

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**8th Day**

**Monday, February 25, 1963**

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

On the Orders of the Day.

**CORRECTION TO VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS — FEBRUARY 21**

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to draw attention to an error in the Votes and Proceedings of February 21. In reference to an Act Respecting Hail Insurance By Certain Municipalities, the second paragraph is in error. This was not introduced on the basis that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor had been informed of the subject matter of the bill. It is not a money bill.

**ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Semchuk for an address-in-reply and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Gardiner.

**Mr. R. Perkins (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, after listening with a great deal of interest to the learned speeches of those who have preceded me, I would like at this time to add my humble voice in support of the address-in-reply.

I would wish first to heartily congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address-in-reply on the splendid job they did at that time. I would like to also congratulate the two new cabinet ministers who have been appointed I think since the last sitting of the legislature. I am sure that in filling their positions in these departments they will add to the stature of this government. I would also congratulate the new member from the constituency of Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) who took his seat just recently.

**February 25, 1963**

I think, Mr. Chairman, that this throne speech is a well-balanced document, containing as it does a nice relation between imaginative planning and the outlining of progressive and practical legislation that will be announced later in the session. Now the Liberal press and the Leader of the Opposition have both observed that this speech lacks imagination. I am sure this can be truthfully said that the speech of the Leader of the Opposition was not lacking in that respect. In fact he strayed I think a long way from the area of imagination and got a long way out into the field of exaggeration.

Now the Premier last Wednesday dealt fully with the misrepresentations outlined by the Leader of the Opposition. What I admired about the Premier's speech was the fact that he cut to ribbons most of the misstatements that had been made by the Leader of the Opposition. He did this without displaying any of the rancor and tearing down of personal character that is too often practiced in this house. Some of the members have accused the Premier of a vicious attack on their leader. This was not the case. The devastating attack of the Premier was directed not against the leader of the opposition; it was directed against the practice of misrepresentation and distortion of fact, inside and out of this house, and if the Leader of the Opposition or any of the members of the opposition are feeling embarrassment of any kind, it is not because of any personalities that have been thrown out by the Premier, it is, rather, because of the fact that they have been guilty of the practice in and out of the house, which the Premier so thoroughly exposed.

Much as been said, Mr. Speaker, by former commentators about the unprincipled misrepresentations of some members of the opposition. I really suppose we shouldn't blame them too much for this because if they stuck strictly to the truth they would have very little to say. The truth can be pointed out again and again to these gentlemen and still they persist in these misrepresentations. Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures mean nothing to them. Still they keep operating on the Hitler principle that an inaccuracy told often enough will be believed. We saw an illustration of this the other day when the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) rose. After the Premier's definite proof of the misstatements of the Leader of the Opposition, this man had the effrontery to come into this house and repeat over and over again the same misstatements.

I have a cartoon here taken from the Prince Albert Daily Herald of November 10, 1962 — at the time of the Prince Albert by-election. It shows the Leader of the Opposition seated on a soap box with his right toe in a bandage, and with

the candidate for the constituency of Prince Albert seated on his right knee. The only thing missing in this cartoon, Mr. Speaker, is that fact that the one character should have been twins — this man, the candidate, is named Dave, there should have been one on the leader's left knee called Walter. This cartoon says: "Now, Dave, what are you going to say to the people out there?" Dave says: "Taxes, compulsion, regimentation." "That's good, Dave, and then what are you going to say to them?" "Taxes, compulsion, regimentation." "Excellent, Dave. Now, let's try it again." I thought this was a pretty fitting cartoon to exemplify the mistruths that were so often thrown around at that time.

Stagnation, compulsion, regimentation. Since then they have added another word — high taxes.

I would like to spend a moment or two, Mr. Speaker, in referring to these two or three words that have been bandied about so carelessly. What of these words — stagnation, regimentation, compulsion. Let us take a look at the first — stagnation. How do they support this charge? Let us consider roads for example. Do they think people of this province forget the state of the roads prior to 1944 when they drive over the many excellent highways we have in this province today, which are yearly being improved and added to; roads that we enjoy every time we leave home. Still, after travelling over these roads, they can holler "stagnation". When they look at the extension of electrical power in Saskatchewan since 1944, where power is available to every farm, hamlet, village and city in this province — can they concede what electrical power has done to farm living in this province and still scream "stagnation"? Can they look at the many farms and villages and towns that are now enjoying, for the first time, sewer and water facilities, and still scream "stagnation"? Can they pick up any paper and read of the largest towns and cities in our province enjoying more prosperity than ever before in their history and looking with confidence to the future, can they still shout "stagnation"? Can they consider the expansion of health services in Saskatchewan since 1944, health services which have led the dominion in their coverage and efficiency, and still wail "stagnation"? In industry, in the mining branch for instance, Mr. Speaker, in spite of all their propaganda, can they observe the tremendous increase in the production of oil, of natural gas, of sodium sulphate, and now potash, can they still croak "stagnation"?

The answer to all of these questions, Mr. Speaker, is yes. They still do. No flock of birds were ever more guilty, Mr. Speaker, of fouling their own nests than some of the hon. gentlemen roosting — I beg your pardon — sitting on your left. The same thing applies when using the words regimentation and

**February 25, 1963**

compulsion. To listen to the opposition one would think that every citizen in Saskatchewan was being forced to report to the government daily. Why do they toss such words about without any foundation in fact?

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to refer to just one more of the charges of the Leader of the Opposition regarding administration of medical care. As I remember it, he claimed that doctors were at present leaving the province by dozens, that doctors were being discriminated against, and that there was harassment of doctors in this province. I believe his claims of discrimination and harassment are completely without foundation. I believe that he has yet to make his first attempt to perform any act of service to the health situation in this province. If he had been anxious to ascertain the state of payments by the medical care commission he would have found that, as of February 7, of the 370,000 accounts which have been submitted and which would have required \$3.1 million on the agreed 85 percent basis, \$3 million had at that date been paid. He would have found, as of the same date, a little over 70 percent of the claims of all agencies had been paid. An announcement appeared on Friday evening's Leader-Post that further substantial payments had been made.

I would like to turn, Mr. Speaker, to the question of social aid. I would like to do so if possible without further embarrassment to the hundreds of people in this province who, through no fault of their own, through advancing age, failing health or various other circumstances are forced to take assistance from the public purse. As I say, I would like to say a word or two without further embarrassment to those deserving people.

I wish to inform the opposition and the public that the members on this side of the house are fully aware of the problems relating to social welfare. We realize the necessity of encouraging and maintaining self-reliance in the individual. We are aware of the problems connected with handing an employable man or woman public assistance, but the problem will not be solved by calling a man such names as a deadbeat, a bum, a drunk or a chiseller. It will be alleviated, in my opinion, only when governments at all levels, together with individuals and organizations, recognize and give full consideration to the impact of mechanization and automation in our present-day society. With the machine replacing man at the present rate, measures must be devised that are not now in existence in any country. In the meantime, I think that great credit should be given to both elected and appointed local officials who are dealing at the present with this exceedingly difficult situation.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to take a look at the speech from the throne from the standpoint of mentioned accomplishments as they affect my own constituency. It seems to me this is a fair way to assess the merit of past or future

programs and past or future progress as it is only reasonable to assume that many other constituencies in the province have similar conditions. I think this should be a fair way to assess the situation and see if stagnations is as rampant as the opposition claim.

Let us look at the activities of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation in the Nipawin constituency. First, of course, is the construction of the Squaw Rapids Dam where, for the first time, the waters of the Saskatchewan River will be producing power to take care of the expanding need in the province. Construction of heavy transmission lines to hook up with the provincial grid are being rushed at the present time to accommodate the completion of the power house. The creation of a sizeable lake and its attendant recreational facilities is a story in itself. The promise of another dam upstream some 45 miles at Codette Rapids is a distinct possibility if the demand for power keeps up. Installation of natural gas in the town of White Fox, across the Saskatchewan River from Nipawin and in the village of Codette was completed during the past summer.

I should also mention the power corporation building presently being erected in the town of Nipawin. Timber board planing mills are running to full capacity in the towns of Carrot River and Nipawin. A joint stock company, Agra Developments Limited, have announced that in a month or so their up-to-date plant will be ready for operation. We have high hopes for the success of this venture as the district is well suited for the production of this crop. The Department of Natural Resources have completed a road to the two Indian reserves in the constituency. This will be of tremendous value to the reserves of Red Earth and Shoal Lake, and ties in with the integration of our native people as outlined in the throne speech. The Department of Highways have let the contract for the rebuilding of no. 23 highway from Zenon Park to Carrot River. Provision has been made for a grant to the town of Nipawin to assist in the hard-topping of the streets.

Purchase of debentures have already taken place from the town of Carrot River to the extent of some \$71,000 for assistance in sewer and water installation.

I should mention school grants, Mr. Speaker. The constituents grants paid to the school units in the Nipawin constituency of \$657,709, \$569,461 is operating grant and a capital grant of \$88,348. Nipawin constituency embraces all of the Nipawin school unit except a very small part of the unit which extends into Cumberland and a very small part of the Tisdale unit, and also a narrow part of the Melfort unit.

I would like to mention also the operation of the grid road program for the year in the same constituency. Of the three municipalities in the constituency, rural

**February 25, 1963**

municipality of Moose Range No. 486, \$51,897 grant; the R.M. of Nipawin No. 487, \$29,978; the R.M. of Torch River, a total of \$33,344. I might mention in passing that the two municipalities, those of Torch River and Moose Range, are the two largest municipalities in the province in area and also in rural population.

I should mention a program that has to do with agriculture, and that is the opening of two new community pastures for grazing for this next summer, one at Garrick and the other at Pontrilas.

I have just run over these programs, Mr. Speaker, to show the relation between the speech from the throne and the activities taking place in our constituency. It seems to me that this is a fair indication of the strength of the contents of the speech from the throne. You will notice I have mentioned agricultural activities, the senior citizens' housing, and I forgot to mention the Elks Lodge at Nipawin who are to be congratulated on the opening of a senior citizens' unit — the Elks Lodge of Nipawin sponsored this activity and the government contributed \$30,000 as a grant. In all of these, we have the Department of Agriculture, the senior citizens' housing, the grid roads, the educational activities, sewer and water, power, highways, roads to resources, recreational facilities, and, except for the erection of the Squaw Rapids Dam, I think that this same activity could be applied to every constituency in the province. It seems to me that this — an outline of this picture as it applies to our constituency could be called the speech from the throne in action. I think it is a long way from stagnation.

At this point I want to voice a comment that I have heard on scores of occasions since last summer's medical care crisis, regarding the conduct of our Premier during the trying time. I don't know how many people, but a great number, have commented to me on how they had admired his courage and the way he kept his head at that time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — The steadfast, quiet, even kindly behaviour of this man under what must have been most intolerable circumstances was, I think, an attainment to which very few men ever can hope to rise. His moderation, without sacrifice of principle, on this occasion places him high in the estimation of thousands of people regardless of their political beliefs. Compared to the propaganda antics of the K.O.D. and the Liberal party, his accomplishments and his record shine all the more clearly. When the history of these days is written, the name of Premier Lloyd will stand out for the qualities of courage, of honesty and integrity.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — Now I have outlined some of the things, Mr. Chairman, in the speech from the throne as they apply to our constituency. I wish to again congratulate the mover and the seconder. I wish to report that the people of our constituency are looking forward with hope and confidence in the future, and I wish, finally, to say that I will support the resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. H.R. Dahlman (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to add my words of congratulation before I say anything on this debate to the mover and the seconder of the speech from the throne. I think here we have two men who are beginning to shine as people who have a good future in the political field. These men not only understand what they are talking about but they are also able to present their arguments in a very, very apt way.

I also, Mr. Speaker, want to congratulate the two gentlemen who were brought forward into the cabinet. I am sure that they will add wisdom and dignity to the cabinet, and also they will add a lot of weight, if you look at them.

I also wish to say a few things about the speech by the Leader of the Opposition. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that he has changed just a bit. He was loud, he was quite ferocious, but there was an undertone of gentleness that wasn't apparent before. Now, I just wonder why, Mr. Speaker. You know the one thing that was very outstanding and was missing was this — that he didn't promise to return the cost of power installations to the farmers. You know this was a promise that he felt he could make quite easily without ever having the responsibility of doing it. But this time there must be some feeling there someplace that he might be called upon to be the premier after the next election. You know, here he is making another big mistake. If he would only go out to the country, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that he would find and would become very modest because there is an undercurrent of anti-Liberalism and especially Thatcherism going on in this province today. You know, I believe that that is one reason that he now wants to call a general election now. He thinks he might have a chance. But if we go the full term, he knows perfectly well it is too late, and I believe he made a statement one time — if we can't defeat the government on the medicare issue, we'll never get them out. He won't. He won't get them out. You know there is only one way that you can defeat this government. You can't defeat them by being critical because if you are critical of what this government has done, then you put yourself in a position of being absolutely foolish. You know, the opposite to good is bad, and the opposite to being wise is to be foolish. Well, I think this government has been wise in every endeavor that it has proceeded with.

**February 25, 1963**

Now, I also want to congratulate the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart). He did win that by-election, and I congratulate him for winning it. But the sad part of it is that he didn't win it for the Liberals, oh no, he won it for the Thatcherites. As the member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) stated, I hope that after he has been sitting in this house a while he will change his mind. I think there is one thing that will become apparent to him, and that is that everyone doesn't think the same as his leader sitting on the opposite side. I can think of a few people over there whom I consider true genuine Liberals, but certainly if he wants to follow the role of his leader, he is not going to be a Liberal, he is going to be a Thatcherite. Well, I hope they don't all think alike over there, especially if they think like their leader. So we go on and we hear the little story told by the member from Nipawin (Mr. Perkins) that we had a little baby sitting on somebody's knee and he was repeating — taxes, compulsion, regimentation. Well, who was against taxes? Liberals. Are they? Anybody that is against taxes is against progress, because if the price of civilization is taxes, then I am for it. Isn't there a certain amount of compulsion with taxation? This follows. If we are going to progress and if we are going to involve our society in a way where we are our brother's keeper, where we have regard for the welfare of others, then of course we are going to have to engage in taxation, to provide for the common good. Now, what is so wrong about this?

Regimentation. Is there any regimentation in the fact that we have the only air ambulance in Canada today? You notice that hundreds of people have learned to thank God for these wings of mercy. There is no regimentation here. We do a lot of things that aren't regimentation. Rural electrification — is this regimentation? Hospital services — is this regimentation? You have to pay taxes but it is for the common good. I am sure that a lot of people are glad that this was made compulsory, and I am also certain that a lot of people are going to be glad that medicare was made compulsory. Anything less than that would be insufficient.

Now then, with medicare, this was one of the big steps that was taken in North America, not only in this province but in the whole of North America. But I think that every member in this legislature voted in favor of the principle of its application. But was it worth the organization of the K.O.D. organization to start a civil disobedience campaign in this province, just when we were launching the greatest and the most beneficial program ever attempted in North America. I'm not going to say that the Liberals organized it but certainly Liberals were involved in it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!



**Mr. Dahlman:** — You know civil disobedience campaigns can only succeed if they can create a crisis. Just at a time when people were frustrated and excited and nervous, we had also to submit to this intolerable organization who tried to foster some sort of civil disobedience and a crisis. This, in my opinion, should be to the everlasting disgrace of Liberals.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Dahlman:** — You know they used the same tactics — they are power mad — they used the same tactics in the federal field. They precipitated a national election on the nuclear arms debate, now, of course, they say that this isn't a national issue, but that is why they precipitated the vote of confidence in the house of commons. This they are going to have to admit. I have never seen a group of people so power hungry, and they will stoop to any tactics to bring about the downfall of a government. Medicare, in my opinion, is workable today in its present form — it is only a matter of working it out. I said that last year. You just don't set up a medicare program, you build it and you plan it, and it is in the process of being developed now, the wrinkles are being taken out of the plan. It is only a matter of time until we will have one of the best medicare plans in the world and we should be proud. We shouldn't be running around here trying to bring the government down because they brought in medicare.

If the opposition wanted to do something good, they could be constructive and wherever they see that there is something wrong, some way that they could improve its function this would be something that they should spend their time at. Using private plans are only costly and cumbersome in our opinion, and I think by the time that another year rolls around that these people will begin to realize that they are just paying \$5.00 a year for just plain childishness. We have security for doctors and patients and it is the cheapest possible plan that you could devise. So I think everybody is going to recognize this, Mr. Speaker, and become patient, and satisfied with this plan in one year's time. Both those giving the service and those receiving it. Now then, would low income groups object to paying for medicare by way of ability to pay, our method of taxation in levying money to carry on medicare? I don't think so. But would the average income groups object to the levies that are being made now? I don't think so. I don't hear any complaints. And why would anybody in the high income tax level wish to object to the present form of levying? Certainly they are in a position where they could afford to pay their own, but they can also afford to pay the levies that are now being made on the present basis and formula, and make everybody happy. Certainly in my opinion this is something which we should all be working for instead of sniping and carrying on disobedience campaigns. I know what it is for. The opposition hopes to keep this thing boiling a little bit

**February 25, 1963**

and hope they can stir up and incite trouble and resentment again against the government for the next election. This is all it is for. As a matter of fact I have had good responsible people tell me this.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state why I wish to support this resolution. We have made wonderful progress with the Saskatchewan River Dam development. We were promised in this speech that we will continue the development and construction of this project. We have also been told that we are going to have further development of community pasture and fodder projects. We are going to utilize all our waste land, put it into productive use for the production of livestock and also to assist those who wish to expand their herds and this livestock operations. I think we now have assisted about 6,000 people, farm families, in modernizing their homes with farm water and sewage. We also find that the non-agricultural labor force in Saskatchewan is now in excess of over 200,000.

