the extra space and equipment needed.

Now, certainly Regina does need more hospital accommodation and I believe that both of our hospitals are asking the provincial government for very large sums of money for extension and renovation, but I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that an entirely new hospital is the solution to the problem, and would not be much more expensive than the proposed additions which I understand come to around \$9 million. Now I say this for several reasons. Over the past few years there has been very extensive research and a great deal of thought and study by a number of experts in the field from both United States and Canada, in the field of hospital planning and field of hospital construction. And the trend seems to be away from the large, sprawling hospital, which is difficult to administer in an efficient manner. The trend is to smaller, more compact hospitals that are more flexible units and lend themselves better to modern trends in hospital care.

Now, one of the reasons for this intensive research is the growing concern about the tremendous rise in the per diem cost of hospital care that is apparent all over the North American continent, and I have been reading a most interesting study on the subject of hospital planning, called "Elements of Progressive Patient Care". This study has been conducted by a very impressive group of specialists, including medical doctors, nurses, dieticians, architects,

social scientists, hospital management people, medical record experts, and expert operations research people, and an analytical statistician and chartered accountant. It is a very interesting document. Their recommendations are aimed primarily at tailoring hospital services to meet the patients' need or, as they put it, "the place, the right patient in the right bed, with the right services, at the right time". This suggests specially planned and organized units to be set up to which the patients are assigned, according to their degree of illness and need for care, and they suggest a special unit for the most serious cases, needing the most intensive care and specialized nursing, and that this should be sort of a nerve centre of the hospital, easily accessible, close to all the life-saving equipment, and, of course, this is the group of people who need the most intensive and the most expensive type of care.

And then they suggest as they progress from this stage to a less critical stage, they could be moved to a unit that requires less intensive and less expensive care; and there are also many ambulatory cases in the hospital — they need a different type of service and even less intensive or expensive care. These people could be segregated and treated according to their needs.

I would also like to remind you that in the final report of the medical care commission which, by the way, I have studied with a good deal of interest, you will find the recommendations that the government proceed by stages to implement the Saskatchewan plan for mental hospitals. And they suggest that these mental hospitals should be in close proximity to, or on the grounds of, or in a wing of, existing hospital planning and I believe they also suggested that physical restoration centres and rehab centres should be in the same area.

Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would be much easier to incorporate some of these new suggestions and modern trends when you can start from scratch with a new hospital. It would be so much more difficult to get the necessary flexibility in a hospital that was built before these new ideas were abroad. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because Regina needs more hospital accommodation and, I believe, from the viewpoint of both economy and efficiency and keeping in mind future needs, a new hospital is the proper solution, and because the situation in Regina regarding outside patients is comparable to that of Saskatoon, where they have the university hospital, built by the government, and because I believe that a hospital built for Regina by the government would provide for more equity and a fairer distribution of costs among all the users of the hospital; for all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe the government would be justified and would be commended for building a hospital for the city of Regina, and once again I urge consideration.

February 21, 1963

Now I see the clock says I must conclude, so in conclusion I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that because the speech from the throne is a further evidence of the energy and sincerity with which this government is proceeding to implement the promises it made to the electors in 1960, and because we are going to be able to get up on any platform when the new provincial election rolls around, hold up our promises and say, these are the things we promised you; these are the promises we have kept; and because the speech from the throne shows progress in Saskatchewan, and further progress is being implemented, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and proud to support the motion.

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Prince Albert): — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the people of Prince Albert for the confidence they placed in me on November 14, and I promise that I will do my utmost to be worthy of the trust they placed in me.

Prince Albert and its people are, of course, the finest people and the finest city in the province of Saskatchewan. That goes without saying, and I would like to invite anyone who hasn't been up to Prince Albert to come up and see where we feel that Saskatchewan really begins, and, of course, this invitation is to both sides of the house. I realize that most of the cabinet ministers are familiar with Prince Albert; they spent enough time up there in the by-election, but I am sure if they come up again on a different occasion we will give them a much warmer welcome.

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Mineral Resources): — We'll come up and take you out.

Mr. Stuart: — Well, if you don't have any better success next time than you had last time, I have nothing to worry about.

My congratulations go, Mr. Speaker, to the mover and the seconder and I would like to thank all those members who have welcomed me to this legislature. I must say most of the members opposite were extremely honest; they said that they hoped my stay would be quite pleasant and quite short; the feeling, of course, is mutual. The Hon. Premier said he hoped that I would be constructive, and then he proceeded to set me a great example yesterday with his vicious and uncalled-for and personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition.

Now I happened to be out of the house, unfortunately, but I did hear his speech on the radio and I think that the best that can be said for it is that it was long, it was boring,

it appeared to be a rather weak and stumbling imitation of T.C. Douglas at his worst. It has been obvious, Mr. Speaker, for some time that the socialists are slipping, but with the little master gone, and under the present leadership, they seem to have really hit the skids.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I listened to the speech from the throne, my first as a member of this assembly, with great interest, and, I regret to say, bitter disappointment.