This is something else again, that here in Saskatchewan we now enjoy the third largest growth in the way of industrial development. It is also gratifying to know that the three western province had a much lower unemployment rate than had the other provinces in Canada. There is only one province that had less and that is the province of Ontario which is, of course, a highly-industrialized province, and Ontario also receives the benefit from the prairie area, especially from Saskatchewan, where this province buys 25 percent of all the farm machinery sold in Canada. So the money earned and spent in this province helps to keep at least the implement and the automobile industry in Ontario going. We also have deposits of helium gas in the province, and I am quite interested in this because we have one of the largest deposits right down at Wood Mountain, which is in our area. We also have Saskatchewan's first steel mill, which is continuing to operate and has the largest contract in its history, and one of the largest in western Canada last year. We also have an increase in the generation of electric power, Squaw Rapids Dam, and with the Saskatchewan Dam coming forth, we are going to have sufficient power for any needs that may arise, and we also have the further extension of gas facilities to the villages and towns. This is something that was very much appreciated out in the country, not only in the saving, but also in the convenience of using natural gas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I see that my time is up. I wish to say once more that, in my opinion, the throne speech was one of the good ones that we enjoyed listening to in this legislature, and promises much for the future of this province.

I shall support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation):** — Mr. Speaker, I too want to extend my heartiest congratulations to the member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) and the junior member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) for so ably moving and seconding the address which we heard a week ago today. I regret very much that I will not be here on Wednesday to vote for the motion. I am committed to be in Porcupine Plains in the MacKenzie constituency which I represented in parliament for so many years, to be on hand when a candidate will be nominated to represent that constituency for the New Democratic Party in Ottawa after the next election.

As social aid has received some critical comments during this debate, I would like to devote all my time this afternoon to discuss this one program of our department. I will have to leave for another occasion references to our program on aid to dependent families, supplementary allowances in the public assistance branch, child welfare, corrections, rehabilitations, housing and nursing homes branch, and the bureau of alcoholism, and the shared programs with the federal government for the aged, the blind and the totally disabled.

After my 11 meetings throughout the province during December and January, which were attended by the mayors, reeves, aldermen, councillors and M.L.A.'s from both sides of the house, I planned on thanking the hon. members from both sides for attending these meetings, for being such good listeners, and for making useful comments and suggestions. I am very sorry that it has been necessary for me to change my speech considerably as a result of comments made by the opposition members.

This past week, Mr. Speaker, we have heard from members comments that are certainly provocative. Hon. members must never forget that the first municipal act passed in Saskatchewan more than fifty years ago clearly placed the responsibility of providing relief, assistance or social aid for those in need on local governments. This wasn't surprising when in the pioneer community people undertook to build a legislative building such as this one and the university buildings in Saskatoon, it was inconceivable that we would ever have a relief problem. Since that time no action has been taken by Liberal, Conservative or CCF governments to deprive municipalities of this fundamental responsibility. During the years of depression and drought, senior governments, first the provincial and then the federal, came to the aid of the municipalities and in more recent years, as a result of automation and mass unemployment, senior governments have not been able to withdraw from assisting municipalities in this field of activity.

**February 25, 1963**

The present social aid legislation was planned by an advisory committee, made up of representatives of S.A.R.M. and S.U.M.A. and representatives of the Department of Social Welfare. I want to pay a tribute to my predecessor in this office, Hon. T. Bentley, who made it clear to both organizations that if this legislation was to be presented to the legislature it must have the unanimous support of both organizations, and this support was forthcoming. I might say to all hon. members, Mr. and Mrs. Bentley, after having lived in various parts of the province, have selected Saskatchewan's finest city — they are living happily in the fair city of Saskatoon.

Both municipal organizations cleared the proposed act and regulations which their membership and expressed complete satisfaction with the proposed legislation before the legislature for approval. It was at that time agreed between the department and the municipal organizations that there would be no changes in this act or regulations, without prior consultation with both municipal organizations. I submit this commitment has been fulfilled. The social aid advisory committee continues to function and meets regularly to review the program and discuss the problem areas. For two full days I have met with our deputy minister and senior officials with the representatives of S.A.R.M. and S.U.M.A. and have found these two-day annual meetings most stimulating.

Hon. members should remember some of the fundamental principles included in our legislation. They are as follows:

Every individual should have a right to social aid when his need for it can be demonstrated, regardless of his race, creed or color. No individual should have to meet a test of moral worthiness in order to receive social aid. Every individual receiving social aid should have a right to plan his own life as he chooses, even though he has lost his financial independence. The privateness of the circumstances of every individual receiving or applying for social aid should be respected. Every individual seeking or receiving social aid should have the right to appeal any decisions concerning his application, if he considers it unjust. Every individual should have the right and obligation to take as much responsibility as he can in seeking a solution to his financial problem. This includes both the finding and holding of employment and the establishment of eligibility for public assistance.

Since the administration of social aid rests on municipal government, municipal council have specific responsibilities. Among these, each municipality must make certain that schedules for their community do meet and provide a

minimum level of health and decency. They must set up local policies regarding establishing eligibility and continuation thereof. These policies deal with such things as utilization of non-essential assets; how vigorously an applicant or recipient must search for employment; the operation of a motor vehicle; and such.

The municipality must appoint a welfare official, who is often the secretary or the clerk, and authorize him or her to deal with applications in accordance with the act and regulations within the framework or whatever local procedures and policies council has enunciated. They must establish a sound two-way working relationship between the elected council and the welfare official. The latter must be able to turn to council or a committee of council as a resource for guidance, and discuss matters of procedure and policy, if necessary. Council likewise must be able to procure information from the official. The Department of Social Welfare strongly encourages council to procure information that is conducive to their becoming familiar with the social aid situation in their community. One means of accomplishing this is to devote part of a regular council meeting . . .

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — On a point of order. I understand that the rules of the house state that a member must not read his speech, and I state here now that the minister hasn't taken his eyes from his paper there or since he got up to speak, except on one occasion that I can remember. I am quite certain that we can read the regulations of the Department of Social Welfare at some other time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! You cannot make a speech on a point of order.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I agree that the minister is staying too close to his notes.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):**— Throw them away.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — I have limited time and I have some very important points, and it has been the practice in parliamentary democracy when a representative of Her Majesty the Queen is making an important statement on public policy that the text can be followed but I can take my eyes up quite easily from the regulations.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — . . . looking at his papers.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — One means of accomplishing this is for the council to devote part of the meeting to consider, in camera, problems in the field of social aid and can receive from the welfare official any information they want.

And then there are procedures for appeals if the citizen is dissatisfied. The appeals can be made if the person is not permitted to apply for aid, or if aid is denied, or if the applicant considers the amount is inadequate, or if the applicant considers that the welfare official has not accorded the citizen the treatment that might be desired.

Hon. members will be interested in knowing that in the 798 municipalities in Saskatchewan which have signed agreements with the government there are normally between 115 and 120 appeals each year. The majority of these appeals are settled at the municipal level. For the fiscal year ending March 31 last only 35 appeals were carried to the provincial social welfare board. This board is comprised of a representative from S.U.M.A., S.A.R.M., the public at large and the Department of Social Welfare. The decisions of this board are final. In the 35 appeals last year, 27 decisions were made at the local level were sustained. The remaining eight were reversed.

Hon. members might be interested in the recording of one of the cases which went to the appeal board, and I will follow my notes for this. This person has for the past year been employed with so many employers for such short periods of time the board members feel that he is indifferent to steady work. Until and unless he shows that he wishes steady employment and makes some effort to obtain and retain employment, board members feel that he is not, in fact, exploring every possibility of self-support. Board members recognize that there are a variety of ways in which this can be accomplished, and the decision, the board decided to uphold the decision of the appeal committee of local government in refusing social aid to this particular applicant because the board felt that he has not produced evidence that he has explored within the limits of his ability every possibility of employment.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say what I said again and again at these regional meetings that I had with mayors, reeves, councillors, that I believe they have conscientiously discharged their duties. The welfare officials have done an excellent job in receiving, processing and deciding on the amount of federal, municipal and provincial funds which should be made available to persons in need of help. May I say again that no one in Saskatchewan received social aid until an application is forwarded to the representatives of the municipality. At these meetings I used a blackboard to show how the dollar which went for social aid was distributed: 7 percent of the dollar was contributed

by the municipality; 51 percent by the provincial government; and 42 percent by the federal government. At one of these meetings a councillor suggested that if the municipalities were paying a larger percentage of the cost, probably fewer persons would be receiving assistance. But I must say that this proposal was not greeted with any enthusiasm, and as you might expect this suggestion came from a municipality where social aid is not a problem.

The hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) objected the other day to my references to the percentage of people in other provinces receiving social aid. Sorry he did not raise this point at the meeting when the representatives of local government would have had a chance to question him. He was a municipal official. There was no reason why he couldn't have made this objection at that time, but he didn't. I might mention that I referred to the annual report of the federal Department of National Health and Welfare. This is the department that is responsible for the federal government's contribution in this field. I tried to point out that, since this was non-political, since there were supporters of all political parties at the meetings, I did say that I didn't think there was any political party in Canada that had an easy solution for this problem. Certainly, there is no province in Canada that can say that no one was drawing social aid in that province. The tables, that I mentioned, give the number of persons in each province receiving public assistance, and I asked my staff to calculate the percentage of the population of the province that this number represented. I said that in Newfoundland, with a Liberal government, they had the highest percentage of their people getting social aid, 11.24 percent; British Columbia, with a Social Credit government, second, 4.94 percent; New Brunswick, with a Liberal government, 4.83 percent; Nova Scotia, Conservative, 3.12 percent; Quebec, 2.95 percent; Manitoba, 2.77 percent; Saskatchewan, 2.25 percent; Prince Edward Island, 1.93 percent; Alberta, 1.84 percent.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Point of order once again. The minister admits he made this speech 11 times at 11 meetings. Surely he can make it without reading it word for word.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) knows very well the minister can make his own speech and you cannot tell him what speech he has to make.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — If you don't enforce the rules of the house, I have a right to object to it, and you haven't. He is reading his speech and it is against the rules of the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Any member can read statistics and he is now quoting statistics of percentages from the Department of National Health and Welfare.

February 25, 1963

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — There is worse coming, Mr. Speaker. The overall average for Canada is 2.84 percent, and I want to say to the legislature what I said to the local government, that these figures were for January 1961, when we normally have an increase in the number of people seeking public assistance in the prairie provinces. We had a slightly lower percentage than Manitoba, slightly higher percentage than Alberta. I do not expect that opposition members will accept this, but these meetings were held because of the general criticism, unfair I think, regarding a program that is designed to help the aged, the young, and the people who aren't able to get work, who aren't eligible for unemployment insurance, who have no other way of living except social aid. And I want to say more than 1,100 mayors, aldermen, reeves, councillors, from all parts of Saskatchewan, in the coldest weather we have had this winter, met with my officials and myself to discuss these problems, and later on I will have time to cite some of the very interesting and helpful suggestions that were brought forth.

And again I want to say that no one in this province receives social aid except through the province, and everybody who receives social aid signs an application, which says as follows:

In the event that I am eligible for social aid, I agree to notify the municipal welfare official (not the provincial government — the municipal welfare official) at the earliest possible time of any change in my, or my spouse's, or my dependents' income, assets, number of dependents, change of address, or any plans of moving from the municipality.

And then there is this declaration:

I \_\_\_\_\_ (giving Christian and surname) do solemnly declare as follows that the above statement and allegations constitute my application for social aid and that the above statements and allegations are true. That I have not concealed or admitted any information respecting the financial conditions of myself, the applicant, or that of my spouse or that of my dependents, and I make this solemn declaration, that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, so help me God.

This must be declared before a Justice of the Peace, a Notary Public or a Commissioner of Oaths.

Mr. Speaker, when anyone says, as the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) said on February 21, that social aid, that the social aid situation of this province is becoming a scandal, he is questioning the honor and integrity of over 4,000 reeves, mayors, aldermen, councillors and welfare



officials in the 798 municipalities in Saskatchewan, and he is questioning the honor of 19,000 unfortunate Saskatchewan citizens who have no way of living and cannot come to this chamber to defend themselves as being in this category. I protest with all the vigor I possess this unfair assault on public-spirited citizens who are doing an excellent job and are unable to speak in this chamber. I am very sorry that the former mayor of Prince Albert, the present member for Prince Albert, did not take the chance at the regional meeting in Prince Albert, when someone in the audience invited him, to say the sort of things he said here, when the present mayor of Prince Albert and the aldermen and the city commissioners were there to defend themselves against such unwarranted charges.

**Mr. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. On a point of privilege. He is misrepresenting the facts. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! That is not a privilege.

**Mr. Steuart:** — But, Mr. Speaker, he is not telling the truth.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Will the member take his seat. That is not a point of privilege or a point of order. That is a debating point which can be debated at a later time if his facts aren't right.

**An Hon. Member:** — It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that you made members on this side withdraw when over there they are certainly not telling . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Steuart:** — He is misrepresenting what happened and he knows it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, there has been a very serious allegation made against the Speaker of this house and I think the member ought to reconsider it even though he is a new member.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, if they give me a chance to prove it I won't have to withdraw it.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

February 25, 1963

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, I now come to the program of the Liberal party as outlined by the Leader of the Opposition on February 19 in this chamber. While he admitted that there are many people in Saskatchewan drawing aid and doing so legitimately, he said:

There is increasing evidence that hundreds of people drawing aid today who are simply not entitled to it. Social aid in Saskatchewan is becoming a provincial scandal. There is evidence that social aid, on an ever-increasing scale, is being given to chisellers, deadbeats, drunks, people too lazy to work, to people who are frequently not even citizens of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, let's have a look at the last charge first: social aid has been given to people who are not even citizens of Saskatchewan. Do I understand that this is the new policy that Lester Pearson is advocating for Canada? Is you are a coal miner from Nova Scotia, where the mine has closed and you are on your way to southern Alberta to find a new job and your car breaks down and you run out of money in Regina, do you starve there or are you shipped back to Nova Scotia, freight collect? Even in the most difficult period during the thirties they had the misfortune, misfortune hit them there and they couldn't get back home. Saskatchewan citizens who require public assistance in every province in Canada receive it, and in this province are not permitted to starve. Do I understand this is now the policy of the Liberal party? This is the first time to my knowledge that any responsible person . . .

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Minister of Public Health):** — Responsible?

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Did I say responsible? That was an error.

. . . has suggested returning to practices which were abandoned in Europe in the sixteenth century. After citing a number of cases to prove that there were hundreds of chisellers, the Leader of the Opposition was kind enough to reply to my request when I asked him to identify these. He said, "Yes, Mr. Minister, I have the names here. I rather hesitate to make them public but as soon as I finish my remarks I will be pleased to give them to you personally". Well now, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of documents here but these aren't the names. I sent a note over to him to say I would like to have them and . . .

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse):** — I gave them to your secretary the next morning. Let's have no nonsense here.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, that's what I was going to say. The hon. member said that I rather hesitate but as soon as I finish my remarks I would be pleased to give them to you personally. This is what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said and I was about to say that at 10 minutes to 12 the next day the hon. member did phone my secretary but she didn't take down the hundreds of names. One would naturally expect that there would be several hundred in this list . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I gave you the ones . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Five cases in the legislature and I . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I can give him as many more as he wants . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition did notify my office that he didn't recall the names of the two that appeared in the Leader-Post but he did supply three names, three names, not three hundred, not three thousand, three names and they weren't from the city of Moose Jaw or from the constituency of Morse — they were here in Regina, all Regina, yes all three from Regina.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — These are the ones I used in my speech.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — The editor of the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix I think was justified in assuming that no one expecting to be in public life long would take advantage of his position in the legislature to say there is increasing evidence that social aid is being given to chisellers, deadbeats, drunks, persons too lazy to work, even to persons who are not citizens of the province, without assuming that the speaker was able to substantiate his claim. The editorial says "these are charges implying what is close to a public scandal". And the editorial said "apparently the Liberal leader is prepared to back up his claim . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — When the minister's estimates come up you bet we'll be prepared to back . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**February 25, 1963**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We've already done . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! You know the rules better than that.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — The editorial says that apparently the Liberal leader . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Wait till your estimates come . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — . . . is prepared to back up his claims that the distribution of social aid is costing the taxpayers more money than it should. Mr. Speaker, I would like to come to these cases.

**Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it not the rules of this house, set down by the former Minister of Social Welfare, that no names can be disclosed when you are referring to social welfare?

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, this is not a point of order.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — It is a point of order that . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, since the Leader of the Opposition has said "social aid in Saskatchewan is becoming a scandal" I expected him to send me the names of these "chisellers, deadbeats, drunks, people who are too lazy to work" from the city of Moose Jaw. Not a case from Herbert, from Morse or Brownleigh. I quote the Leader of the Opposition:

Another case has been drawn to my attention. (by whom? And he identified the place. I am very sorry.) A single woman, a school teacher who says she does not want to teach. This woman was sent by Premier Douglas personally to social aid officials although she had a beach cottage and a car, he ordered her to be put on social aid and since that time she has drawn \$72.50 a month.