I was interested to learn the reactions of the government that just three months ago had suffered its fourth straight defeat at the polls. Mr. T.C. Douglas, our former premier, was fond of calling elections the highest court of public opinion. Well, if that is true, this government has been tried in four such courts, ranging from Weyburn in the south to Uranium City in the north, and found guilty of gross mismanagement of our public affairs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The verdict, Mr. Speaker, is even more damning since it was rendered by people from the north, the central and the southern parts of this province. By people from all walks of life, and by thousands of supporters, former supporters, of the present government. Now, in the three months since the Prince Albert by-election, we have witnessed tremendous activity by the members of the government. Cabinet ministers have scattered all over this province, holding meetings on every conceivable subject. The object appears to be two-fold. First, to give the impression of a busy, active government. Second, and probably most important, to attempt to play down and hide the action NDP control of this administration. Why, the Hon. Premier has even taken a leaf from the book of Real Caouette and he is broadcasting weekly the joys of life under socialism. Well, one of my friends, after hearing him talk about all the freedoms brought to us under socialism told me to ask him, “please, don’t give us any more socialist freedoms, we can hardly afford those we have now, and with any more we won’t be able to call our souls our own.”

You know there is a feeling growing in this province, Mr. Speaker, that with friends like the NDP-CCF in office, Saskatchewan hardly needs any enemies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — That this latest flurry of activity and propaganda has failed to solve the problems facing this province is obvious. That it has failed to redeem this government’s reputation with the people will be equally obvious, whenever our premier

February 21, 1963

has the courage to take his rather dismal record to them in a general election. Watching the government's action this past few months, and knowing that we face serious problems of economic stagnation, mounting taxation, we face the problems of social aid, in the field of education and serious lack of industrial development, I had expected much more from the throne speech. I had hoped to see a bold plan of action unfold, to get this province moving, to take its place as one of the leading provinces of this nation.

I was disappointed, Mr. Speaker, when we need so much leadership, to be offered so little. Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that these socialists have failed to learn from their own costly blunders? Why have they plunged blindly ahead in the face of mounting public censure, spreading compulsion, restricting our freedom and throttling our development? Well, I think the reason is plain. It is because they are socialists; they believe in socialism; they have tried to make socialism work; and when it failed, as it has failed, they failed as a government. Step by step, law by law, they have spread compulsion and regimentation across this province. As their failures grew, so did their propaganda. You know the ultimate irony is, the socialists now are beginning to believe what they say themselves. They are victims of their own propaganda.

Before you can solve a problem, Mr. Speaker, you must first admit that it exists. This government has no plan to ease the burden of taxes on homeowners, on our working people, on our farmers, on the business community. It has no plan, because it denies the fact that we are among the highest taxed people in the dominion of Canada. There is no program to cut the high cost of government, because they refuse to admit that waste and extravagances exist in almost every department and crown corporation. When it is pointed out to them, for example, that we in Saskatchewan carry over 2,000 more civil servants than the province of Manitoba, where they have a higher population than we do, they claim this is an accomplishment.

Faced, for example, very recently with serious criticism concerning inefficiency in the power corporation by contractors and unions in the building trade, the minister in charge, after little or no investigation, flatly denied the whole thing. It was interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that this brief criticizing the power corporation was compiled for the most part by unions in the building trades, these including carpenters, and laborers, and electricians, bricklayers, tinsmiths, and the plumbers' unions. Well, when working men and women in our unions are prepared to spend their own time and their own money to put an end to wasteful practices in our crown corporation, then I think it is high time this government tried to clean up its own mess.

I read the minister's reply, that he had all ready even before the people presented the brief; he accused them of generalities and his was one mass of generalities, Mr. Speaker. This government refuses to clean up its own mess; members on this side of the house have over the years uncovered instance after instance of waste and extravagance, only to be ignored or abused. The government won't clean its own house; the costs continue to mount and the taxes continue to grow. But probably the worse example of socialist double-talk over the years has been seen in their propoganda concerning the huge public debt that they have amassed.

Our present treasurer seems to be following in the footsteps of that famous master of double-talk, the late and rather unlamented Clarence Fines. Our treasurer announced recently that our net debt was down to about \$22.5 million and would soon disappear. The fact is we are deeper in debt today than at any time in our history. This government and its corporations owe over \$530 million. But how do they arrive at their figures? It is very simple; it was pointed out here again today; they say that the money that is owed by the power, the telephone, and other crown corporations is self-liquidating so that they don't owe it, according to them; and they say, look, we are practically out of debt. It is socialist arithmetic, to be sure; but, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the people where they borrowed this money, down in Eastern Canada and in the United States, don't subscribe to socialism and they insist the money be paid back, both the principal and interest, when it falls due. So the debt continued to grow, the payments continue to grow and so do our taxes, power bills and telephone bills, and the same attitude prevails when it comes to other grave and growing problems.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The power bills are among the highest in Canada — you should check your own figures. Take the social aid program, they like to boast about the social aid program. These socialists claim in a very sanctimonious voice to be their brother's keeper; well, we think we are our brother's keepers too, but we would like to see our able-bodied brothers get out and do a little hustling for their keep.

The people who are unable to work, by all means give them all the help we can. Most able-bodied men want, or they should want, jobs and decent wages. To provide jobs you must have business and industrial development, and this the socialists have failed to provide. We need to provide work, for example, for chronic social cases through work and wages programs. We haven't done it. We need to institute a comprehensive re-education plan to train most social aid cases just

February 21, 1963

to hold a job in this very technical and modern age in which we live. What is their answer then? Give them a hand out. Last year as many as 27,000 people on social aid, at a cost of almost \$6 million, and little or nothing to show for it. When the Leader of the Opposition, a day or two ago, stated that the social aid situation in this province was becoming a public scandal, oh, they bitterly criticized him, but he was telling the truth. We in the Liberal party are not opposed to social aid. If people need help they should receive it. But we are opposed to people with assets ranging from farms, with grain in the bins, to Cadillacs receiving social aid when they are not entitled to it. They are free-loading off the back of the taxpayers, taking their hard-earned tax dollars when they haven't got it coming. The provincial government must face the ultimate responsibility for this. They pay out most of the money and in the final analysis it is their responsibility. They are not keeping faith if they don't make an honest effort to put a stop to these abuses. If they did what they should do they might have more money to help the sick, the needy, the widows and the old people who really need our help.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Stuart: — Mr. Speaker, their greatest failure, though, had to be in the field of industrial expansion. I find it most amusing when they take these figures and they claim now that they show the greatest percentage, the greatest percentage of increase in the matter of industrial development. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, this is wonderful arithmetic. A man says, I've got one, I get another one, I now have two, but I have a 100 percent increase, and I am much better than the fellow who had 100 and gained 50, he only had 50 percent increase. Well, I would like to inform them that two times zero is still zero, so this had to be their greatest failure.