My officials have been to City Hall, and I want to thank the city welfare workers for their courtesy and complete co-operation. I want to tell them and every social welfare official in the province how very, very sorry I am that their honesty and judgment has been questioned without a shred of supporting evidence to accompany these charges. There is not a particle of evidence at City Hall, in my office or the Premier's office that the then premier wrote or phoned or talked to anyone about this case. My files have been examined, the files of Premier Lloyd's office have been examined, and the former premier never wrote to anyone. This is simply untrue.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It is true.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — . . . and I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to say outside this chamber that this woman . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I am asking the Leader of the Opposition to call the press after I am through and say to them “This woman was sent by Premier Douglas personally to social aid officials and he ordered her to be put on social aid.” That is all I am asking the Leader of the Opposition to do, to make this statement to the members of the press gallery outside this chamber in which he is immune. If he will not do this, he owes an apology to a very old and sacred institution — parliamentary government, to a former premier of this province, to every mayor, every alderman in the . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — If the minister will come out to this corridor as soon as he’s finished, I’ll make that statement again.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — When I give the details I will ask this house whether this woman should be described as belonging to this group of “chisellers, deadbeats, drunks, people who are too lazy to work”. This woman is well trained and had some excellent references throughout her teaching career until her health failed at the end of the school term in 1960. She lived on her savings until June 1961. She had been left a cottage at the lake, which the Leader of the Opposition identified but I will not, and during the summer of 1961 she took ill and came to Regina for medical attention which he received. She was referred to a specialist as she was having very serious migraine headaches occurring every second week — the drugs that she had to buy, the medical services used up all her resources that she had been able to save during her career as a teacher. Since the lady was not well enough to resume teaching in the fall of 1961, who was referred to our rehabilitation branch. She was most upset. When the life savings of her parents and herself had all gone for drugs, medical services and she was not a bit better, and she was unable to maintain school teaching, she was advised to spend as much time as possible with her professional friends in the city, to concentrate on getting well again — not to worry about receiving public assistance. She had been assured that federal, provincial and municipal funds were available to assist just such a case as this. Mr. Speaker, I submit that never in the legislature of any province in Canada, in any parliament in the Commonwealth, has a leader of a political party stooped to such a low, to try to besmirch a former premier

**February 25, 1963**

of this province, to identify a sick woman so that her many friends will hear her described by the Leader of the Opposition of Saskatchewan as one of the “chisellers, deadbeats, drunks, people who are too lazy to work”. I appeal to the four teachers who are Liberal members of this legislature to demand an immediate apology from their leader for making such an unwarranted attack on a sick member of their profession.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Now I come to the second case. This family applied for aid in the city of Regina, and again any criticisms that were made are directed to the elected mayor and aldermen of Regina and their efficiency. This family came to, applied for aid on December 29, 1961. May I mention again that the only way anyone in Saskatchewan can secure aid is at the municipal office. The family at this time . . .

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — . . . had a late model car which was half paid for and \$154 in the bank. The husband took very severely ill but the city withheld granting aid until the \$154 in the bank was utilized. They did grant temporary assistance early in January pending exploration of the sale of the car. Aid was continued to this family, with adjustments made for the husband being in and out of hospital on several occasions until he died in October 1962. Early in January the widow was interviewed regarding her continued eligibility and may I say to the credit of the city of Regina that, in addition to requiring the declaration I mentioned before, everyone who receives social aid is required each month to state that there has been no change and on account of the death this woman wasn't visited in December as she normally would have been. When they came in January it was disclosed that she had received \$10,000 worth of insurance in November, 1962. Aid was discontinued immediately because of the fact that the woman accounted for the money having all been spent. This case was appealed to the city appeal board. The city appeal board sustained the decision of ineligibility and the case is presently coming before the provincial appeal board and it would not be appropriate for me to say more but I think it shocking that the Leader of the Opposition will use the material in a confidential file of this sort to misrepresent a case which reflects on the city of Regina but not our department. May I say that in the original application no mention was made of an equity in this insurance policy and those who issue social aid in the 700 municipalities in the province assume that the citizen is honest till he is proven to be dishonest. Hon. members will be making out their income tax returns in the next few weeks and the federal government assumes that we tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but

the truth. Occasionally someone is discovered who has not told the truth and he is in trouble but those who issue social welfare do accept the fact that people do tell the truth, and if the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else has information where people have given false information this should be conveyed to the municipal officials. This is fundamental.

The last case involved a family of a man, a wife and 11 children, ranging in age from 15 years to seven months. The family had been referred to our department by the public school attendance officer that neglect appeared to be apparent. The family is known to the public health nurse because of suspected malnutrition. But there wasn't any evidence that there was neglect and so our department had no further responsibility for this case. As the Leader of the Opposition said, this family does have land but I'll not identify the community. They were living in Regina part of the year. On June 12, 1961 an emergency grant of \$10 was given pending a finalization of this case, particularly regarding ability to borrow money on grain stored on the farm. The application was refused when it was ascertained that this resource was available. The wife applied for social aid on September 26 because her husband was in hospital, because the grain had previously been sold and further, because there had been no crop harvested during the 1961 season. Minimal aid was granted for the latter part of September, October and November until December 13. On that date it was ascertained that the husband was working during the Christmas rush at the post office and aid was discontinued. Shortly after a wheat board payment also was received by the family and the confirmation of non-eligibility was passed on to the family. On January 5 the family sent in a letter in which they appealed the decision of the social service department, of Regina of course. When the department wrote a lengthy letter outlining the reasons and the policy regarding the refusal of aid, the man obtained a loan and thus withdrew his appeal and no further aid has been granted. It should be noted that this family had received aid in the fall of 1961 in somewhat the same manner as a large number of families did throughout the province until wheat board payments and subsequent prairie farm assistance payments were available but the family has not had any aid since December 13, 1961. The report makes no mention of a Cadillac car and I submit that the city welfare officials have followed the act and the regulations scrupulously and there was no justification whatever for the Leader of the Opposition raising the point he raised.

So, Mr. Speaker, if there is increasing evidence that there are hundreds of people drawing social aid and who were simply not entitled, social aid is becoming a social scandal, this is evidence that social aid on the ever-increasing scale has been paid to chisellers, drunks, people who are too lazy to work, people who are frequently not even citizens of Saskatchewan. The first cases mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition were dealt with quite adequately by the Attorney General the other day when he pointed out that this was clearly a responsibility for the city authorities.

**February 25, 1963**

I must thank the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) for asking the question the other day — how many persons in Saskatchewan receiving social aid, December 1, 1961, December 1, 1962. The answer appeared in this morning's Leader-Post. December 1 a year ago there were 24,377; December 1, 1962, 19,772; a reduction of 4,603 persons. This question and answer prove conclusively that municipal officials are doing an excellent job in administering public funds. Citizens of Saskatchewan are proud people and do not seek social aid because they are chisellers, deadbeats, drunks, people who are too lazy to work.

Surely the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) knows that in 1961 we had the poorest crop since 1937, and people who had never received public assistance before, and hope that they will never need it again, were obliged to seek social aid if they were not to starve.

Again, I want to congratulate the municipal welfare officials throughout the province and the 4,605 citizens who were obliged to seek public assistance a year ago who were self-supporting in December, 1962. 1961 was a very bad year but it is remarkable how quickly we bounce back. Even the sale of alcoholic beverages fell off in 1961. The hon. member for Prince Albert said last year that as many as 27,000 people on social aid, at a cost of \$6 million, and we have little or nothing to show for it. He and the Leader of the Opposition apparently think it would be a cheaper and better policy to let people starve. I ask hon. members to compare expenditures in Saskatchewan for the three years for two items — social aid and sale of alcoholic beverage. In 1959/60, total expenditures to social aid \$4.1 million.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! State the point of order.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The hon. minister said that members of the Liberal party would just as soon let . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! That is not a point of order.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No, I am going to speak. He said that we would like to let people starve, well that simply isn't true, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Sit down, will the hon. member sit down.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No, I'll sit down when I make my point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! That is not a point of order. You are . . .



**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, it certainly is, Mr. Speaker.

**Premier Lloyd:** — The Speaker is on his feet. The hon. member, out of courtesy, ought to take his seat when the Speaker asks him.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, you boys on that side don't do it. You think it's fine for you boys to stand up.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! You cannot enter the debate again a second time and call it a point of privilege.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The minister made a statement, Mr. Speaker, which is simply . . . on my point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, you won't listen to my point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Because you don't have a point of order.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, let me — listen to me.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Sit down, take your seat. A point of order must pertain to the rules of the house and your comments pertain to the debate and not to the rules of the house.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, very respectfully, the minister has made a statement which cast reflection on every member of our party and we simply are not going to accept it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! There are lots of opportunities to come back in the debate for members who have not yet spoken.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I brought this up twice and you don't pay any attention to points of order. The minister is still reading, and continues to read, and who knows who wrote this for him. He certainly didn't because he couldn't write that kind of a speech, and he can't read it very well either.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I agree that the minister was staying really too close to his notes. And he has been quoting a lot of statistics and I have allowed a lot of latitude in this house to members on both sides.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — I am sure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will be interested in these figures regarding alcoholic consumption — they will not be controversial. I was merely going to say that for 1959-60, we paid \$4.1 million for social aid and \$43 million on a voluntary basis for alcoholic beverages. The next year social aid was up to \$5.7 million, alcoholic beverages up to \$46.5 million, in 1961-62 social aid up to \$6 million, alcoholic beverages dropped on account of the poor crops to \$45.1 million, but so long as citizens of this province are able, on a voluntary basis, to pay \$9 - \$10 for liquor which injures them and the community, they should not complain too much about paying \$1 through taxes to the municipal, provincial and federal government to assist the needy in the community who are unable to find jobs and have no other way of remaining alive unless public assistance is made available through charity or taxes.

Mr. Speaker, “social aid in Saskatchewan is becoming a provincial scandal”, so says the Leader of the Opposition. Proof? A well-trained teacher too sick to teach draws \$72.50 per month for her room, clothing and food. If we made him Premier of Saskatchewan, we will set Saskatchewan social aid recipients back to where they were the last time the Liberals were in office. Let me tell the house that if it had not been for the callous attitude of relief inspectors when Conservatives and Liberals were in office prior to 1944, it would never have been possible for the poor people of Saskatchewan, with their bare hands, to be able to upset the very powerful Liberal machine. Let me tell the house that I have on my desk a very interesting directive which went from Mr. W.W. Dawson, the director of relief to municipal secretaries on October 1, 1937. He said, “Re: Clothing. Every possible effort should be made to interest voluntary community organizations to provide good used clothing.” Hon. members will note this clothing must meet two tests — it should be good, it should have been used, before being made available to relief recipients. However, and I quote:

If it is impossible to provide assistance through such channels, this bureau will contribute to clothing assistance on the following basis. One person \$14, two persons \$25.50, three persons \$35.

Oh, you are saying, he is pretty generous. The member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) is right, not per month, per year. These were the allowances. We had larger families in Saskatchewan in those days and so the schedule goes up to 20 persons in the family. A family of 20 could have \$140.00 for clothing if, of course, they couldn't get good used clothing free, on a charity basis. The next paragraph says:

It should be borne in mind that the above are maximum schedules and approval must not be granted for these amounts where a lesser amount will take care of the urgent

requirements of the applicant. The bureau will refuse payment for any order for clothing if it is in excess of this schedule.

Ah! this is really choice.

Hired help is not considered as a dependent on the employer for clothing. Grown sons and daughters, while dependent insofar as food issues are concerned, are in a great many cases not dependent on their parents for clothing.

Mother and Dad are not expected to let them starve, but if they are too old to go to school, no reason why gunny sacks and old togs should not be adequate.

And then I have the food schedule. December 1, 1937. These are rurals: one person, for food — \$7.85 per month; five in family, five persons — \$20.00 per month; ten in family — \$32.45. If you live in an urban locality, allowances were slightly more generous.

And then again the Premier referred to the callous attitude of the relief officer during the last time the Liberals were in office. The first time I spoke in the house of commons — I note now that we are off the air that everyone is quite relaxed and we won't have so many interruptions — the first time I spoke in the house of commons, I referred to the very difficult conditions in north-eastern Saskatchewan where my family and I had been living for many years, and I referred particularly to the World War I veterans who, after making the world safe for democracy, went back to Saskatchewan's new frontier where they were able to get 160 acres of fine bush land for \$10.00, and the then Minister of Labour, who was responsible for the federal unemployment relief, was really quite a fine gentleman, and apparently he was quite moved by what I said and he was good enough to send one of his officials out to Saskatchewan to investigate these cases and other cases which were brought to his attention. The minister was kind enough to supply me with a copy of the report, which I have here, marked confidential; it will soon be 25 years old and I think by that time it is probably in order to make it available in the archives, but I think the hon. members might be interested in this one case where a member of the legislature accompanied the inspector from Ottawa, and they both supplied me with comments on this case. Here is a World War I veteran, with his wife and one child, who had gone north as a result of the drought, and I read this from the report:

They had been on relief continuously for food at \$12 per month, except just lately when it was raised to \$12. Since going to the homestead, the branch had supplied them with building

**February 25, 1963**

materials for a good house, stove, tools of all kinds, two cows, a team of horses, harness, feed, sleighs, wagon, plow, harrows, and he had broken about ten acres of land. Last of all, we also issued a small clothing order of \$18.

Considering the monthly food order and the fact that he had some outside earnings, we are honestly of the opinion that there was no undue hardship whatsoever. When one considers that a year ago this family had absolutely nothing, now they are ready to start a new home, we believe that they should consider themselves fortunate. It is true that we reduced the monthly food order slightly this spring, but that is due to the cows freshening and the garden coming in. This is a case where we have no excuse to offer whatever.

So said the inspector from Ottawa.

What did the M.L.A. say. Well, in his report, he also checked to see how things were in the house and the good lady reported that they had about 25 pounds of flour, about four pounds of sugar, about two pounds of lard, and some tea and coffee, a little bit; they had no milk, they had no meat, they had no potatoes, no eggs, no butter, no fruit, no syrup or honey. They were short of clothing; for bedding they had two blankets, three sheets, a quilt, an over-quilt, no mattress, but through the rosy colored spectacles of the man who had come from Ottawa, "this is a case where we have no excuse to offer whatsoever".

Mr. Speaker, these were the conditions that resulted in Canada finding herself in 1941, when the Minister of National War Services reported in the house of commons, as a result of the finding when the first 200,000 — 209,298 young Canadians in the prime of life were called for military service. What did they find? 44.1 percent were rejected for military service because they could not meet the physical requirements established by the government of Canada.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if hon. members opposite wish to antagonize a great many people, just continue to advocate getting back to the good old days when . . .

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — Good old days?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No one has.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — I was interested in some of the views that the Leader of the Opposition himself had when he and I were members of the parliament of Canada, back in 1952, when the people over 70 were getting a little break, it wasn't too big, but it was \$40 a month to everyone over 70. The present Leader of the Opposition said:

The estimates of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (that was his friend Paul Martin who went down to the banquet with him the other night) are going to be increased this year by \$225 million, mainly because of pension payments which were introduced last session. They were paying old age pensions to every Canadian over the age of 70 without a means test. That measure passed this parliament unanimously, and I was one of the members that was for it, but I must admit I'm beginning to wonder if certain modifications to the act might not be desired. We have had this scheme now for four months, and I can't help doubting the wisdom of paying old age pensions to Canadians who are wealthy and have no need of it.

The hon. member can interrupt me now to indicate whether he still . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I indicated a means test for people earning \$5,000 a year or more. I still think that way.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Yes, that makes it quite clear. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition I presume is the only member of this legislature who would now advocate and would say that should there be a Liberal government in Ottawa, they will introduce the means test, that no one over 70 will get assistance without a means test. As long as it is clear that is fine.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I said \$5,000 a year or more.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — That is it. There will be a means test to find out just how much flour you have.

**Mr. Steuart:** — How about a means test now?

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Jimmy Sinclair said "you want a means test, in other words", and just let me continue, "you want a means test". Well, a little later, in 1959, his pal, Hazen, was asking that family allowances be increased; and that was a sound proposal.

**February 25, 1963**

Family allowances were introduced following World War II as a sound principle for redistributing national wealth on the theory that those with big families were helping to build up a country and they should have something special, and one Tory and the present Leader of the Opposition are the only two members I've ever heard about who have offered objections to family allowances. Here is what he said, this was when his room-mate, Hazen Argue, his present pal, had cleared with caucus a resolution to increase the allowances so that in 1955 a family of five children would be able to buy as much bread and butter and milk as they could in 1945 when the legislation was passed.

And here is what Mr. Thatcher said on the 23rd day of January, 1955 — it is almost an anniversary:

Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance that I feel obliged to comment on this motion. If a vote should come, I feel I must vote against the proposal, even though it is introduced by my friend and colleague (and room-mate he might have added) the hon. member for Assiniboia. I should like to make it crystal clear that I support the principle of family allowances, and I am convinced that family allowances are making a real contribution to the well-being of the nation. I hope, moreover, the day will come when we can increase the level of these allowances. However, in my opinion, such a proposition is neither realistic nor practical today. I hope . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — With about three hundred million, we just couldn't afford it that year. I was all for it when we could afford it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I'm not for it if we can't afford it.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — May I ask the Leader of the Opposition whether now when with a very sizeable deficit if, by some misfortune, there should be a Liberal government, they would take the view that there can't be any more money for the children and we have to apply the means test . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Thatcherism.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You have your supplementary old age pension means test here in Saskatchewan. You have the worst means test of anybody I have ever heard of in Canada.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Will the hon. member sit down and remain in his seat. He is neither rising on a point of privilege or point of order. It is pure interruption.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — We are off the air now, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I don't care whether we are off the air or not. I must insist on the rules in this house.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Thank you very much. I have one more quotation from a Liberal who was one of my colleagues in the house of commons many years ago. I ask my friend whether he is proud of this statement. Here was Dr. Blair, Liberal member.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — He was Conservative. He doesn't know the difference.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — There is no difference. Can't tell the difference. Dr. Blair was a Liberal member. No difference really. Here is what Dr. Blair said on the 18th day of April, 1939:

I have a large number of men working with me all the time and I have sympathy with them.

Dr. Blair, in addition to having a very big practice, also had large farming operations down near my old home.

But when I go to your city bums on the street I cannot get a man in 50. You might think you could, but just you go and hire some of these yaps on the street and you will see what you have got. In the country I get men that work fine, but I can't when I pick up these travelling transients. I give rides up and down the road in my car, not as many as I did a few years ago, not so many. I question them, 'Do you want a job on a farm?' the answer is no.

Mr. Speaker, these bums and yaps a year late were in the army, the air force and the navy. They became the heroes overnight, but because they were unable to get jobs, because they moved around from place to place, they were referred to as bums. This Dr. Blair wasn't there after 1945. He wasn't able to get elected again after making such offensive statements. It was the other Dr. Blair, Progressive Conservative from Lanark who was there in the days when the Leader of the Opposition was in the house of commons. This was a Liberal member — you will find in the reference on page 290 in the Hansard for 1939.