Mr. Kuziak: — Two times 1944 equals zero.

Mr. Stuart: — Two times 21 would be 42, and these fellows would be back where they belong — outside this house.

Mr. Speaker, how could the socialists expect, the only socialist government in North America expect to get a fair share of free investment? Why, they not only couldn't expect, they didn't want it. We had our crown corporations but of course this experiment failed and cost millions of dollars in the process. So the next step was to change their tune and invite these people in that they had been calling "hucksters" and "fast buck artists", these free enterprisers to come in and bring their money and help develop the province; but they got their signals mixed. Cabinet ministers and M.L.A.'s still kept insulting and hamstringing the business communities, driving

them out again. Well, in 1946 they set up an economic and advisory planning board. What did they do? They staffed it, for the most part, with political heelers who wouldn't know how to meet a payroll or run a business if they lived to be a thousand, and again they failed. In 1947 we had the industrial development fund. Oh, it was to encourage the establishment and the development of industrial plants and programs; and in 1960, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Industry and Information was instituted; and again it was to promote industrial and commercial development. Now it is 1963 and we have another vague promise in the throne speech that they will promote the private sector of the economy, more industrial expansion, but again on paper.

Why have we had to set up all these boards and departments at terrific cost, all to do the same job? Any one of them handled properly could have given us our fair share of the great boom that the rest of Canada has enjoyed in these post-war years.

We failed. We failed because all the fancy titles and propaganda couldn't hide the socialism, and this new effort will fail. Just as the other have because it doesn't get to the root of the trouble. It doesn't remove the real road-block restricting our development in Saskatchewan. The answer is simple. Let these socialists resign. This will be the greatest blessing they can bestow on the people. This will make room for real development in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now we know, Mr. Speaker, this is too much to hope for, and we all know what has happened. Business and industry have been driven out and kept out. Our population growth has been stopped, because thousands and thousands of our best people have had to leave here to find jobs and opportunities in more progressive provinces. Debt piled on debt, tax piled on tax, until we will have the greatest mess to clean up when we take over the government that ever faced any administration in the history of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Now, Mr. Speaker, we know they have failed, we know they have failed and we will ask the people of Saskatchewan to give us our chance, and we won't fail. What must be done in this legislature to get the economy of Saskatchewan rolling? Well, first we should institute an independent and thorough investigation into every department and into every agency of this government, with a view to increasing efficiency; with a view to eliminating unnecessary compulsion and with a view to cutting costs. This will clear the air, bring an air of freedom back to this province, it will make possible lower taxes, it will make possible reduction in the costs of services provided by the crown corporations. Then let's look around. Let's take

February 21, 1963

an honest look around for once. See how other provinces have been succeeding over the years where we have been failing. Manitoba and Alberta, both provinces with conditions very similar to ours. They have outstripped us in population, they have outstripped us in industrial development. In fact, they have outstripped us by almost any yard-stock with which growth and development are measured, and they have accomplished this with governments that differed in some respects but had one thing in common — a belief and faith in free enterprise. Free men left alone to develop the province. They encouraged people to come into their province and invest their money and their skills. We discourage them; they prospered — we fell behind.

I must call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to an article in the February edition of “The Canada Month”, a national publication. I will quote from that article:

Manitoba and Saskatchewan are much alike provinces. Both provinces have largely agricultural economies and both want new industries to keep the small towns going. This is where the similarity ends. For Manitoba is getting the industry and Saskatchewan isn't. Last month Manitoba's government won the Society of Industrial Realtors' award for the state or province with the most effective development program — the first time it has ever left the United States.

And I continue to quote:

The award was no surprise to Westerners for, while the CCF/NDP government in Saskatchewan has spent 18 years frightening away industry, Roblin's industry-minded cohort, Gurney Evans, says 'we think business people are the people to do business but there are some areas where the government can help'.

Mr. Speaker, if we hope to see industrial development in this province on a scale comparable to the rest of Canada we must have a change in attitude to our government. We must put an end to ever-growing government compulsion. We must guarantee a fair deal to people who are prepared to come in here and invest their money and their skills and their knowledge in our future. If we have to, we'll offer tax incentives to new industries who will come in and develop our untapped resources, offer the same deal to companies here who are prepared to expand. Then let's set up a team of real business and industrial experts — people who really know business expansion — and have them go sell every potential business and industry on the new advantage of coming to Saskatchewan. It will only be through such an industrial and business development that we can hope to provide jobs for unemployed, opportunities for our young people — this is the

only practical way that our province will grow, that our taxes will drop, that increased services on a sound basis will be made available to our people. This is our government has failed to do, it has even failed to plan for it.