**February 25, 1963**

Well, coming back to some of the comments made during the debate, the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) offered some objection to the fact that he and the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) were not invited to speak at these meetings and I extend to him my apology. Actually, these meetings started out to be on a constituency basis, and the first two and the last were arranged; the last one was to accommodate my colleague, the Provincial Treasurer who was tied up all during the months of November and December with his new duties as provincial treasurer, so that the first two in Touchwood and Melfort-Tisdale were on a constituency basis and it was only right that the members for the constituencies should be given a chance to welcome the reeves, councillors, mayors and welfare officers from their constituencies. But it was decided that since we were going on a regional basis, if we could have greetings from the mayor of the city where we were meeting, or if one of my cabinet colleagues was good enough to travel from here to Swift Current on one of the coldest days in the winter, that it was an act of discourtesy if we didn't give him a chance to welcome the delegates. But I should say that the first meeting on a regional basis was held in the city of Regina, the Minister of Labour provided for us the auditorium in the Workmen's Compensation Board, the lady member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) and a great many members of the legislature were there.

If we had all the M.L.A.'s give a five minute talk it would have taken an hour and I think that most hon. members agreed that the meetings were called to give the people at the grass roots a chance to make their comments. However, I do apologize to the member for Rosthern and the member for Prince Albert, and I assure them that no offence was intended. The last meeting held at Tisdale was to serve the Kelsey and the Nipawin constituencies out at the north-east, and it was only proper that the two M.L.A.'s representing those constituencies on a very cold day should have a chance to tell their neighbors and friends that they appreciated their coming out to this gathering.

The member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) made some reference to the fact that the premiers of the provinces of Canada have had some discussion about work for aid. Now, a great deal of consideration has been given.

**Mr. Cameron:** — The member from Humboldt isn't right.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Your notes are wrong, should have been Rosthern.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — I am sorry, that should have been Rosthern (Mr. Boldt). I apologize. I think that it is quite understandable that in a community, where the wage earner is working for low wages and is having trouble balancing his budget, that it is annoying to see someone down the street who isn't working, can't get work, receiving social aid.



Now at these meetings there were questions asked, "Are the schedules too high? Are they too low?", and at two of the meetings two welfare officers said they are too high, but right after an elected member said "It's pretty obvious these men haven't the family responsibilities some of the rest of us have." And I say this to the Leader of the Opposition, if he thinks that \$72.50 is too much for one person to have on social aid in the city of Regina, he should try living on it for a month. He should secure some place where he can have his room and do light housekeeping and not draw on any of his other resources, and come back to us and tell us that on \$75.00 a month I have been able to get my room, my food, my clothing, and everything.

My colleague, the Minister of Public Health, representing the Premier at a conference last summer when premiers were meeting, was asked to comment on some of the press reports at the time, and here is an extract from one of his letters:

I did not see the news reports of the type mentioned, but I can understand how they might have arisen from the discussion. I should say at once that Saskatchewan and few of any of the other provinces took the view that welfare recipients should be made to work in order to entitle them to welfare payments. The discussion arose out of the well-known problem of federal sharing for welfare payments, or unemployment assistance as it is called. As you know, the federal government will share the costs of such payments made to welfare recipients by a province, but will not share the cost if a province establishes some program which provides gainful employment for potential welfare recipients, and thereby reduces welfare costs by providing employment. There was general agreement that this situation had undesirable aspects since it was clearly preferable that people be provided with jobs, rather than welfare payments. Premiers expressed the view that it was better for governments to initiate employment-making projects than to make welfare payments. Better for the community and for the individual recipients. It is out of this decision that erroneous reports must have arisen, suggesting that all welfare payments should be conditional upon recipients doing work as required by welfare agencies. This is not the idea being considered, rather was it that governments should find a mechanism for providing job opportunities, both generally and through specific programs such as winter-work programs as a substitute for social welfare payments to the unemployed.

But this question came up at our regional meetings and it is a very real problem, and hon. members might be interested in some of the problems we discussed at these 11 meetings.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I have a question on this point, I am still not quite clear from what he has said as to the position of the department. If a man is applying for social aid, if a job is available and he turns that job down, what is the attitude of the department under those circumstances.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, again this is one of the duties at the municipal level. This appeal case that I mentioned was a case where the municipal people refused to give assistance because they believed that this individual had not explored the opportunities to work. This is a decision made at the municipal level, the municipal councils can decide that no one getting social aid can drive a car. At one of the meetings, one of the councillors said, “Our municipality has taken the view that nobody who drives a car will get social aid.” I said, that is a decision that is quite right. Immediately someone from a rural municipality said, “We have people ten miles from town getting social aid. They have no horses, no way of getting out except by car, and we think we must not deny people aid merely because they have some distance to come to town.” So in that particular municipality they have decided that it will not be required that the individual turn in the car licence. And our department reviewed the procedures with various municipalities; we insist that municipalities have the same rule for all the people. They can't have one rule for the good people, and another for the bad people, and quite a number of these appeals that I have mentioned — I read them all — these appeals where the final appeal board, which has a representative of S.U.M.A., S.A.R.M. and our department, have decided in favor of the local municipality, which has denied aid because the individual has refused to take the assistance that is . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Excuse me, Mr. Minister, might I ask a question?

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that we are not in committee of supply, and I have permitted quite a few questions, and I have a number of my items left. I will be glad to take further questions when my estimates are before the house, or when our public accounts are before us.

The question of rehabilitation came up again and again. What leadership has the government given in developing a rehabilitation approach to social aid in this province? The type of training for under-educated people, work conditioning, which might be considered. If trained, will work be available? What is being done for unemployables? What are the plans for rehabilitation in Saskatchewan? This question of whether the person has tried for work or not also comes up.

As I mentioned before, I would like to pay tribute to the municipalities for the constructive and imaginative work that is being done in trying to move people from the social aid fields to employment. And I think one of the outstanding work in the Meadow Lake area — again I am sure that the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) will want to correct the erroneous information that he gave regarding this community. I understand that the report that he was reading from was written by a former Liberal member of his chamber whose views are naturally colored.

But I want to say that in the Meadow Lake area, we have an excellent example where the town and three rural LID's around have set up a program — and hon. members might be interested in knowing that there has been a very interesting change since they have introduced this program — for August, 1961 there were 822 individuals receiving social aid in the town and the three LID's; a year later this number was reduced by 44, the total expenditures were reduced from fourteen thousand two, to nine thousand seven. For the month of September there was a reduction from 883 . . .

**Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern):** — Point of order.

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

**Mr. Boldt:** — I want to ask the minister a question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is not a point of order. You cannot rise on a point of order to ask a question.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — For the month of September there was a reduction from 883 to 662; the month of October from 805 to 610. And I want to thank the hon. member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) for the excellent leadership he has provided in the community, in having the public appreciate the very difficult problems in that area. I recently had the pleasure of meeting His Worship the Mayor and the council, and I want to thank them for giving such high priority to this particular type of problem. And I also might mention that at Nipawin they have done an excellent job. The figures for Nipawin are before me here but time is running on. One of the councillors from Nipawin, who attended the regional meeting, raised a very interesting point. He said that some of their taxpayers were thinking that maybe they spend too much time and energy in trying to get jobs for people on social aid, would not the senior levels of government be well advised to recognize that this should be a part of the program which they should share in. Many of their people think that it would be much cheaper for them to issue social aid since they are only paying 7 percent of the bill. This is a proposal which I presume will be coming up at the annual meetings of S.A.R.M. and S.U.M.A.

**February 25, 1963**

Sorry that the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) is not in his place when I pay a tribute to the mayor, the councillors and the city commissioner, and those in the welfare department. They have given me a report on one, two, three, four, five, six, seven very interesting cases which have involved a great deal of work and where some very remarkable accomplishments have averaged out. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that members opposite will persuade their leader to apologize publicly for the unfair attacks he has made on the people in this province who have been compelled to go to their municipal welfare officers to give a full statement disclosing all their assets and liabilities, and have agreed to notify the welfare officer regarding any changes which might take place, and, in conclusion, I want to pay a special tribute to the welfare officials. Theirs is a most difficult position. At one of the meetings where the question of — what about the man who spends his money on liquor before he brings home the groceries. And the answer to that is hold it. The welfare officials must see that the money is spent for what it is intended and if it isn't going for the groceries and the clothing, he can appoint a trustee or he can pay the money to the wife. It was said to me that these are tough decisions to make in a small community, why can't you have one of your officials come out and make these tough decisions, and my reply was — well, this is part of the deal; the municipalities take the responsibility for deciding who will receive public assistance and you must not ask the provincial government to move into a field which by constitution is the responsibility of the municipalities.

Well, again, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I will not be able to vote for the motion but if I were here I would certainly be supporting the motion and voting against the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, in entering this debate, I wish to join with my colleagues in welcoming to the ranks of the opposition and to this house the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) and the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart), and to congratulate them both. Their long and successful records of public service and their wide experience make them invaluable assets in the people's battle against government centralization and bureaucracy, and in our struggle for the preservation of local self-government.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words in regard to the constituency which I have the honor to represent in this house. I refer to the provincial constituency of Saltcoats. We have within that constituency one of the densest agricultural populations in the province of Saskatchewan. We are justifiably proud of the intensive agriculture which is

carried on in our area. In addition to normal cereal production we have many producers of registered seed, both of grains and of grasses. In addition to the general production of livestock, cattle, hogs, poultry, etc., we have many producers of registered livestock who have, down through the years, I think it is generally recognized, been most successful. Their success at shows in the province of Saskatchewan and exhibitions all over Canada attest to this fact. Farmers in our area pioneered turkey production by the hatchery method. We have four creameries in our area and since pioneer days our farmers have poured an unending stream of agricultural wealth into the economy of the province of Saskatchewan. Now, to add to our agricultural wealth, we find within the confines of the provincial constituency of Saltcoats, the world's largest producer of refined potash — a \$40 million mining refining development with a potential production of 1.2 million tons per annum of refined products valued at \$25 million per year. This new development is adding to the economic diversification of our area. It has led to increased urbanization and the modernization of the multiple communities serving our agricultural and mining area. We are justifiably proud of our agricultural production, Mr. Speaker. We are also proud to have become overnight the potash capital of the world, and we look forward with anticipation and hope to further development.

Mr. Speaker, before dealing further with our potash development, I should like first to deal briefly with a matter which was raised at the last regular session of the house, at which time I introduced a resolution, seconded by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane), seeking the establishment of a veterinary college at our University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon. At that time our resolution received the unanimous support of all the members of this chamber and has since then received massive support from public bodies, representative of all the people of our province. Since submitting the resolution at the last regular session, the proposed veterinary college has received support from public bodies all across our province representative of all the people of our province. The Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association has approved the city of Saskatoon as a location for a faculty of veterinary science, as reported in their brief to the government of September 14, 1962. Repeatedly the executive of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities has passed resolutions and forwarded them to the government, seeking the establishment of a faculty of veterinary science at our university. At the last regular convention of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, a motion was passed seeking the establishment of such a college. The 38th annual meeting of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, as reported in the Western Producer of November 22, 1962, endorsed the idea. The Saskatchewan Farmers' Union annual convention, as reported in the Western Producer of January 17, 1963, also endorsed the proposal of the establishment of a veterinary college at the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon. And in the Saskatchewan

**February 25, 1963**

Farmers' Union brief to the government of the province of Saskatchewan recently submitted, they urged the establishment of a veterinary college at Saskatoon. The Saskatchewan Cattle Breeders Association on January 24, as reported in the Western Producer, also endorsed the establishment of a faculty of veterinary science at our university. The Saskatchewan Agricultural Graduates Association at Farm Home Week in 1963, as reported in the Western Producer, supported the idea. Five Saskatchewan regional livestock associations, as reported in the Leader-Post of December 16, 1962, gave their support to the proposal. Resolution no. 9, page 15, of the Saskatchewan Trustees' Association brief to the government of June 8, 1962, sought the establishment of a veterinary college at the University of Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan Livestock Board, meeting in Saskatoon on January 25, 1963, as reported in the Western Producer, also lent their support to the proposal. The Saskatchewan Agricultural Society Association meeting at Saskatoon during Farm and Home Week also endorsed it.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing indicates massive support for a veterinary college in our own province and at Saskatoon. I would also like to draw to the attention of all hon. members of the house that the Saltcoats Liberal Association in their annual meeting held in the provincial constituency of Saltcoats and representative of people from all walks of life — farmers, townspeople and miners in the provincial constituency — also unanimously passed a resolution seeking the establishment of a veterinary college in Saskatoon, with the instruction after they had passed the resolution that it be forwarded to the annual convention of the provincial Liberal association at Saskatoon with the hope that it would be included in the platform of the Saskatchewan Liberal party. And I am very happy to report to all members of the legislature who show any interest whatsoever in our livestock, and I notice that the Minister of Agriculture is doing more giggling than anybody else, I am glad to report to the house that when that resolution was presented to the agricultural committee of the Liberal party convention in Saskatoon it passed that committee unanimously; it went from there to the floor of the convention where it was supported unanimously by people from all walks of life, and from all across the province of Saskatchewan. Now I am happy to say that it has become part of the platform of the Liberal party.

The Minister of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan can display his ignorance of the problems of livestock men and he can display his disinterest in the problems of livestock producers by sitting in his chair and giggling to his heart's content. I am glad he is happy because I tell him right now that a man with a sick cow and no veterinary service doesn't feel very happy. He is feeling most unhappy.

I want to quote from the Leader-Post of September 4, 1962, and I hope the Minister of Agriculture is paying attention:

Lack of facilities will prevent many of the 16 students who took pre-veterinary courses at the University of Saskatchewan last year from completing their training in Canada, it was learned. Two officials in veterinary education said in an interview that the conditions point out the immediate need for another veterinary college in Canada. Dr. T. Lloyd Jones, principal of the Ontario veterinary college at Guelph, said a very limited number of students who have taken a pre-veterinary course at certain universities are admitted and they must have advanced standing. Dr. Robert Connell, director of veterinary science at the University of Saskatchewan, said it would only be a matter of time before western students would be excluded completely from the Ontario college.

I am pleased to note that the Minister of Agriculture has finally ceased laughing.

In the light of this statement, Mr. Speaker, I regret that there is no mention by the government of any proposed action in the speech from the throne. I wish now to quote from the Leader-Post of September 26, 1962:

Dr. E.E. Carlson, head of the health of animals branch of the federal Department of Agriculture, said in Regina no further progress has been made towards the building of a veterinary college in the west although we are still trying for one. There are a large number of students in Saskatchewan who wish to attend the college but find it impossible to do so because the only one at present is in Ontario. If a young man wishes to take up the veterinary profession he must go to Guelph or to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that young people are being frustrated and unable to follow their chosen profession due to lack of adequate facilities in our province and I most strongly urge the government to take action at an early date. I wish to quote from the Western Producer of September 27, 1962.

Dr. William Turnbull, past-president of the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association, speaking at Saskatoon again cited an urgent need for a veterinary college in Canada. He noted that to the best of his knowledge 34

**February 25, 1963**

Saskatchewan students had been denied entry to Canada's single English-speaking college at Guelph, Ontario. Dr. Turnbull thinks Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, could be the location for Canada's second English-speaking veterinary college. According to recent reports, the area around Saskatoon will become a major centre of the cattle industry upon the completion of the South Saskatchewan Dam. Another reason for locating the college in Saskatchewan, said Dr. Turnbull, is the serious shortage of veterinarians in that province.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Turnbull is an eminent Canadian authority and he endorsed Saskatoon as a logical place to put a veterinary college. As all hon. members know, it is necessary that there be a high livestock population adjacent to a veterinary college in order to provide a sufficiency of practical study material for students. The South Saskatchewan irrigation Development guarantees the requisite concentration of livestock close to Saskatoon.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

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

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — I wonder if the point of order the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) raised earlier would apply to this speaker?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think it applied equally well both ways.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, as all hon. members know very well, I have always used copious notes and followed them closely. I also understand that when one is using quotations they should be followed verbatim. That I am endeavoring to do. Now, Mr. Speaker, just to settle the argument once and for all time I intend to table the notes that I have already used and after this sitting is over hon. members may peruse them and if any hon. member on the other side of the house can make a speech such as I have made, based on those notes as I have done, then I will personally give him a brass medal. And in addition to that I will also make him an honorary member of some society or other which I will think of a name for later on.

Now, I am endeavoring to discuss the necessity of the establishment of a veterinary college at Saskatoon. I am surprised at the levity displayed by all the members on the other side of this house, including the Premier of the province. He seldom laughs but this time he has laughed and sneered at every farmer in Canada.



One of western Canada's leading farm newspapers thought the matter of sufficient importance to discuss it editorially. I wish to quote from the Western Producer of September 27, 1962, from the editorial of that date:

The need for a western college was underlined most recently by Dr. William Turnbull of Saskatoon, past-president of Canadian veterinarians. He called the need desperate (and the Premier is laughing) pointing out that at least 34 qualified students from Saskatchewan alone were not able to enrol this term at the college of veterinary medicine at Guelph, Ontario, because of the institution's limited accommodation. The Deputy-Minister of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan and the Dean of Agriculture at the University of Saskatchewan acknowledge existence of the need when they were asked to comment. There undoubtedly is merit in Dr. Turnbull's observation that the university at Saskatoon will be next door to the South Saskatchewan irrigation area which, when it is functioning, may become the heart land for the prairie cattle industry.

It is significant that Dr. Turnbull's statements were endorsed by no less personages than the Deputy-Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan and the Dean of Agriculture of the university at Saskatoon, and I regret that the Minister of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan didn't say anything to support them.