Mr. Speaker, we listened yesterday to a terrific attack, an uncalled for attack by the Premier on the Leader of the Opposition. Now why do they attack him? Because here is a man who has done a tremendous job through the Liberal party, on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. And he will lead this Liberal party, as soon as they have the intestinal fortitude to call an election, he will lead this Liberal party to victory and we will form the next government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — This province has tremendous potentials. We have thousands and thousands of hard-working people. We've got great untapped natural resources. We are a good province. We can be a great province. But we need to remove that dead hand of socialism off the backs of our people. We need to get rid of socialism. We need to breathe the fresh air of freedom back into the province, and only if we do that will we get this province rolling again. These people have broken faith with the people who elected them. They started out as the CCF and they have sold their soul to the NDP. They have a premier who has never been endorsed by the people and has not the courage to take his case to the people of this province in a general election.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that the throne speech indicates another lost year for the province of Saskatchewan. I will oppose the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the newly-elected member of Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) for the fine contribution we have just heard in this house this afternoon, and want to welcome him as a colleague to this legislature. I also want to extend my best wishes and congratulations to the member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) for having made an intelligent decision in joining the great Liberal party of Saskatchewan. I welcome you to this side of the house and I am confident that your contribution to the debate and committee will be greatly appreciated and in the final analysis will contribute much in the ultimate defeat of this present government.

I also want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the throne speech. The presentations were good but the contents misleading. Some politicians are often carried away

by sheer enthusiasm. Some in recent days were carried away by sheer disgust. The member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) the other day was carried away by unwarranted enthusiasm of what this government had done for the people in the north. He spoke of Meadow Lake as the greatest wheat-growing centre of the north; how the government had provided the community with good roads; the fine school that provided a high standard of education for all; the hospital and medical facilities that provided the best of health; and all with a minimum of cost; how the government had opened up the north by serving the area with a power grid 175 miles north of Meadow Lake. Well, Mr. Speaker, this must have all happened in the last 11 months. To prove this I would like to read from a report published in the Star-Phoenix on March 23, 1962, on conditions that existed only a few months ago. At the outset I would like to say that I have no particular pleasure in reading this, but in view of the statements made by the Premier yesterday and recent reports in the Leader-Post, I feel that this report will confirm that the social aid program is a real scandal in the province of Saskatchewan. Now the Meadow Lake council had a meeting not so very long ago, about 12 months ago, and I will only read a few paragraphs from this article in the Star-Phoenix of March 23:

In addition to immediate and legitimate cost of social aid arising out of the welfare program, other problems and other costs are growing at a rate that threatens the morale and the ethical and financial stability of the whole community. The apparent use of social aid as the accepted and acceptable way of life is widely evident. Young couples of the area, both urban and rural, with no physical means of support, little education and fewer skills, marry and go on social aid as a means of support. For years a large percentage of beds in the local hospital maternity wards have been almost continuously occupied by unwed mothers and their babies, sometimes unwed mothers and their daughters confined at the same time.

And it goes on to say . . .

Mr. M. Semchuk (Meadow Lake): — We're not responsible for that.

Mr. Boldt: — And it goes on to say, Mr. Speaker:

regularly for several days at the end of each month, when social aid cheques are sent out, local liquor sales jump out of all proportion to the rest of the month.

Crime and disrespect for the law and the law enforcement is rising rapidly with the corresponding rise of police costs to the town. School facilities lag behind population growth. Some of its second and third generation families born and raised on social aid. Major expenses of the town in 1961 were social aid \$96,000, medical care \$17,000, and police costs \$17,000.

Briefly, this is the great development of the north the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) is so enthusiastic about. When we talk about these things the mayor of Regina wants us to resign. As long as I am a member of this house, we will continue to scrutinize every department to see that the taxpayer receives full value for his dollar.

An Hon. Member: — There's your record, there's your record.

Mr. Boldt: — Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we had the unfortunate opportunity to listen to the Premier of Saskatchewan in a barrage of criticism levelled at the Leader of the Opposition. At first I was disappointed at the small group of students of the university and visitors attending the session to hear the Premier of the province. But, after such a cheap performance, it was not worthy of better attendance. I noticed a group of students leaving the chamber half way through the course of his speech, not to return. The day before when the Leader of the Opposition spoke there were three times as many students and visitors in the chamber, listening carefully and intelligently as he outlined the Liberal program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The Premier attacked the Leader of the Opposition on every statement he had made and will make till the day he and his government will be defeated at the polls. I can hardly imagine the Premier being annoyed to such an extent as he displayed yesterday at the Leader of the Opposition, but rather am inclined to believe that he is annoyed at the people of Saskatchewan who turned down the government candidates at Athabasca, Turtleford, Weyburn, and Prince Albert. Since his election as leader, the socialists have slipped all over Saskatchewan. His uninspiring and colorless performance of the past year makes the task of the Liberals definitely easier in the months ahead.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Saskatchewan has no leadership.

February 21, 1963

Mr. Boldt: — The lack of contents of the throne speech is a sure sign that this government is faltering and stumbling along and the electorate is just eagerly awaiting for an opportunity to sweep them out of office. Another sure sign that this government is on the way out is the fact that the Tory and Social Credit leaders of the province have for the last six months continuously levelled all criticism at the provincial Liberal party and have completely forgotten about the NDP. Mr. Pederson and Mr. Kelln are two of the very few that do not want the Liberal victory. These two gentlemen are trying to convince the electorate that the Liberals and the NDP are closely related. After hearing the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier in this debate I am thoroughly convinced that the Liberals and the NDP are farther apart than ever before and to those that are not convinced I challenge them to ask the Premier when they can expect him to join the great Liberal party of Saskatchewan.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Morse): — We wouldn't take him.

An Hon. Member: — No, Heaven forbid, No.

Mr. Boldt: — Our leader enjoys the confidence and support of the Liberal party, was elected to this house in 1960, he scared Tommy Douglas right out of the province, and, incidentally, I want to congratulate the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) — he scared the Premier right out of this house a few moments ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The Leader of the Opposition certainly was instrumental in electing Liberals in three by-elections and has . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I rise to a point of privilege on behalf of the Premier. The Premier has many things to do as head man in the cabinet.

Mr. Boldt: — The Leader of the Opposition was certainly instrumental in electing Liberals in three by-elections and reorganized the party to the extent that today it is the greatest political force in the province. In comparison, what claims have Messrs. Pederson and Kelln to the premiership of this province. Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa the recent government has been accused of indecision. In Saskatchewan the government could rightfully be accused of not having made wise decisions on numerous occasions. Let us take a look at some of the decisions that have been made.

The house has seen numerous changes since the last election in 1960. Perhaps the first mistake, Mr. Speaker, was made by the electorates themselves by electing this government to office in 1960. Since 1960 we have had three ministers of finance, we have had our second minister of education, our third minister of public works, our second minister of municipal affairs, our second minister of co-operation, our second Speaker, our third Deputy-Speaker, and a third minister of public health — and a change of party name — the NDP — the new displaced persons. The Premier has juggled his ministers at such a clip that I would think, Mr. Speaker, that it would hardly be fair to expect us to always correctly associate the minister to the department he is in charge of.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I believe there have also been major changes in the party. As I have already stated, they changed their name to the New Democratic Party. They used to pride themselves as the party of reform, the party of the farmer and labor, humanity first, abundant living, the party that keeps its promises, etc. Well this great party had a convention last July. This was during the medical crisis. Naturally there were some resolutions of interest on medicare. The two resolutions, outside the ones on medical care, that were of the most interest, as reported in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of July 23, 1962, are as follows:

That the convention urge the government to lower the legal drinking age from 21 to 18.

The second resolution of important was “that the government make it an offence for any person, except a parent or guardian, to give liquor to anyone under 18”. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the majority of citizens of Saskatchewan will agree that these resolutions merit discussion. I personally am concerned as to the number of people we could keep out of the beer parlours, instead of more in. I am sure that the Minister of Social Welfare shares my concern. When resolutions such as these as quoted are foremost in the minds of delegates of a political party, I think it is high time that we make every effort to get our medical doctors back and do some real mind searching. To my knowledge, there was no discussion reported on radio or the newspapers on industrial development, on agriculture, financial aid to young farmers, social welfare, Indian affairs, on education, or labor and employment. Oh, yes, I believe there was a resolution on employment. It went something like this:

Whereas there are too many employees in the public service that do not believe in the philosophies and policies of the government and therefore do not work to the best of their ability in the interests of the people of

February 21, 1963

Saskatchewan, be it resolved that the entire question of hiring public servants be referred to the incoming provincial council.

It was passed.

An Hon. Member: — Yes, it would be.

Mr. Boldt: — I am asking the government if they intend to act upon the wishes of the convention. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the government has taken the wrong approach in trying to solve some of the problems, especially those related to rural municipalities. The government has taken the attitude that by merely increasing the size of the municipality, by enlarging the boundary lines, all the troubles of the R.M.'s will be solved. Although municipal men and school trustees agree to a large extent that revision of boundaries for school purposes is desirable and practical, they certainly do not agree that the same holds true when related to municipal government. Therefore, the municipality within these boundaries set out by the advisory commission have requested the minister that no change of boundaries is desirable and, therefore, very few, if any, will request a vote to be taken on municipal units or the counties. It would appear to me then that the government should embark upon a new approach in solving the problems which are mainly financial. It is agreed by all political parties in Canada that tax-sharing agreements of the federal government with the provinces is a good thing. In the field of education the government has a similar formula where the low assessed school units are aided by equalization grants. I see no reason why the have-not municipalities should not be dealt with in a similar manner. I think it would be rather difficult to convince the higher-assessed municipalities that have finished the grid road program in their area, have good maintenance equipment, and are operating at a relatively low mill rate, to vote for a large unit with the low-assessed R.M.'s added to their unit, which would only tend to increase the cost and raise the taxes.

I do not believe that this would be a fair way of equalizing the cost, namely within a given boundary. I believe the equalizing should be done by the entire provincial area, rather than locally, and am fully convinced that equalization grants would serve this purpose without interfering with the local economy. The government will argue that the continuing committee recommended the setting up of municipal units or the county and the advisory commission has been busy setting up the boundaries. They will argue that these committees were headed by experts in the field, and they certainly will say that they had all the qualifications. Well, experts are not always right. I would like to remind the government and the people of Saskatchewan that about two years ago 29 university professors demanded the head of James Coyne. Ever since June 18 these professors are remarkably silent.

Mr. Speaker, I also have a grave concern, and so do some of the municipal councils of the municipalities in my constituency in the handling of special grants to municipalities. It has been brought to my attention that the member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) advises the council that the request for special grants should be made through him. Is this the policy of the minister that special grants to municipalities in some areas, namely constituencies represented by NDP members, should be channelled through their members? Special grants should be made available to the municipalities when certain factors are taken into consideration, namely the assessment and the emergency of the project and, in reality, should not be dependent on the sitting member's ability to influence the minister. The action taken by the member of Kinistino is a shameful act and a flagrant disregard for a good standard of sound administration.