Now, I wish to quote again from the Western Producer for December 8, 1962. Dr. A.E. Lewis of Calgary, western representative of the Canadian Veterinary Association, said:

A veterinary college in the west would pay dividends to the livestock industry. Canada requires another veterinary school to provide sufficient veterinarians to service our livestock industry. In addition to practising veterinarians, there is a need for more veterinarians in every related field. The veterinary school at Guelph, Ontario, he said, turns down qualified students each year for lack of accommodation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is most unfortunate that any of our young people in the province of Saskatchewan or the four western provinces should be denied the right to follow the career of their choice because of lack of facilities. Dr. Lewis pointed out that a faculty of veterinary science at Saskatoon would pay dividends to the livestock industry. Now here is a

**February 25, 1963**

project which would be of great practical benefit to our livestock producers and should help them and assist them in some way to make enough money to pay the large tax load that they now carry. I want to quote from the Leader-Post of February 21, 1963:

The Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association expressed its continued support of a veterinary college for western Canada, with the preferable location being Saskatoon. The Saskatchewan association is of the opinion that the immediate interests of the livestock industry can best be served from a location in Saskatoon, Dr. G.F. Hamilton, president of the Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association, said at a general meeting in Saskatoon on Saturday. The livestock industry in Saskatchewan is rapidly expanding but there is still a lack of provincial laboratories and diagnostic facilities. The further development of such facilities must be undertaken either independently or in conjunction with the construction of a college, Dr. Hamilton said. It is our opinion such a college would have tremendous effects on the livestock industry and there is no location to rival Saskatoon.

Now here again, Mr. Speaker, the desirability of Saskatoon as a location is stressed. The Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association has pointed out that we presently lack sufficient laboratory and diagnostic facilities and will shortly have to increase the same. It would obviously lead to greater efficiency and economy if these were secured in conjunction with a veterinary college supported by inter-provincial and federal financial assistance by way of construction and maintenance grants. In this manner I do not believe that the construction of a veterinary college would lead to any greater expense than if we had to construct the facilities aforementioned on our own and then also pay our share of a veterinary college in some other province.

Now, in regard to inter-provincial and federal co-operation in the financing of this project, I think Manitoba has indicated in the past that they were willing to co-operate but not interested in the construction of a college in that province. Quite obviously the construction of a college in the province of Manitoba to serve the four western provinces wouldn't be realistic due to the fact that the province of Manitoba is on the eastern extremity of the district to be served. British Columbia has been non-committal but I am sure they can be persuaded to co-operate — their own province not having a sufficiently large concentration of livestock in any one area to make the construction of a veterinary college feasible in that province.

What I had to say with regard to the province of Manitoba being on the east side of the area to be served applies with equal validity to the province of British Columbia being on the west side of the area to be served. Obviously if we have a veterinary college to serve the four western provinces it must be located in a central part of the west. That has left only Alberta and Saskatchewan. Now, what did Alberta have to say about it? Well, I quote from the Leader-Post of October 19, 1962:

Premier Manning has dismissed the idea of a school of veterinary science at the University of Alberta but has indicated a western interprovincial school might be feasible.

He turned down the idea of a college of veterinary science in Alberta but he did indicate that he was willing to listen to a proposal of having it somewhere else. What did the officials in the province of Saskatchewan say? Well, six days later, six days after Mr. Manning had made that statement, the Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan had something to say. And I quote from the Leader-Post of October 25, 1962.

Establishment of a western Canada veterinary college will be discussed by western agricultural ministers at an Ottawa meeting next month.

Mr. I.C. Nollet said:

Saskatchewan has offered to contribute to the capital cost of the college wherever it may be located.

Well, we ruled out two provinces, one on the east and one on the west; Mr. Manning ruled out the province of Alberta voluntarily and all on his own. What did the Minister of Agriculture, the man who should be most concerned in the province of Saskatchewan have to say. Well, he said:

We will contribute to the capital cost of the college wherever it might be located.

Put it up at Grand Rapids, put it on the Rocky Mountains, put it out on Ellesmere Island, it could be swept under the rug, as far as he was concerned.

Well, I wish now to quote again from the Western Producer of October 26, 1962:

Premier E.C. Manning of Alberta last week scotched any hopes livestock men may have that Alberta might soon be the location of a veterinary college in western Canada. At Edmonton last week, Mr. Manning told a delegation from

**February 25, 1963**

the Home and School Association that there was no chance that Alberta would be getting a veterinary college in the near future.

Once more, and for the second time, the Premier of the province of Alberta turned down the idea. And what did our government do? Well, five days later, and I want to quote from the Free Press of October 31, 1962:

Establishment of a veterinary college in western Canada will be discussed by the agricultural ministers of our four western provinces in an Ottawa meeting in November.

Mr. Nollet said:

Saskatchewan has offered to contribute to the capital cost of a college wherever it is being located.

Now why couldn't he have jumped on his horse and ridden and said, "Yes, Mr. Manning doesn't want it there, we want it here" and thus get a little more federal money into this province.

Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions when requests have been made to the provincial government or when they found themselves in trouble, they have passed the buck to the federal government at Ottawa, regardless of its political complexion, asking for grants, etc., and always passing the buck in that direction. Now in this particular case the cries for assistance were heard in Ottawa and answered, the government of Canada indicating that construction and maintenance grants for a veterinary college would be forthcoming. I have on my desk Bill No. C76, entitled "An Act to Found and Constitute a Western Canada Veterinary College" which received first reading on November 7, 1962, in the house of commons. I want to draw your attention to Section 3, sub-section 4, which says the site of the college is to be Saskatoon. Now that a bill was presented in the house of commons at Ottawa was sufficient assurance that finances would be forthcoming from Ottawa for this very, very worthy project on, I presume, the same scale that has been made available under the technical-vocational inter-provincial training program, whereby the federal government pays 75 percent of the capital cost of construction of technical and vocational schools. In the light of these facts I find it hard to understand the complete lack of action by the government of Saskatchewan.

The government of Alberta, however, once federal grants were indicated, lost no time in changing their attitude. After the government of Saskatchewan had missed the opportunity, after it was indicated that federal grants would be available, here's what officials in the province of Alberta immediately had to say. They got right back into the picture. I want to quote from the Leader-Post, December 13, 1962:

Harry E. Strum, Alberta agricultural minister, speaking at the Farmers' Union of Alberta convention, said, 'Now that the federal assistance has been assured, Alberta was prepared to establish a veterinary college'.

I wonder who was the fall guy for that one. I wish to quote over again from the Western Producer of December 20, 1962:

Mr. Strum, Alberta's agricultural minister, said the Alberta cabinet changed its policy after the federal government suggested it may give financial assistance for the construction and possibly the operation of the college.

Two times Mr. Manning said that he didn't want it there, but indicated that he might be interested in establishing it somewhere else. Two times the Minister of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan fouled the play and fumbled the ball. Well, you know the old saying "Three times and you're out". I hope you have got one chance left and hope you don't fumble the play this time. And the Minister of Education for the province of Saskatchewan — I have referred strictly to the Minister of Agriculture so far because his is the department which should be most interested in the establishment of a veterinary college — should be most interested in the establishment of a veterinary college — but the Minister of Education under whose department administration of the University of Saskatchewan falls, what did he do? Well, if the hon. members in this house will recall, the Minister of Education for the province of Saskatchewan at the present time is a former vice-president of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union. Repeatedly the president of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union passed resolutions asking that farmers be allowed to use tax-free gas in their trucks. Just as repeatedly we on this side of the house have presented a resolution seeking to achieve that very end. Just as repeatedly the former vice-president of the Farmers' Union has voted against it. Now the Farmers' union have just presented a brief seeking the establishment of a faculty of veterinary medicine at Saskatoon. And the Minister of Agriculture is silent, and also the Minister of Education, the men who should have been the most interested or as much interested as anyone in this matter, were silent as the tomb. And the Attorney General of the province, he made his contribution in a rather peculiar fashion — by involving the province of Saskatchewan in a law suit before the Supreme Court of Canada between certain B.C. labor unions and the province of British Columbia. Now, theoretically, he had the right to do so, but I consider it was most inadvisable, not in the best interests of our people, and certainly an action not calculated to secure the support of the province of British Columbia for a veterinary college at Saskatoon.

**February 25, 1963**

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Premier of this great agricultural province, to the economy of which livestock means so much, has displayed his disinterest in agriculture, the health of livestock and of people, and the future of our young potential veterinarians by also remaining silent.

I deeply regret that there has been no mention of a veterinary college in Saskatoon, in the speech from the throne. I most sincerely hope that when the budget is brought down next week the government will announce its intention of proceeding with the establishment of a veterinary college in Saskatoon, in the interests of our livestock producers; to protect the health of our people; to make increased opportunities available for our potential young veterinarians; and in order to add stature and lustre to our university.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to discussions of the tremendous potash development taking place in our province, and particularly in my own area. The first discovery of potash in mineable quantities in our province was made in 1943 by drillers exploring for oil. Subsequent testing revealed a rich bank of sylvanite, the ore from which potash is obtained, some 50 miles wide, 400 miles long, and stretching in an east-westerly direction, across the province of Saskatchewan and reaching across the boundary into the province of Manitoba.

In 1956, International Minerals and Chemicals commenced exploratory work in my area with a view to commercial production of potash, a business in which they were already engaged elsewhere. Based on geological surveys, engineers' reports, costing estimates, market forecasts and relevant data, the board of directors of International Minerals and Chemicals, elected and representing thousands of company shareholders, made the decision to proceed with the sinking of a shaft and the construction of a refinery.

Shaft sinking proved to be no easy matter. Penetration of the Blairmore strata, 200 feet of saline water and quicksand with a pressure of 500 pounds per square inch, presented major problems demanding new and different mining techniques and was the cause of increased costs estimated in excess of \$2 million. The construction and shaft-sinking phase provided employment for a work force in excess of 500 people. The result, after six years, a fully automated mine and refinery, costing in excess of \$40 million, requiring a work force in excess of 500 people to maintain a normal production schedule of 1.2 million tons of refined potash per year, worth in excess of \$25 million, for shipment to world markets.

This gigantic mining refining colossus is a monument to the vision, courage, perseverance, determination and skill of the shareholders, management and personnel alike. It has

already led to a massive infusion of new purchasing power in our area, and will continue to pour forth an unending stream of new wealth into the economic life of Canada, there being estimated reserves sufficient to maintain present production rates for 235 years. Exports of present production will bring \$17 million in foreign exchange into this country annually. The freight bill alone, on present production, is estimated at \$12 million per year causing the construction of additional trackage and the employment of approximately 60 more men at the Canadian National Railroad divisional point at Melville.

The Canadian Pacific Railway constructed last summer a 15 mile line from their divisional point at Bredenbury to the mine site, costing approximately \$1 million; providing temporary employment for more than 250 men, while increasing permanent employment on the railroad in the town of Bredenbury. Permission to construct railroads in excess of a given mileage must be secured from the parliament of Canada, by and through the railroad committee of the house of commons, of which committee the Hon. T.C. Douglas was a member at the time of the hearing of the Canadian Pacific Railroad's application to construct the Bredenbury mine site line. I wish to quote what he said at the time, as recorded in Hansard, November 15, 1962, page 1669:

What we are being asked to do here is to authorize the construction of a line to duplicate a line already in existence, the Canadian National Railroad, which would have the effect of dividing the traffic when that division of traffic may be wholly unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't seem reasonable to force an industry with a \$12 million freight account to be captive of one railroad nor to endeavor to prevent increased employment and prosperity in our province. In my opinion, that is precisely what the former premier of Saskatchewan was endeavoring to do by his way of obstructionism and delaying tactics when the matter was before the railroad committee in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss for a few moments the local and provincial impact of the mine.

The following facts and figures are from the reports and executive statements of International Minerals and Chemicals, and are based on the present single shaft and refinery.

1. The annual mine payroll is estimated to exceed \$2.5 million per year.
2. The estimated personal federal and provincial income tax payable by employees will be in excess of \$400,000 per annum.

**February 25, 1963**

3. Provincial sales tax payable by employees only is estimated at \$150,000 a year, to which must be added any sales taxes which are paid for materials used in the mine.
4. Property taxes paid by International Minerals and Chemicals and its employees is forecasted to be in excess of \$250,000 per year.
5. Production royalty payments to the province of Saskatchewan are estimated at \$400,000 per year.
6. Royalty payments to private individuals will account for a further \$400,000 per annum.
7. The estimated grand total of taxes and provincial royalties, therefore, is the substantial sum of \$1.17 million annually.
8. To which must be added gasoline taxes paid by miners driving to and from work, and sundry other local, provincial and federal taxes.

Based on economic forecasting of a six percent annual increase in the demand for potash, International Minerals and Chemicals has announced its intention of proceeding next summer with the sinking of a second shaft and expansion of refinery facilities. This will lead to employment of an additional 500 people and a potential doubling of taxes and royalties payments to an approximate annual sum of \$2.3 million a year; or a ten-year total tax take figure of \$23 million, based on two shafts.

Mr. Speaker, at least six other companies, in addition to I.M.C. have leases in our area but have not as yet decided to attempt production. It is reasonable to suppose, however, that we can hope for more development when circumstances are right and conditions warrant company expenditures of such magnitude.

A successful ten-shaft mining refinery development would provide a potential tax royalty income of \$11.5 million annually, or the stupendous sum of \$115 million for a ten-year period.

Mr. Speaker, what economists have to say of other areas can justly be said of ours. That every new job created by industry requires the support of at least two other jobs in the services industries. On this basis a twin shaft refinery development should provide economic support for approximately 3,000 people and their families, all making their contribution to provincial taxes, while placing increasing demands on local services. It is estimated that a ten-shaft mining refinery development could support 15,000 people. The effect of this is already becoming apparent in the multiple communities which serve our mining area.



Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the elected representatives of the people and to all the local officials of our rural municipalities, towns, villages, hamlets, school districts and hospital boards, for the way in which they have met the challenge of industrialization with its increasing demands for schools, roads, hospitals and modern facilities such as the installation of sewer and water recently completed in four of our communities.

I also wish to pay tribute to the wonderful spirit of fair play and co-operation which has existed between our local officials and the personnel and management of International Minerals and Chemicals.

Mr. Speaker, our local tax load is already heavy, and, as I have indicated, the provincial government is reaping a lion's share of the royalties and taxes. It can be truly said that our area has now become the provincial tax-gatherers' garden of Eden.

The pressure of industrial progress is making new and increasing demands upon recreational, educational, hospital and housing facilities. Three housing projects for senior citizens are presently receiving local study and it is hoped that these projects will be proceeded with this summer. In order to provide for retirements of our aging agricultural population, and to provide for potential mine retirements, and in order to adequately care for our aged and ensure that they will be able to spend the twilight of their years among relatives and friends.

The hospital facilities of our area are now being strained to capacity and beyond. I wish to pay tribute to the Sisters of Charity who operate St. Anthony's hospital in Esterhazy for carrying on their mission of compassion and mercy with the same space which their hospital had when constructed in 1940, at a time when local population was much smaller and danger of accidents much less. Extra hospital space is now imperative in order to adequately serve this area and its people. I sincerely hope the government will show recognition of this factor when the budget is brought down and make provision for adequate construction grants therein.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 20 years, our agriculture has become completely mechanized and highly technical due to the introduction of chemical insecticides, fertilizers and other modern techniques. I wish to quote from the Leader-Post of January 11, 1963:

W.H. Horner, deputy Saskatchewan agriculture minister said one of the greatest problems is how to keep the boy who is going to be a farmer in school, at least to grade 12, and preferably see that a significant percentage proceed to university or to special vocational training. The problem of vocational training in agriculture still seems unsolved.

**February 25, 1963**

I'm surprised. I thought that after 18 years of socialistic government, I thought they had solved everything. Our potash development and its service industries also demand that our people have technical and vocational training in multiple skills. International Minerals and Chemicals organized their own training program in order to make positions and opportunities available to our own local people. But, Mr. Speaker, there are six other companies who may decide to enter the field of potash production in our area, and there is no guarantee that they will be as farsighted or as considerate. This indicates the necessity of immediately increasing facilities for technical and vocational training in areas of apparent need, in order to assist our young agriculturists and to ensure that the benefits of industrialization accrue to our own Saskatchewan people.

I hope that the government will take action in this regard before the expiration of the federal-provincial technical and vocational training agreements on March 31 next. The federal government has been willing to pay, as I understand it, under those agreements 75 percent of the capital cost of technical and vocational schools.

During the past six years there have been approximately 500 mine workers who have been commuting an average of in excess of 30 miles per day to and from work, over many miles of road, built and maintained by our rural municipalities. Next summer we expect the number will be around a thousand. Conditions on many of those roads, due to lack of funds and inadequate provincial assistance, are rough and dangerous due to the excessively dusty conditions, particularly during shift changes.

Similar conditions also exist on much of that part of the provincial highway system within the mining areas. Such conditions are manifestly unfair to miners, farmers and municipal men alike. Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need for an adequate system of hard surface, all-weather provincial highways to properly serve the multiple communities in our great and growing mining refining area.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't let an opportunity such as this pass without mentioning the desirability, or without supporting the idea, of a second trans-Canada highway. I believe that this highway is justified and necessary. It is justified by increased motor traffic, by increased use of the roads for freight and express. It is needed to serve our agriculture and our mining areas. Now, the first trans-Canada, as all members of this house know, was constructed under federal-provincial agreements, and federal grants were made towards its construction. A second trans-Canada highway was promised by the Prime Minister of Canada in 1957, when he opened the election campaign of that year, and again in the election campaign of 1958. Many people have promoted the idea, delegations have asked for it, but no action has been taken so

far as I can ascertain, that I think should have been taken by the province of Saskatchewan in pressing the government at Ottawa to implement their promises. Time and time again, at election time, when a federal election is on, we have heard socialists on the platform tell the people of this province, "Oh, if we only had the balance of power, what goodies we would get for you". Well, Mr. Speaker, for nine months the socialists in Ottawa did have a balance of power and they couldn't even produce a second trans-Canada highway for the province of Saskatchewan.