Then, of course, Mr. Speaker, the social aid problem is causing much concern. Somehow I feel that the minister has finally acknowledged a weakness in the act and the abuses that are apparent throughout the province. The minister, together with some members of his staff, have held numerous meetings in the province with municipal and social welfare officials. I was interested to note that at a meeting in Tisdale — I have a clipping here from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix which stated that the hon. members, Mr. J.H. Brockelbank, Provincial Treasurer and member for Kelsey, and Robert Perkins, M.L.A. for Nipawin, both spoke briefly. Invitations to speak at these meetings were not given to the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) and myself as we were invited to a similar meeting in Prince Albert. I just wonder why they made a political meeting out of this meeting in Tisdale.

I am afraid very little has been accomplished in the way of solving abuses under the act and until the government is prepared to change some sections in the act, together with the federal government, I see little hope of a change of heart among social aid recipients. One of the changes in the act, I believe is a must, is that the employable social aid recipients must and should give service for cash assistance received. This has already been agreed upon by the premiers of the provinces in Canada and it is now up to the federal government to pursue this policy. Another thing wrong with the act is the schedule. The schedule to me seems only fair when the recipient is unemployable. In many areas a municipal official could make a far better deal with the applicant than under the act. Where this has been done in the past, the government official making his rounds insists that the recipient be put on the schedule. In other words, the applicant either qualifies for the maximum amount or nothing. Let the minister ask himself this question. Is it fair to put two applicants on the same schedule where one was able to earn \$2,000 and the other only \$500 in a given period?

February 21, 1963

We also note, Mr. Speaker, that social aid payments are a direct gift to the recipient. No note is signed or receipt issued by the recipient. Where the recipient is unemployable, this could be justified. But for the employable recipient to enjoy all these benefits, I can hardly agree. I would probably go along as far as the clothing and food is concerned, but certainly do not agree that instalment payments on electrical appliances, payments on mortgage on the home and arrears of taxes should be included. I believe you would find that many an applicant would withdraw his application for aid if he were asked to sign a note. The fact that in 1954 we had 5,866 people on social aid as compared to 25,549 in 1961 is alarming to all taxpayers in the province, with the cost for 1953-54 a little over a million dollars and up to almost \$6 million in 1961. Then, of course, in recent weeks we have heard the interference in the administration of social welfare by civic officials. Such acts will only tend to weaken the administration of social welfare and ultimately defeat the good intent of the honest and highly trained welfare officials. Such interference, Mr. Speaker, is highly unwarranted in the light of the various appeal boards the applicant is privileged to go to. In the light of recent happenings of a certain case in my area with the child welfare department, with the reports of social aid abuses in many areas in the province, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat and appeal to the minister for a complete overhaul of his department and demand the end to abuses of hard-earned taxpayers' dollars.

I would like to say a few words about farm credit. Farm credit is on the minds of young farmers and would-be farmers. Past and present governments have failed to adequately assess financial needs. The federal Credit Corporation Act, replacing the Farm Loan Board Act, and the provincial act of 1959 to provide assistance to farmers in establishment and development of family farms as economic farm units, fail entirely to meet the necessary needs of young farmers. I have no argument of the amount of money available to each farmer, nor the terms of repayment and the interest rate, but in order to qualify, and this is the experience of dozens of young farmers of my area, for a considerable amount of money, both acts require too much security. In most cases young farmers in need of loans are asked to provide for more security than they have, with the result that their needs are not met if this security is not provided. The mere fact that the federal and provincial acts boast at the very small percentage of loss, I believe it is considerably less than one percent, would indicate to me that the acts are not broad enough in scope. I believe that farm credit is of a major importance to individual young farmers and to the industry itself; that the government should make loans more readily available. To me it seems absurd for the government to make loans of up to \$25,000 to individual farmers who must have at least \$50,000 assets to be eligible. These individuals do not need loans financed by governments. They should be asked to go to other sources, but, rather, loans should go to those young individuals who were born and

raised on farms, who would like to remain on the farm, with the background and character of the individual taken into consideration at the time of application. I believe that governments must and should take certain risks if we are to keep the young people of the farm on the farm. A percentage of loss on loans, I believe, would be quite in order and the results in the end most gratifying. This government has lost billions in its experiments with crown corporations, it should be willing to risk some to farm industry.

A few weeks ago I heard the Premier on the television program stating that \$3.5 million in loans had been borrowed by students from the government, interest free. How about applying this generous gesture to young farmers?

These problems that I have mentioned would be dealt with by a Liberal government in a most effective manner. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the throne speech does not indicate that the government has a solution to the rural municipal problem; it doesn't intend to deal adequately with the social aid program; nor has it a program to assist the small farmer with his financial needs; I shall not support the motion.

Mr. M. Semchuk (Meadow Lake): — I wonder if the member would mind giving me the date of that article that he read on Meadow Lake. I didn't catch the date.

Mr. Boldt: — March 23, 1962.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — In rising to take part in the throne speech debate, I would first like to add my words of welcome to those that have already been extended, by members on both sides of the house, to the newly-elected M.L.A. from the constituency of Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) and as well to the former Minister of Health and, also, a former school teacher of mine, in the person of the M.L.A. from Milestone (Mr. Erb). Both of these members, I know, are going to add greatly to the work of the opposition in the months that are to come, as I feel that the challenges that have been presented to the government across the way are definitely not going to be accepted in the near future because the government knows that if it did go to the people this year, they would be lucky if one of them were returned to sit in this house. So, Mr. Speaker, I am quite certain that, for the short time that we on this side of the house will be in opposition, both of these members are going to add a great deal to the work of the opposition in presenting to the people of this province the

February 21, 1963

issues of the day and protecting the rights and interests of the people of this province from the socialist government sitting to your right.