Now was the time, if ever there was one, to get action but the socialists failed and that has proved this balance of power argument they have been using as being nothing more than a fairy story, a myth, a legend and a hoax.

Nine months of socialist balance of power and not even a second trans-Canada highway for the province of Saskatchewan — or grants for a veterinary college. Huh! Well, don't peddle the same story this election for goodness sake.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the things that I have mentioned should be proceeded with at one, in order to serve this area and its people, and in order to indicate, in no uncertain terms, to management investigating the possibilities of participation in future potash development that our province is willing to meet and is prepared to meet the challenge presented by a huge mining refining industrial complex.

**Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Could I ask the hon. member a question?

**Mr. Snedker:** — No, you can't. You can ask it after I'm through.

I have in my hand a clipping from the Leader-Post, dated February 22, 1963, and it is headed: "Saskatchewan seeks top spot in industry". Well, there is nothing wrong with that.

The Saskatchewan government is planning programs designed to put Saskatchewan in the forefront in assistance to industry, Industry and Information Minister, Mr. Russ Brown, said in the legislature on Friday.

Bumpy roads, dusty conditions, that is hardly what I would call assistance to industry. "Present programs of assistance" he said, "will be expanded (what programs?) and some new programs will be introduced." Well, I might ask, what new programs? I certainly hope some new ones will be introduced, and I certainly hope that I have given the Minister of Industry and

**February 25, 1963**

Information some idea of the type of programs he should introduce, to encourage further development of our potash area. Mr. Brown said that inducing new industry is a matter of dogged work. Well, I admit he looks dogged, but I don't think he has been working. A government must not only say it wants private industry but must prove, by assistance it is prepared to offer, that it really means it. I think it is possible to develop some of our potash deposits to a greater extent. There is a 15 mine refinery, or better, potential in our area and I would suggest that we had better make sure we get them in Saskatchewan because it is possible to develop some of these potash deposits in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, because the speech from the throne gave us no assurance of the establishment of a veterinary college in Saskatoon and was barren of concrete proposals for action to provide adequate services to the wealth-producing agriculture and mining areas of our province, I shall support the amendment and oppose the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join in congratulating the mover, the member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) and the seconder, the member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder), and I also want to mention the great display of ability that they gave to this house.

I also want to congratulate the new cabinet ministers, the member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) and the member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), and I want to congratulate the member — who is not in his seat now — from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) for making it after trying for so long.

Now, I also want to thank the local government group of my constituency, and not only to those in my constituency do I want to express a word of praise to, I also want to express a word of praise for the local government in the Rosthern constituency which has intrigued the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) to make mention of it just a few days ago.

I see, Mr. Speaker, the time is getting on — I would like to call it 5:30

The sitting was recessed at 5:30 o'clock p.m.

The sitting was resumed at 7:30 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. A. Thibault:** — Mr. Speaker, just before we went for supper I mentioned the local governments in my constituency and it has always been my practice to meet with the local governments, whether municipal, hospital or trustees or school boards, and this sort of got around some of the municipalities bordering my constituency — I am referring to the remark made by the hon. member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) a few days ago. I did go across the border a little bit because I was invited. Now I usually discuss the program of our government because this promotes better understanding between local government and the senior government. Now, I've carried on that practice with the result that I finally found myself way into the Rosthern constituency. Some problems were brought to my attention and I told these local governments that they should get in touch with their M.L.A., that it was part of his job to get acquainted with the problems that exist.

One problem in particular, a municipality with an assessment of \$1.25 million had a problem and I said, now if you can get your M.L.A. to recommend to the minister to get special help, I don't doubt that you are able to get it. But . . .

**Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern):** — What was it, Mr. Thibault?

**Mr. Thibault:** — Now, listen, I didn't interrupt you the other day when you were on air time and I could have had you straightened out and I didn't say anything. After I am through you can correct your statement if you want to, but I am going to just tell you what happened. They did go to their M.L.A. and, according to the report that I got from the reeve of that municipality, he told me that the M.L.A. just simply told him, you cannot get any help from the government. Well, I said if that is the case I am very sorry, but I will tell you what I will do. If you just get in touch with the Department of Municipal Affairs and lay your case before them, I will certainly write . . .

**Mr. Boldt:** — On a point of privilege. The member just stated that I had told the council that they could not . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! You haven't got a point of privilege. He is stating what was reported to him.

**Mr. Boldt:** — . . . He is not telling the truth. I have got a point of privilege. The member is not telling the truth.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

February 25, 1963

**Mr. Thibault:** — I asked the member to withdraw the statement that I was not telling the truth.

**Mrs. M.J. Batten (Humboldt):** — Surely a member has a right on a point of privilege to deny a statement attributed to him and say he didn't make the statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That isn't what was said. What the member said was that it was report to him by the reeve.

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — You didn't give him a chance to prove it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Premier Lloyd:** — When the Speaker is on his feet, will you please refrain from interrupting the Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) raised the point of order that the member had a chance to deny it, but he didn't attribute this statement to the member, he was saying what was reported to him by his reeve. Now, whether it is right or wrong, the point of order would be with the reeve and not with the member speaking.

**Mr. D.T. McFarlane:** — On a point of privilege, would the member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) state the name of the reeve who supposedly gave this information? Could we have the name of the reeve of the municipality.

**Mr. Thibault:** — I don't think I have to give you the name of the reeve. I think the member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. When a member gets up in this house and says that a statement was made, and quotes somebody he has to give the name of the person to whom he attributes that statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, your point of order is well taken. If a member is quoting somebody and the name is requested, he must either then assume the responsibility himself or give the name.

**Mr. Thibault:** — Well, I'll take the responsibility for that statement as I said awhile ago.

**Mrs. Batten:** — On a point of order. If he takes responsibility for the statement and the hon. member says it isn't true, he must then withdraw the statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is what I said. If he takes the responsibility then he has to be responsible to us because otherwise he must give the source of his information.

**Mrs. Batten:** — And he just did, Mr. Speaker. Therefore the point of privilege holds that he must withdraw it.

**Mr. Thibault:** — The source of information. We are getting into crossfire here. I was reported the other day as stating that the special grants had to come through me, which was false. I didn't interrupt the gentleman from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) because he was on air time and I am setting the record straight today, and I was kind enough not to do like they did with the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) today, trying to tear his speech all to pieces. I could have had that withdrawn the other day by the member from Rosthern when he said that I told them that special grants had to come through me, which was absolutely false. I had a hard time to stay down here but I said, let him go, he is on air time, that's fine. I took the blame for it and now, today, I said it was reported to me by the reeve that had this problem and he told me he had gone to the member for Rosthern and he told him that he could — the member for Rosthern told him that he could not get help for it. And in that case I asked that reeve to make an application to the Department of Municipal Affairs and apparently from the letter that I got from the reeve a few days ago he had good results.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member give us the name of the reeve whom he quoted:

**Mr. Thibault:** — I don't think I need to give the name of the reeve.

**Mr. Cameron:** — If I may speak on this point of privilege. Surely we haven't come to a position in this house where a member can quote something that he says another member said, and when this member asked for his authority, refuse to give it, and then say that that is not a breach of the privilege of this house. He has quoted some derogatory remark of a member of this legislature, said to some other individual . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! You can't debate it. I think the point is well taken that the member has said it was the reeve, well if he gives the municipality, the name of the reeve.

**February 25, 1963**

**Mr. Thibault:** — If the member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) would give me the name of the person that reported me . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I would ask the member to give the name of the municipality . . .

**Mr. Thibault:** — Well, I didn't have to wait that long. I will give you the name of the municipality — the municipality of Duck Lake, which does not touch my constituency at all, and you cannot say that I was looking for my own benefit.

**Mr. Boldt:** — That is not the municipality he referred to . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! You cannot keep jumping up to try and correct another member's speech.

**Mr. Thibault:** — Now, you've got the name of the municipality. Does that satisfy you?

**Mr. Boldt:** — I still think the member is withholding information.

**Mr. Thibault:** — Well now, Mr. Speaker, I didn't think I would run into so much trouble. I can sit here just as quiet as a lamb for days and days but the moment I get up to my feet, here's what I've got. And I want to just advise the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) that if he gets out there and informs his municipal council the way I do in my constituency, that he will not run into the trouble that he is running into. Give them advice, tell them all about the grid road program and other programs. I know some municipalities certainly appreciate the grid road. The member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) told the people of Saskatchewan that the grid road program in 1956, and I quote the member for Moosomin as reported by the Leader-Post, that "it was just a mirage to get votes". Believe you and me, it's a mirage of the kind that I would like to see extended in this province. And I am sure that the people certainly want a little more of that mirage and they will see to it when the next election rolls around.

Now that municipality last year got grants, grid grants, about \$38,000 — in that neighborhood — and they also get equalization grants, and if they think we are not treating the municipalities right, let them go and check their own record. They only got grants the year of an election. But even though, with all the grid grants and equalization grants,



municipalities do have problems at times and they need a little special assistance, and I think the members of the legislature in that area should try to help these municipalities with good advice.

Now I would like to say a few words about the Premier of this province. I certainly want to compliment him for the calmness and clear thinking that he demonstrated during last summer's crisis. It was not a time for weaklings that would quit part way across the stream, and he did not get excited when they wanted to meet 30,000 people in front of the legislature and, it was reported by the Leader-Post, somewhere around 4,000 — and I know that some of our Sunday picnics usually have more people than that, so there was nothing to get excited about. But although I like to add a little humor, I want to be serious at times and say that I want to thank those who prayed instead of counselling murder during that time.

Now, my constituency did demonstrate a great deal of calmness during this strike, but I would say this, that if the Good Samaritan had been walking across Saskatchewan in 1962 he would have had a hell of a fight with the Thatcherites and he would have found the innkeepers gone fishing. But, I would say that Saskatchewan gave birth to a medical care plan. Now, as every young child, when born, usually has troubles, this plan is going to have teething problems, going to have walking problems, and we will have to lay it on our shoulders perhaps and make it burp once in awhile, but I will say this, I hope that the people of Saskatchewan don't give this baby over to the Liberals for adoption because they are sure going to have it run down. Now then, Mr. Speaker, I think that when history is written you will find that Saskatchewan has won one of the greatest victories for the people of the North American continent.

Now I would like to say a few words for the minister of the power corporation for the wonderful job he has done in this province. But I want to also add that if we had not kicked the Liberals out of Ottawa, the Saskatchewan River Dam would not have been built, or we would have had to go it alone. And, on behalf of the people of my constituency, I also want to thank the minister for the power corporation for the wonderful job that he has done. His department has brought natural gas to practically all the places that it can be brought to in my constituency — Wakaw, Domremy, Hoey, St. Louis, Birch Hills, Weldon, Kinistino, Beatty — he's only got Hagan left and I am quite sure that he will do that in the near future.

Now, I think that all the projects that we have seen, such as the Squaw Rapids Dam and the power building will add to the efficiency of the power corporation and we are certainly looking forward to progress in that field that will enable industry to have a source of power which we did not have before. But I also want to add that the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) who owns an electric store in Prince Albert and in Nipawin, has also benefited by the work of the power corporation. I think he did very well.

**February 25, 1963**

Now, the attack by the member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) on the Department of Agriculture I think was really unwarranted. But that is a matter of opinion. I want to say that the Department of Agriculture has done a great deal for this province in its pasture program, its conservation development, and I am sure with the new ARDA program that it should help the regional parks and the Ag. Rep. service, the veterinary service, and the scholarships for veterinary students — over 402 scholarships up till 1961 have been paid. Now at the present time we have got 53 students, scholars attending the veterinary school. Now the bangs control program in this province has gone a long way to save a lot of money for our farmers, and now the sewer and water program that many of the farmers now enjoy, I think, removes all the doubt that the Minister of Agriculture is doing a good job in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — Now I would like to say a few words for the Minister of Highways, for the wonderful job he is doing, especially in the member of Humboldt's (Mrs. Batten) constituency. I am beginning to have a little doubt but I would say with 8,500 miles of highway in this province we have over 2,700 miles dust-free.

**Mrs. Batten:** — May I ask the hon. member a question? What is he beginning to have doubts about?

**Mr. Thibault:** — Well, I think that you are getting your fair share of highways. We are being accused at times of not giving fair share to each constituency. Now I see that no. 5 highway is going to be blacktopped from one end to the other of your constituency. That is giving fair play to the seats in the opposition. I want to say that is more than fair play to the seats in the opposition. You can't complain — the member from Humboldt will be able to come on dust-free highway all the way to Regina next year.

Now, just the other day we had a bus load of children come from Birch Hills. Mind you they drove on dust-free highway all the way to Regina. The member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) just can hardly leave the black-top — he would have to do it deliberately — all the way from P.A. to Regina. But I must say that the member from Prince Albert did not request any improvement to his highways. He came here just to tear everything down. But I would say if he could only remove that overhead bridge — we call it a Liberal monument — it's a suicide curve we call it — if he could only find a little money to remove that — to straighten it up, he could keep the overhead bridge as a souvenir. I think we can miss it.

Now, as far as the Minister of Public Health, I want to thank the Department of Public Health, perhaps the member of Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) forgot that they are getting help there. I want to thank him on behalf of the people in my constituency for the great help we are getting at the Holy Family Hospital, for the rebuilding of the Holy Family Hospital. I know it will be appreciated by the people in my constituency and also the people in the Prince Albert constituency and I think it is a good project.

Now I would like to mention a few things about the programs in the Department of Public Health. I've got a survey here that was carried on in 1958 about the hospital beds in each province. We like to say, oh it's just as good across the border, but let's have a look at these hospital beds. Now you have Ontario, in 1958 had 5.5 beds; Quebec 5.6; and Saskatchewan with 7.5 beds for every thousand people. British Columbia has 6.8; Nova Scotia has 4.8; New Brunswick has 5; and Newfoundland, a Liberal province, has 4.2; Alberta has 7.1; Manitoba 5.9; and Prince Edward Island 6.9. Now you will see very well by these figures that the provinces that went into the medical hospitalization plan first have the most beds per thousand people. Now, if you want to take a look at the picture of how many doctors we've got. We could go over it — those figures were taken in 1959. In Ontario they have 1,075 people for every doctor; Quebec 1,402; Saskatchewan 1,317; British Columbia 1,019; Nova Scotia 1,536; and New Brunswick has 1,903 people for every doctor; and Newfoundland again, with Liberal government, you might say has almost 3,000 people for every doctor in that province. So you can see that we have twice as many doctors in this province than in Newfoundland, that we have our fair share here and I think that with our new medical plan we will be able to hold our own.

Now I want to say a few words about the Minister of Social Welfare. I felt sorry for the battle he had to put up this afternoon. I want to tell the minister that the regional meetings that he held in the past have improved the understanding of social welfare in this province. In my constituency we have always had a fair understanding because we didn't have a M.L.A. in that area that was misinterpreting the Social Aid Act, and we didn't have anyone crying social aid scandal as we heard during the P.A. by-election. Now, during the P.A. by-election we heard about four words — high taxes, industrial development, compulsion, social aid scandal. Oh, we heard it over and over again. We heard it in here too. But if the member for Prince Albert — he is not in his seat, I suppose he is out campaigning — wants to talk about taxes, let us have a look at his record. He was the mayor for the city of Prince Albert from 1955 to 1958. What did he do about taxes? In 1955 the mill rate was 30 mills, in 1956 32 mills, 1957 36 mills, and in 1958 37.6 mills, or an increase of 22 percent. So now if he is going to reduce taxes, we certainly cannot take his example.

**February 25, 1963**

Now, what about the debt for the city of Prince Albert? The debt or unmatured debenture debt for 1954 for the city of Prince Albert was \$1,186,060; in 1955 \$1,619,536; in 1956 \$1,716,642; in 1957 \$1,861,406; in 1958 \$1,999,408 — almost an increase in the debt of 70 percent. So now when he comes here and tries to tell us about doing something about high taxes, he will have to show a different example than he has shown in the city of Prince Albert.

Now, it is too bad that he is not in his seat because during the P.A. by-election what we heard was amusing — as we called from one place to another — about social aid scandal.

**Mr. Foley:** — Did you see the handwriting on the wall, Art?

**Mr. Thibault:** — No, if we . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I must insist on this here calling members by first names across the house is definitely unparliamentary and he must desist. Members must be addressed by their proper titles in this house.

**Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca):** — Did you see the hand . . . Did you see the handwriting, hon. member from Kinistino?

**An Hon. Member:** — That's smart.

**Mr. Thibault:** — Well, during the by-election there was one story that was quite uniform — this social aid scandal — and whenever I met someone I would ask him, well, name me one case of social aid scandal. Oh, yes, they had one case — the fellow has a half section of land, has four kids, and those kids are so lazy that they won't even walk to school — they have to send the bus right up to the door to pick them up. Well, I said, this does sound pretty bad, but I didn't pay too much attention to it, but, repeatedly as I went along the same story was thrown up at me — a half section of land, four kids and they are too lazy to walk to school. So finally when somebody mentioned social aid scandal I could say, yes, half section of land, four kids and they are too lazy to walk to school. But I investigated. I happened to meet a school trustee and I ask him — what about these four kids that are too lazy to walk to school. Well, he said, look — the father was in the war, he has two river lots and for a couple of years he was unable to work because he was wounded in the neck and he had an operation in his neck. After he got back, he had another accident which leaves him practically unable to work. And, he said, I am the one that ordered that school but to go and pick up those children because in that home there is a crippled child that is mentally fit but physically unable to get around, and the health authorities

recommended that that child attend public school with the rest of the children. And that was the reason, he said, that I sent the bus right to the door of the house to pick that child up. Well, I said, if that is what they call scandal, then I'm in favor of scandal.

Now this is the family that was exposed from Lily Plain to Steep Creek about social aid scandal. They were exposed that way because the father could not work and they were picking up a crippled child to bring to school — and there's where they tried to tell a half truth — they told part of the story but not the whole thing, which is worse than an outright lie.