I would also like to take this opportunity to extend to previous speakers, and I would say particularly to the Leader of the Opposition, my congratulations on the addresses that they have presented in this debate. I can say that I think I agree much more with what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition and the two members that have just spoken this afternoon than I can with the remarks of other speakers during the course of this debate. I regret that I was unable to listen to all the remarks of the Premier yesterday. I heard a major portion of his address over the radio, while driving in my car, so I did not miss entirely the remarks that he had to make at times.

Most of the remarks that I have to make in regard to those remarks I will be saving up for the radio time tomorrow afternoon, in order that I might answer some of the remarks that he made at that time, both in relation to the Leader of the Opposition and to the Liberal party generally.

For the few moments I wish to speak this afternoon I want to deal with some of the remarks that have been made in this legislature since the beginning of the debate, and I think chiefly with the remarks made this afternoon by the lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper).

We have heard many arguments in this house, they are made daily from both sides, using population figures of the province of Saskatchewan to prove their points. The Leader of the Opposition had figures to prove that the population of Saskatchewan had not advanced in the way that it should have since this government came into office. This afternoon we had the lady member for Regina presenting figures that she intended to prove would show that it was previous governments that were responsible for this fact and not the present government that is sitting on your right.

However, I think both of these figures failed to prove either of the points to the satisfaction of anyone, and so I went to the trouble of getting the figures which I think would best indicate the progress in this province in comparison to our two neighboring provinces in the last 19 years under the present government that sits to your right, and that is the population figures of 1946, which was after this government came into office; after the war years had been concluded; after the period of depression. I am taking the figures of the three prairie provinces, beginning in the year 1946, giving them to you as they were at that time, and then giving them to you as they were in the census of 1961. I think this, better than any other figure that has been presented to this house, will indicate the comparative figure as far as the prosperity of the three prairie provinces are concerned.

In 1946, for example, in the province of Alberta, there were 803,330 people residing in the province of Alberta. What is the figure for 1961? In 1961 there are 1,331,944 people resident in the province of Alberta. Then let us look at the province of Manitoba. Manitoba in 1946 had 726,923 people, whereas today Manitoba has a population of 921,686. How about Saskatchewan? Well, Saskatchewan in 1946 had a higher population than the province of Alberta and a much higher population than our neighboring province of Manitoba. In 1946 we had 832,688 people living in this province. Today we have 925,181. In other words, in comparison to an increase of 500,000 population in the province of Alberta and 200,000 in the province of Manitoba, we here in the province of Saskatchewan have had to settle for an increase of 90,000 in population in that same period. These are figures, Mr. Speaker, that the government across the way cannot refute; they cannot bring up arguments to prove that some other political party, or some other political group has been responsible for the fact that these figures have not been different over the period from 1946 to 1961. There is only one political party in this province, and that is the party represented on the government side of this house, that must accept the responsibility for the fact that Saskatchewan has lagged behind, that Saskatchewan has not enjoyed the economic progress that has been enjoyed in our neighboring provinces of Manitoba and Alberta. I hope this, along with the evidence that has been presented, will be enough to indicate to my friends across the way that they cannot hope to prove, no matter what they say about the population of this province, they cannot hope to work their way out of the difficulty by trying to blame this problem on others.

I think this afternoon as well I must . . .

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I wonder if you will give us population statistics from, say 1934 to 1946.

Mr. Gardiner: — I am just going to that. I am just going into that now. I'm glad you brought that up because I was hoping that someone might suggest that I go back and cover a little more of Saskatchewan's history, after what has been said in debate in the last two or three days. I read the remarks of one of the movers of the speech from the throne, talking about this government across the way bringing Saskatchewan from a wilderness up to the prosperity of the present day. Well, I want to indicate to my friend across the way that he couldn't have been born prior to the time this government came into office, or he would have known the facts about the time when Saskatchewan was a wilderness, and he would have known the political party that brought us from the days of wilderness

February 21, 1963

up to the position of its greatest prosperity in 1929. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, that was a Liberal government, which came into office in 1905, when this province was born, when there were just a few thousand people resident within the boundaries, when these parliament buildings did not sit on this present location, when most of the public buildings had not been constructed, when there was no school system whatsoever, at the time when the provincial government took over in 1905. We had no medical facilities. There were no roads, because there were no cars in 1905 in the province of Saskatchewan. But from the date of 1905, when we were created a province, to 1929, the entire school system of this province had to be constructed, pretty well to the point where it is at the present time, with certain differences in administration. The school system from 1905 to 1929 was built up to a point where the people in this province had built more schools and maintained more school buildings in this province than they do at the present time — from 1905 to 1929. As well, we found that in 1911 the members of this legislature first moved into this building that we now occupy. Back in 1911 this building was built during the early years of progress in the province of Saskatchewan. We can go into the question of health facilities in this province. Our mental hospitals which were constructed during that period of year. We can consider as well our tuberculosis sanatoria, all of which were built during the period that I have mentioned, 1905 to 1929.

At the same time, also, we were building the facilities that were required at that time and could be provided for a population of 930,000 in 1929 — which was a larger population than the present government has to provide facilities for at the present time in the province. This was all done in a period of 24 years, with a total expenditure of not more than the money that this government will have to spend in this present year when they bring down their budget. That is all the money that the government had to spend in the province and create the facilities in this province for 930,000 people, and I would suggest to my friend who suggested that his party had brought Saskatchewan from a wilderness, that had they had the problems to deal with that previous governments had to deal with, from 1905 down to the time they came into office, if they had ever had to deal with half the problems that those governments had to deal with in those years, then they would have something to take pride in. They would have something to say to the people of this province, that we deserve recognition for what we did for the province of Saskatchewan.