Now, as far as the Minister of Public Works, I don't intend to go here until 9 o'clock. I know you are all in a hurry to adjourn. I want to thank him for the wonderful job he has done in these chambers. We can hear each other a little better, and I also would suggest to him now that we are going to own our buildings that he should put some pads on the doors for the Kick on Door club, so that they don't knock them down if this ever happens again.

Now with these few remarks, I want to say that I will not support the amendment but I am going to support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Will the hon. member answer a question?

**Mr. Thibault:** — I have never risen in my seat to interrupt any one, but have delivered my speech and that is it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member has indicated he is not prepared to answer questions.

**Hon. W.G. Davies (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, in beginning this evening, may I join with the others that have done it already in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address-in-reply. It was plain to everyone in this house that the member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) and my fellow member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) had done a great deal of work in the preparation of their speeches and I think it was evident in what we heard on February 18.

**February 25, 1963**

I should particularly like to congratulate my own fellow townsman and associate who shares with me the job of representing in the legislature the city of Moose Jaw. I think you will all agree that he is a credit to our city.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — In commenting about him, I want to also say that he comes from the railroad community, a body that for many years has been a very significant section of the citizenry in Moose Jaw and one, I think, that is a self-respecting and worthy group. Dieselization and other inroads have affected the railroad community in my city but it remains a big group and a very important one. I think my fellow member from Moose Jaw is well known amongst this section and has, because of his speech, added to his own laurels and, as well, will be applauded by that section of the population.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say something about the statements that have been made in this house by the Leader of the Opposition and some of the other members who followed him, with respect to the speech from the throne. I thought, personally, that the address of the Leader of the Opposition was largely a duplicate of what we have heard in other years from him and from other leaders of the opposition in this house in other years. Perhaps there was one marked change. I think that for the first time we get a glimpse, if perhaps an unguarded glimpse, of what Liberal policy might be in Saskatchewan in the event that the hon. gentleman and his party, by some freak of public judgment, were to be returned to political power.

I can't help but think that the people of this province, with respect to the pioneering aspect that the Leader of the Opposition talked about, got enough of Liberal pioneering in the years before 1944; a distorted type of pioneering to say the least.

Heaven knows, the pitted and the rutted trails that passed for roads in this province under the regime of the Liberals strained the "pioneering" spirit to the extreme. And I think most people up to 1944 wondered when pioneering would end and progress would begin. Under a CCF administration since 1944 we have taken the province out of the period of the prairie trails and the period of one-room schools to a time of something better. I don't think the people of this province want to return to the old days under the Liberals.

I say, Mr. Speaker, in a modern-day sense, the people of this province have been pioneering under a CCF government. The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, repeated the same rather dog-eared and rather musty themes alleging stagnation in Saskatchewan since this government took power. And, of course, it was suggested that we would have had an industrial paradise

had the Liberal party been in power in this province. The same speaker promised us that with this land of industrial milk and honey we would have, under the Liberals, a whole lot of other very fine things too.

I found this very strange, Mr. Speaker, because it seems to me that the proof of the pudding is in the eating. I think that if we look across this country and see what has happened, it belies what we were told by the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke to us the other afternoon. In the first instance, let us look at the country as a whole.

We have, ever since 1867, had either Liberal or Conservative governments at Ottawa. In the main of course we have had at Ottawa Liberal national administrations. Can it be said, Mr. Speaker, with respect to unemployment, to which the Leader of the Opposition made so much reference, that the Liberal parties of this country solved the question of unemployment? We all very well know that up to 1957, under a federal Liberal government, indeed since 1957 under a Conservative government, the unemployment figures of Canada have been among the worst in the world. Among the worst in the world, Mr. Speaker.

I note that at peak unemployment, over recent years, Canada has had 9 percent of the labor force unemployed; this doesn't mean 9 percent of the people that work in the factories, and in the shops; it means 9 percent of all the people in this country that do anything at all. It includes farmers, the self-employed and professionals. Compare this figure with that of two percent in Sweden and Norway, one and one-half percent in France, and one-half of one percent in such a struggling country as Israel.

I think it is plain that with all the advantages that we have had in this country in terms of resources, our national Liberal administrations have done little to solve the problems of unemployment amongst the people of this great land.

Now, it might be said, of course, that we are talking about provincial politics in this legislature. But is there any special difference when we look to this aspect? I don't think so. Let us take the three Liberal provinces in Canada — Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Quebec. At peak unemployment in recent years, Newfoundland has had as high as 24 percent of the labor force unemployed. Twenty-four percent of the labor force, and almost equally bad record is true for the government of New Brunswick. This, too, is a Liberal administration.

It may be suggested that these are peak figures, that a fairer figure of comparison would be something more median in nature. I looked at the figures, therefore, for the month of September, 1962; a month where there was a fairly high level of employment in Canada. I found that in the month of September the percentage of unemployed in the labor force for the whole

**February 25, 1963**

of Canada was almost four percent — 3.9 percent to be exact. For the Atlantic region, including the two Liberal provinces of New Brunswick and Newfoundland, the rate was 6.3 percent — 6.3 percent, Mr. Speaker, a good deal higher than the national figure. In Quebec, again under a Liberal administration the rate was 5.3 percent. In Ontario, the rate was lower again, but still high 3.1 percent. The Saskatchewan rate was 1.8 percent against a Pacific or, if you will, the British Columbia figure of 5.2 percent. I would suggest that these figures illustrate the weakness of the arguments of the Leader of the Opposition.

From these figures and from those comparisons you will see that other parts of Canada have a considerably higher rate of unemployment than the province of Saskatchewan, and I suggest that it would be the height of misplaced optimism and gullibility to hope that a Liberal party in Saskatchewan would do the many glittering things that it has promised. The fact is, if the Liberal party in the other Liberal provinces in this country has not accomplished what the Liberals in this province say they could accomplish in this jurisdiction, it is folly to expect performance here.

Now, when I say all this, Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to suggest by any means that our jobless problem in Saskatchewan is not a serious one. I think it is one that this government has attempted to solve with the best means it could use. I suggest were we to have followed the suggestions of some of the members opposite, were we to have succumbed to the criticisms that have been made of the policies of this government with respect to the construction of the power corporation building and regarding many other programs that are employment producing, the jobless rate in Saskatchewan would be a good deal higher than it is at the moment.

But I do say, Mr. Speaker, that it must be apparent to all that the employment rate in this province, at least, is a good deal higher than the Liberal provinces to which I have given some examination this evening.

The Leader of the Opposition, as is customary, lays the whole blame for unemployment in Saskatchewan on "socialism". I say, Mr. Speaker, that given his brand of Liberal private enterprise, the province would not flourish.

Now, all other nine provinces in Canada have administrations that are certainly not CCF/New Democratic administrations. One would think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that in some of these provinces we would find the condition where the brand of private enterprise, which the Leader of the Opposition advocates, would have been able to eliminate once and for all the spectre of unemployment. I think again that it might be useful to look at what those figures say, and again I chose, since it gives median figures, a month that is fair for purposes of contrast. I took September of 1962. In that month I give the actual number of jobless, rather than the rate.



There were in that month 260,000 jobless people in Canada. 38,000 of them (including the two Liberal provinces) were in the Atlantic region. There were 6,000 persons unemployed in Saskatchewan in that month. In all the remaining provinces there were another 119,000 persons. If you do a little calculating you will find that 97.8 percent of all the unemployed people in Canada in that month came from outside of Saskatchewan. Only 2.2 percent were in this province! The same, Mr. Speaker, is true of any month that you can take.

I took what I thought was the month that would be least subject to any criticism about exaggeration. I say it is utterly nonsense to suppose that a Liberal brand of private enterprise, or any other type of pure business enterprise for that matter, has been or would be successful in tackling the problem of unemployment that has been so desperately serious in Canada during the last decade or more.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, has returned also to the same tired old illustrations about population in Saskatchewan. I don't mean to spend any more than a few minutes on this topic, but I think something can be said again on the lines of what was outlined by the hon. Premier the other afternoon.

First of all, surely it is time that we should all be honest enough to see that our population situation in Saskatchewan has been of a rapidly declining rural population that has come about because of the tremendous extent of mechanization on the countryside. And this same trend, as the Premier has pointed out, is true of other states to the south of us, where no one would dream of accusing the administration of being instruments of, shall I say, galloping socialism. I believe the Premier during his talk cited the population figures in North and South Dakota during the last decade. I was interested enough to look them up as well. I noted that not only does the comparison make good reading with respect to the last decade, but as a matter of fact since 1930. In these years the population of North Dakota has declined, as well as that of South Dakota.

In the year 1930, there were 680,845 people living in the state of North Dakota. By 1960 the population had declined by approximately 50,000 to 632,000 people. In South Dakota the companion figures are 692,849 in 1930, declining to 680,000 in 1960. I say, Mr. Speaker, no one would dream of accusing these administrations of having embraced the cause of socialism. I suggest that the economic trends in those states have been very, very similar to the experiences we have known in Saskatchewan. And I think it is high time that these ridiculous population comparisons should stop. We should settle with the facts, rather than with fancies.

I want to recall something about the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, dealing with labor laws. With a kind of spurious candour he attempted to assure

**February 25, 1963**

the working people of this province that nothing of consequence would happen to labor legislation if Liberals took power. Now, I thought though that at one point his footwork faltered a little bit. It was at the point where he said that a Liberal government would remove what he called disarmingly those "irritants" that might prevent industry coming into the province.

Now, once more, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition might say it was something else, he might say it was legislation, caused by what I think some of the members call "big unions" that they are complaining about. But I suggest that this sort of reply just isn't good enough. If the Leader of the Opposition read the speech from the throne, he would have observed that the non-agricultural labor force in the province of Saskatchewan is now something over 200,000 people. He would have probably noticed too that 74,000 of this group are in establishments with 15 employees or over.

Now I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that many of these people enjoy trade union organizations; many of those people that don't now belong to trade unions still would reject the suggestion that their rights to organize when they want to exercise that privilege should be removed. And I think it is a legitimate question to ask the Leader of the Opposition again, "What are these irritants?" Is it the minimum wage? Is it holidays with pay? Is it statutory holidays? Is it the favorable compensation laws of this province? Is it hours of work? Just what is it concretely, Mr. Speaker? I think we have a right to know. What are the "irritants" in labor legislation that the Leader of the Opposition has told us about?

The Leader of the Opposition has commented that there have been some queries by members of this party as to what the Liberals would do to labor legislation if the Liberals were elected. I say, in view of all that has been said in this house by representatives of the Liberal party, that this query is altogether proper.

It is usual during sessions of the legislature, at least during many I have attended, Mr. Speaker, that members of the opposition inveigh against the Saskatchewan Trade Union Act, and its administration. All sorts of things are charged, or intimated, by members of the opposition when they talk of the Trade Union Act. I think the truth is, Mr. Speaker, as I have said in this house before, that the Trade Union Act is a piece of legislation that should offend no employer who wants to play the game with his employees with respect to the union organization. If he refrains from discrimination, if he refrains from interference, if he permits trade union organization to develop normally as it should do, on its own volition, he has no worries. There is no need whatsoever for any employer in Saskatchewan otherwise to fear the Trade Union Act.

Now, you may say that this is a matter of opinion. It is a fact, nonetheless, that the proportion of lost time due to strikes in the province of Saskatchewan has been for many

years much less than the national average, and in many of these years lower than any other province in Canada. I am talking about the rate of lost time due to labor disputes, as well as the actual lost time due to labor disputes. The Leader of the Opposition from time to time, and I believe in his speech the other day, has talked about productivity. Productivity has a lot of comment from many places over the last several years and I don't object to the question being raised here.

I wonder, though, if the members opposite are aware of the fact that in Saskatchewan we have achieved a very high rate of labor productivity. And it is a matter of fact in the last year for which we have full figures, the rate per Saskatchewan workman for productivity has been the highest in Canada.

Now productivity, first of all, in the period 1944–1960 increased in the whole of Canada by some 147 percent. But during the same period, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan per workman productivity increased to 181 percent. The figures, if you are interested in them, are: Saskatchewan productivity for manufacturing worker increased from \$3,303 in 1944 to \$9,272 in 1960. As I say, this is for the last year for which we have full figures and represents an increase of 181 percent.

I want to point out that in 1944, after some 35 years of Liberal government — with the odd break in between — Saskatchewan had reached a point where it was fourth among all the provinces in Canada in terms of productivity per workman. In that year it was exceeded by British Columbia, by Alberta and by Ontario. In 1960 the productivity per workman in this province had reached a point where we were first among all the provinces in this country.

May I comment that this surely is an illustration that the labor laws of this province, which it has been suggested, form a sort of barrier or a detriment to new industry, have apparently done the precise opposite, Mr. Speaker. I don't think there could be a better criterion to point to but the fact that in the period that this labor legislation has been effective, we have achieved the highest productivity of any province in Canada.

I have asked what the Liberal policy would be to labor laws in Saskatchewan if, by some unfortunate chance, the Liberal party was returned to power. I have given a number of examples, Mr. Speaker, which I think were interesting and should be answered by some of the representatives who sit opposite. May I ask, however, what the Liberals would do with regard to those pieces of Saskatchewan labor legislation that are more favorable than any in other provinces in Canada.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what a waitress in the city of Regina, earning as I believe \$34.00 per week would say if she were working in St. Johns, Newfoundland for \$15.40 for a 44-hour week. I wonder, Sir, what she would feel like in Quebec City,

**February 25, 1963**

where the wages of a waitress for a 44-hour week is \$28.16. I say that whether we take the legislation on the statutes, whether we take a comparison of minimum wages or hours of work, or any other kind of legislation, our laws stand up much better than laws in any other province, and specifically the Liberal provinces in Canada. But, more than that, we have less unemployment and a more flourishing atmosphere and I suggest again a free place for trade union organization than any other place in Canada.

The other day, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition made reference to civil servants and a number of very unkind things at this time were said. I believe the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) also said something to the effect that the number of civil servants in Saskatchewan was a great deal higher than the number of civil servants in the province of Manitoba. I have one or two figures here that I think would be of interest, and I think they again belie what has been passed to us in this house as accurate information.

The last figures that I have, Mr. Speaker, of eight provinces reporting show that Saskatchewan ranks only fifth in terms of the number of civil servants per population and this in spite of many programs that are in effect in Saskatchewan that are not enjoyed in other provinces.

It is also noteworthy that Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, Alberta and Nova Scotia are all somewhat higher — again, I suggest, without the benefit of many programs that take employees to operate them. If we take these figures as of December 31, 1961 — the source is the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Provincial Government Employment — if we take civil servants per 10,000 population, we find Prince Edward Island has 137 civil servants for that number of population; Newfoundland, the Liberal outpost, 111; Alberta 85; Nova Scotia 78; Saskatchewan had 77. Now it is true, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba has a lesser figure than 77 per 10,000, the figure being 55. But surely the comparison is hardly fair. Half of the population or better of Manitoba is in one city. The province, in terms of communities, is very much more concentrated; the number of programs as I have said is certainly far fewer. I don't think there is any question about it . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — Could I ask the minister a question?

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — Yes.

**Mr. Guy:** — Are you including in your figures for Saskatchewan the number of people that are employed by the power corporation, Saskatchewan Government Telephones and the other crown corporations?

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, I am including the number of civil servants in the population and this comparison is the same in our province as it is in any other province. I hope the hon. member is not suggesting that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures on provincial government employment do not state the same figures for each jurisdiction. Of course, the power employees of Manitoba and the telephone employees are treated separately, and are not treated as civil servants. But here again I think it is evident that it is not a good thing for us to have exaggerations of this kind made in this house. I am sure they are disturbing to the civil service which, I think, Mr. Speaker, is second to none of any provincial civil service in this country. I want to point out that we were the first province, so far as I know, to get a classification division to rank and rate every position in the civil service and to outline the qualifications necessary for the job, and to form a selection division to administer the merit system for the appointment and for the promotion of civil servants.

While I am on my feet and while I am talking about the civil service, I want to repeat that to my mind we have an exceptionally good group of people in our service — a group that is growing in knowledge and one that again — treating with the general and not with exceptions — is an excellent service with a developing sense of public responsibility. I, a month or so ago, lost my own deputy, Mr. Jim Langford, to the federal government. He has now become the chief architect of the federal Department of Public works. This, I think, was a tribute to Mr. Langford as well as an indirect tribute to the Saskatchewan civil service. I believe it is a fact that public administration groups across Canada would agree that the calibre of our people here is such that there is a constant demand for their services.

Now, much has been said on the question of social aid. My colleague, the Minister of Social Welfare, dealt with this extensively this afternoon and I don't want to do any more than to discuss this in passing, Mr. Speaker. But I do think that many comments that have been made by members opposite on the question of social aid are, to say the least, disquieting. I wonder what the policy of the hon. members is on social aid. Surely the reference that there are hundreds of persons on the social aid list who are apparently “deadbeats, chisellers, too lazy to work” — if I got the quotation right — then this kind of an accusation should be accompanied by a detailed list of persons who justify that kind of derogatory appellation.

When I hear comments from our opponents about the party on this side of the house, the government, Mr. Speaker, “recklessly outbidding other parties on social welfare matters” and taking this in a piece with all the other comments that have been made by the members opposite on the social aid question,

**February 25, 1963**

I can only conclude what I think the people of the province will conclude generally, that the Liberal party is not a party sympathetic to those who are on social aid. Certainly, they believe that there are many, many people who are abusing it although they have really nothing but confusion to put in its place.

I know that as a member of the city council, the Moose Jaw city council, Mr. Speaker, for over eight years, I heard a great deal about many social aid cases. I can say, in honesty, that there were few exceptions of people who for one reason or another were malingerers and who might in some faint way justify some of the unkind things that have been said about social aid recipients by the members opposite. I must say that of the hundreds of cases that I knew about there were very, very few cases indeed where there was any abuse whatsoever. I do know though that whenever there was a rumor started about someone taking advantage of social aid, this rumor became ballooned out of all recognition. It was only found on subsequent investigation how far-fetched that rumor had been. This sort of rumor was touched upon in this house — you know, the social aid recipient with a Cadillac car and all kinds of financial reserves who is still drawing social aid.