In those early days those governments did not have the hand-outs from the federal treasury that this government has enjoyed since it came into office in 1944. Those governments did pretty well all their own financing and all their own work to provide the facilities necessary for the people

in those days. So I say here, to the members of this legislature, that when my friends across the way try to tell the old, old story of nothing being done before there was a CCF government in this province, it is only because they are not old enough, they are ignorant of the facts, or they will not go back and read the history of this province, if they make statements such as have been made in this debate and in many other debates in this house since the present government came into office.

I just want to say, before taking my place this afternoon and adjourning the debate, a few words with regard to social welfare services in our province. During the last few months the Minister of Social Welfare has been holding meetings about the province. I can see many reasons for holding these meetings. I am quite certain that after the addresses have been made by other in this house that the people of this province can well realize why the minister should be holding such meetings. But, on the other hand, if he thinks for one moment that those meetings were called in order to give advice to the people of this province, as to what to do, I fail to realize how he would get that information from the formation of the meetings that were held when I attended. I would like to call them political meetings — political meetings. I make that charge here today. At every meeting the minister stood up and he made a speech that he might have made in this legislature. He had comparisons of social welfare figures for all the provinces in Canada. Why did he have to have those? What was the purpose of those? How was that going to gain for him any advice to the solution of the social welfare problem in this province?

At meetings where there were only CCF members, I noted by the papers, all those members were asked to speak. Where there were Liberal members, they were not. And so I can say now that I think those meetings were called for only one reason. For window-dressing, and to try to convince the social welfare workers throughout this province and the municipal people, that the minister had a genuine interest in knowing exactly what the social welfare problems were in this province.

I am quite certain that the minister has done nothing to date, at least that I know of, to correct many of the problems that were suggested to him at those meetings. I would like to state to the minister, though, that I do appreciate this one fact. That over the last year or two, due to the demands of the public, due to the demands of those who have to operate the social welfare program in this province, that he has acceded to some of those demands, sometimes very quietly.

I can remember the first occasion on which one of the larger towns in this province decided they were going to take the matter of protecting the money of the people of this

February 21, 1963

province in their own hands. They were going to lay down regulations in their community with regard to the handling of social welfare. The minister told them in no uncertain terms that they had no business putting down such regulations but today he goes out to the country and says, oh, yes, you should be doing that — you should have those regulations in force. The municipalities are responsible for this problem of social aid, and you fellows, you councillors, we are quite happy now if you will sit down and make out all your own regulations. He knows as well as I do that every social welfare worker in this province has a book, a good thick book, full of regulations and graphs and guides, as he might call them today — they were originally regulations. When his inspectors go out they are still regulations, he still calls them a guide, and he says, you can do anything you like with regard to these regulations. Town councillors and municipal councillors can sit down and they can draw up their own regulations and their own guides, if they so desire; but still when the officials of his department go about they still tell the social welfare workers what they should be doing and the actions they should be taking in granting social aid in this province. They still tell them whether they think they are not giving enough, it is not very often that they suggest that they are giving too much, not too frequently they suggest that, it is usually the suggestion that perhaps they are not keeping quite up with the standards that are suggested in the manual that is sent out by the government of this province.

However, I would like to say this. That I think that the major portion of the responsibility for our difficulties in the field of social welfare at the present time in this province, cannot be laid at the door of the civic officials or the municipal officials of this province. It must be laid squarely at the door of this provincial government. The reason that I say that is this. Every time I have noticed when some person has been cut off another pension payment by the provincial government of this province, there is a little notation put on the letter, “If you find yourself in difficulties, go to your municipal officials and get some social aid”. They will cut them off the pensions that the provincial government has responsibility for and then they will send them over to the local municipal officials and tell them that if they are in financial need, that is the place that they should go.

I think it is high time in this province that we have a uniform system of social welfare payments so that the provincial government accepts full responsibility for all those over a certain age level, if we are going to divide this according to ages; so that there are not three possible pensions for everyone over 65 years of age; so that the government of this province cannot slough off the responsibility onto the municipality, and so that no longer will the municipalities, possibly if they desire to do so, try to place that responsibility on the government of this province.

I think it is high time that we had a uniform policy that would provide these pensions on a common sense basis, and not have two or three government bodies, responsible for the payment of the social aid in this province. And I think that is where one of the main solutions to this problem lies at the present time. So I say to the minister that I think that these meetings he held with regard to social welfare were window-dressing. Certainly there were many got up at the meetings, I was at two of them, and asked questions. There were many got up and made suggestions, but I don't think that there was anyone at those meetings, as far as I am aware, that really received anything back out of them. I don't think they were convinced by the minister that he was doing better for the people than the governments in other provinces of Canada were doing. I don't know if they were convinced he was doing as well for the province as they were doing in other provinces in Canada or not. But I think much of what he tried to put across at those meetings was done for strictly political purposes. Trying to mend the fences of the government of this province. Knowing that their popularity is at a low ebb as far as the public is concerned, and trying to revive it with meetings held at the expense of the people of this province, instead of at the expense of his political party if he wants to promote the aims of his own political group across the way.

And so, in adjourning the debate, I just want to say that it is time that the minister was sincere about this problem; that he took it out of the sphere of politics; and placed it in a sane and sensible administration so that the problem can be solved in the future and so that the people that are in need in this province can get the true benefits of the tax dollars that are paid for social welfare purposes.

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

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:34 o'clock p.m.