It is my experience that the local officials are most scrupulous, most assiduous in seeing to it that the obligation to investigate and to ensure that social aid is being administered properly is being in the main lived up to in every respect. I had the privilege of being with the Minister of Social Welfare and his officials in Moose Jaw at the time that a regional conference of local officials was being held not so long ago to discuss the social aid question. I was informed — I can't vouch for the accuracy of this — but I was informed that the Leader of the Opposition, as the member for Morse, was invited to this conference but could not attend. I believe that the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) was another of the members that might have attended — I am not sure again whether he received an invitation.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Yes, it was — everyone did.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — My colleague tells me that this invitation was extended.

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Every member of the legislature.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — I don't know whether the member was in his school, I don't know where the Leader of the Opposition was, but I know that they had the opportunity to attend. I can say though, Mr. Speaker, that certainly I didn't take any political advantage of the conference and I never heard a whisper throughout the afternoon that could be in any way construed in that fashion. The comment, the discussion, the questions asked were all about social aid. Everyone seemed to want to do the best job they were capable of

under the circumstances. I am quite sure that the large group — I think there were over a hundred representatives of communities there as representatives of councils and social aid boards — I don't think there was one of those persons who would not try to do his duty with respect to seeing that there were no "chisellers and deadbeats" that we have heard suggested are so prevalent on social aid rolls.

I say that our system of administering social aid should continue to rest on its local base where it belongs. Here the reeves, the councillors and social aid bodies understand and know intimately each of the applicants who come before them and are most likely to do all that should be done in justice to such applicants. I think that the farther away you remove the system of administration for social aid from the community, the more difficult it is to have the system that operates best for everyone.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief comment about my own department. I know there are a number of other speakers who expect to address the house this evening so I am going to make my remarks in this respect brief. I hope later on, on another occasion in this session, that I might speak more specifically about what my department has done and intends to do regarding a number of matters. I will say something only about some of the larger current projects.

I should first of all say something about the provincial technical institutes program. You will recall that up to last year we had the institute in Moose Jaw functioning as a very large and flourishing institution which had exceeded all expectations, Mr. Speaker, in terms of attendance. The enthusiasm of those students who are attending the courses here has been great.

This institution was built in 1958 and due to the need for expansion last year a decision was made to add to the building. It was decided to build a wing that would provide for an increase of some 40 percent in the shop area for trades instruction. It was decided generally to double the classroom space, and, at the same time, get a building that would conform to the general design which was molded around the old teachers' college building. Now, the progress of this addition has been excellent. The new building will very shortly be ready for full occupation; as a matter of fact some of it is being occupied now. In every respect, I think that the building program has been a successful one. Naturally enough I feel rather good about this — it is in my own constituency and it has been an exceedingly useful experiment. I have found, in consequence, that it has improved the calibre of the local labor force and

**February 25, 1963**

the ability of my community to cope with employment situations.

Now I think the house is familiar with the fact that a decision was made to build a technical institute at Saskatoon. The architects chosen for this project were Webster, Forrester, Scott and Associates of Saskatoon. After the preliminary work of design, the tenders were called and closed at June 21, 1962. The general contractor making the low bid was Smith Brothers and Wilson of Saskatoon. The amount of the contract was some \$2 1/3 million. I am pleased to report that this structure is also very well advanced and within a month or two the building will be ready for occupancy. Something about the building — it is a multi-wing affair of steel frame construction; it has an exterior finish in brick, Saskatchewan Clay Products brick. The school will contain 24 classrooms; it has an especially large shop area, a library, a work room, a science laboratory, an auditorium and a gymnasium, a cafeteria, and administration offices.

I should add that, as at Moose Jaw, we are taking some care at this site to preserve the trees. We were successful at Moose Jaw in maintaining a number of trees, 20 or 30 years old. We hope to do the same in this location. These will be replanted when the building is finished. In Saskatoon, again, the construction progress is quite good and the entire building will be ready very soon.

Now, the Prince Albert technical high school is the third project of this series. I shall say something very briefly about it. Tenders closed on August 31, 1962. It was decided at this time to have a two-stage construction so we called for tenders in two stages. Architects selected were Kerr, Cullingworth, Ritchies and Associates of Prince Albert. The amount of the first contract for foundation and structure was \$384,332. This work was finished around the end of the year. There were some difficulties in getting requisite supplies but that is past now and the second stage is well underway. This contract was awarded to Boychuk Construction of Saskatoon at a cost of \$1,258,000. Again the completion of the building will be, I think, in August of 1963, and if we are lucky the Prince Albert institute should be ready for occupancy as of September. Here there is a difference from the other two institutes in that it is expected that in the future the school authorities in Prince Albert will take over the institute and run it themselves.

I think, too, Mr. Speaker, members are familiar with the fact that the geriatric centre at Swift Current is expected to be completed very soon. I don't want to say more about this in the interests of saving time. I will comment about one other building. That is the Yorkton Psychiatric centre. The construction of this building commenced last fall. The bid was awarded to a Yorkton contractor, being the low bidder, Matheson Brothers of Yorkton.



We have been able very successfully to maintain our program of winter work at Yorkton, and I may say all other buildings for that matter. This centre, as the member may recall from the brief description given in the house by myself last year, is a cottage-type mental institution with a capacity of 148 beds. It shares services such as heating, laundry, kitchen and power with the Yorkton Union Hospital. Apart from the value of the building itself, of about \$1.2 million, a considerable amount of money, practically three-quarters of a million dollars, was devoted to enlarging these facilities so that they would serve the hospital and the psychiatric centre as well — this being our arrangement with the Yorkton Union Hospital authorities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you more about these and other projects on another occasion in the house.

I think you will have gathered from what I have said about the speech from the throne that I do support the mover and the seconder and the main motion, and reject the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I have phoned the reeve of the Duck Lake municipality regarding the statement attributed to me by the member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault). The reeve has authorized me to state that at no time did I tell him that I, that it was of no use for his R.M. to make application for a special grant. I am sure the reeve would be prepared to verify this in writing.

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to offer my congratulations to my able colleague, the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart). I can say on behalf of the north that we are proud to have such a capable and conscientious member adding his voice to those who are interested in the development of the northern part of our province.

I would also like to congratulate all members who have previously participated in this debate. There has been great variety; from this side of the house the speakers have been very informative, and from the other side they have been particularly amusing, particularly amusing was the reference to the term that has been used on several occasions, and that is “Thatcherite”. Now Thatcherite, with the “ite” ending seems to be a term that has biblical significance.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer):** — Like termite.

**Mr. Guy:** — Now I watched the show “Sodom and Gomorrah” the other night, and I must admit that I couldn’t help but think that our leader is

**February 25, 1963**

somewhat like Lot — leading the Thatcherites away from the sin and soft living of the socialistites, and although the socialistites have attempted to persuade the Liberalites that patronage, soft living, compulsion, regimentation is a desirable way of life, our leader, with his supporters, have shown the strength of conviction and there is no danger that they will look back and be turned to stone.

**An Hon. Member:** — To salt.

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, I think in the picture that I saw it appeared that the salt is more a type of stone. I am glad that the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources has returned. I noticed him earlier on in the evening reading a newspaper, and, in all due deference to the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, I would like to suggest that we could send him a copy of a far more truthful and realistic paper across the floor if he would be willing to spend his time reading it.

**Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources):** — I'll read it.

**Mr. Guy:** — Now I would also like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the address-in-reply because they made a very creditable attempt to sell an obsolete product. Because never has there been a product more obsolete than the type of socialism that the government opposite have been trying to sell for 18 years.

Let us look for a moment at the fate of socialistic experiments in the British Commonwealth since 1945. Britain had a socialistic experiment underway which bankrupted the country. Where is it today? New Zealand and Australia tried socialistic governments. Where are they? In Canada, socialism has had no success except in the province of Saskatchewan and the truth is that it is this cell of democratic socialism that is the last remaining effort of the socialists in the British Commonwealth to prove that socialism is an economic and political way of life acceptable to the majority of the people. And even here in Saskatchewan the last four by-elections have shown that the death rattle is already in their throats. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that socialism has never worked, it never will work while people have the freedom to control their own destinies. Wherever socialism has been tried as a political and economic system, it has been found wanting. The only type of socialism in existence today which has had any success is the type we find in Cuba, Russia, East Germany and China where, by ruthless means of force and compulsion and coercion, they have destroyed the basic freedoms of mankind. Thank Heaven it appears that socialism will be destroyed in Saskatchewan, along with the Attorney General, and it is our children that are going to pay for Saskatchewan's weakness in accepting the socialistic experiment in the first place.

Now, one hears much about the curse for Saskatchewan's economic sickness, but, Mr. Speaker, before any cure can be of permanent success one must get at the root of the trouble. The cause of Saskatchewan being the backwoods of the North American continent lies solely and completely with the socialists that sit at your right. Until this government is swept out of office our troubles will remain and all their promises and all their backtracking in the last few years will be too little and too late. Business, investment and industry have felt the cold hand of socialism for far too long to be taken in by a few lines in the throne speech promising more consideration to private enterprise. They know that this is an election gimmick to try and improve the Saskatchewan economy prior to the time when the government can gather up enough courage to call an election. Last spring, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that several large mining companies in northern Saskatchewan packed up and were ready to leave. The mineral resources minister finally agreed to amend the mining regulations along the lines suggested by these companies. But have we any increased mining in this province? The answer of course is no, not a particle. The willingness to give in was too little and too late. Mining men have told me that the regulations in this province and the concessions offered could be the most favorable in Canada and still they would not invest a single dollar in Saskatchewan as long as there was an opportunity to invest it anywhere else, as long as the threat of socialism exists. So the throne speeches of this government from now to eternity could go on promising help to free enterprise but these promises fall on deaf ears when they come from the government which have, by their acts, shown their determination to control every institution and every individual within its borders.

One has only to look at the coercive and compulsory legislation introduced during the last 18 years of socialistic dictatorship to realize that the aims of this government were and are based on Marxism and it is only the fact that the provincial government had no control over the armed forces of this country that has prevented the same results that occurred in Red China, Cuba and Russia.

Now the Leader of the Conservative party in this province has taken great delight in the last few weeks, going across the province broadcasting a Liberal and NDP union. Now this, Mr. Speaker, was done in self-defence, for if one looks back over the past four years one cannot help but see the similarity between the programs of the federal Conservatives and the provincial NDP. So any union of parties would most obviously include the Tories and CCF, or NDP. Both governments have been faced by major problems; both governments have lacked the leadership and the program for their solution; both governments lacked courage to ask their population for endorsement of their policy until forced to do so, even though both were being supported by a minority vote; both governments put political expediency ahead of the welfare of their people. The Prime Minister last June in the financial

**February 25, 1963**

crisis, our Premier last year during the medical care crisis, both the Prime Minister and the Premier have lost cabinet ministers because of the lack of support which these ministers can give to the policies of their respective leaders. And both have constantly practised the ancient art of alchemy in their cabinet juggling, trying to create gold from common metal. Both the Prime Minister and the Premier have placed their heads in the sand, hoping that their problems will disappear and finally, both the Prime Minister and the Premier will go down to inglorious defeat in their next respective elections.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that there are some differences between the two governments. In the Conservative party, the captain appears to be the last one to leave the sinking ship, his cabinet is being sent first, probably so that his swan song can be a solo affair; in Saskatchewan, however, the captain was the first to leave the ship. However, before leaving, the former premier said, don't worry, boys, I'm leaving you my debts and my speech writers. The debts have gone up and the speeches have remained the same.

Saskatchewan also tried to a new approach. They changed their name from CCF to NDP. I think perhaps the C.F. of the CCF and the initials of their notorious former finance minister were a little too close for comfort. However, an onion by any other name will be just as bad. And now they are in the process of going even further by trying to eliminate the taint of the name Saskatchewan Government. The first illustration of this, Mr. Speaker, was shown when they tried, or when they did change the name of the Saskatchewan Government Airways to Saskair. I am afraid that a change of policy would have been much more in line with the thinking of their employees and those who happen to deal with them than changing the name. However, I don't blame them for trying to cover up their name after their disgraceful action of last summer.

Now you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Government Airways was one of the carriers interested in taking over part of the prairie milk run, as it used to be known. At the transport hearing in Regina they had quite detailed plans of the amount of subsidy they would need, type of planes they would use in carrying out their portion of the run should it be given to them. Now, certainly this was not a request from a corporation that has the idea of selling out on their minds. And, in fact, it wasn't. When the government announced a few months later that S.G.A. was being sold, it came as a surprise and a shock to all the citizens of this province, and especially to their employees.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Will the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Guy:** — Yes, I will permit a question.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Will he just say when and where and in what way the government ever announced that S.G.A. was being sold? In other words, will he give some proof for this statement?

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, one proof that I can get, that there was an offer to purchase S.G.A. was in a statement from the Minister of Natural Resources at that time which said that the offer to buy S.G.A. was rejected. Now, you wouldn't reject something that you hadn't already received.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask again — the words of the hon. member were quite clear. He said the government had offered to sell S.G.A. He has not in any way whatsoever substantiated that — he ought to withdraw it.

**Mr. Guy:** — All right, Mr. Speaker, we shall say then that there appeared in the press, in editorials at various times over the summer months, that Saskatchewan Government Airways was contemplating the sale of their company to some interest in eastern Canada. And the point is, Mr. Speaker, there was a motive for this, and it was a very infamous and inglorious motive, if there ever was one, because this announcement of possible sale or this suggestion of possible sale, if that will suit the Premier any better, was an infamous attempt to intimidate and coerce the Saskatchewan Government Airway employees into accepting the signing of a new wage agreement. The oft . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Nonsense.

**Mr. Guy:** — Nonsense, nothing.

**Premier Lloyd:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. That statement is completely false. The hon. member has no basis whatsoever of substantiation for the statement and again it is one of those statements which ought to be withdrawn.

**Mr. Guy:** — Well now, Mr. Speaker, since the Premier has made his second speech in the throne speech debate, I will go on to show that there are reasons to believe . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The Premier raised what I believe is a correct point of privilege and it is not good parliamentary procedure to say that he has made a second speech in this debate because he raised a correct point of privilege as Premier in this house.

**Mr. Guy:** — . . . Mr. Speaker, if that is your ruling. However, it doesn't change the fact that the old agreement between the employees of the Saskatchewan Government Airways had expired on April 1, 1962 and this government, the so-called friends of labor,

**February 25, 1963**

according to the minister that just spoke, was unable to reach agreement with the union representing these employees. A board of conciliation was set up to deal with the dispute and in September they unanimously recommended a modest increase for the employees. Now, during the period from April to September, government representatives used the threat of sale of Saskatchewan Government Airways to a company in another line of business, who probably would want to lay off some of the employees, to intimidate the employees into accepting the government offer.

**Premier Lloyd:** — On a point of privilege. The hon. member . . . oh, I beg your pardon . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! When a member rises on a point of privilege I must hear him.

**Premier Lloyd:** — The hon. member is making a statement . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Mr. Premier. I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Guy:** — I won't withdraw the statement. It is so . . .

**Premier Lloyd:** — The hon. member has made a statement that I say again is entirely false. He should not be allowed to make such statement in this house.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, although it is quite permissible for the Hon. Premier to get up and say that the statement is false, on a point of privilege, surely he hasn't the right to go on and criticize the member. He has the right to say it's a false statement if he wishes to do so.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — The hon. member has accused the government of intimidation, of intimidating the union working for Saskair, and intimidation, Mr. Speaker, is an offence, a crime. He can't accuse . . .

**Mr. Snedker:** — Mr. Speaker, we are on a point of order. The Attorney General is making a speech now.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — The hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) cannot refuse time to a member of the government. It is a proper point of privilege. He must oblige.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Are we going to be in a position on this side of the house that every time a member gets up to speak or make a statement, the Premier almost invariably jumps out of his seat and say it's false. He has never once in this house in this session proved any charges ever made against a member on this side of the house. Time after time after time he has got up and just made a statement, it's false, and sat down again. I think he should be made to prove his charges.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point which the hon. member attempted to make. I am making no charges against the hon. member (Mr. Guy) who is speaking. I am simply denying on behalf of the government a serious charge, at least I think it is a serious charge, which he has made against the government. I am in the position of having knowledge of the facts with regard to this, the hon. member is not. I say his statement is incorrect and ought to be withdrawn.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think your point of privilege is well taken that if the member who is speaking can substantiate the statement soon, he is in order, but if he can't he should withdraw it as requested because the Premier in rising on this is speaking on behalf of the government.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, may I speak on this point of privilege. As I take it, the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is laying before this legislature his case and pointing out why he has come to this conclusion. And it is the conclusion of the member from Athabasca. Now, he may base his conclusion on a false premise, I don't know, it's new information to me, I wasn't aware of it, but at least he is doing an excellent job of justifying the statement he has made on the information that he has. And I think he is within his rights in doing so. No one here has the right to say to a member that you can't put your deductions before the legislature — these are the deductions that the member is drawing. I submit that he is within his rights.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There is nothing to prevent a member putting his deductions before this house, but that is a different matter altogether from making a statement that the government is guilty of intimidating the union. It is a different thing, it's a different thing altogether.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the rules are quite clear in the house that motives cannot be imputed that way and I would ask the member to withdraw that statement and proceed with his speech.

**Mr. E.F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch):** — Every time we accuse the government, does that mean to say that we are going to have to withdraw if, in their opinion, they feel that we are accusing them of something falsely. A point of privilege is a personal privilege and the Premier, as far as I can see, was not attacked personally — we are attacking the government as a whole. We can accuse them of a lot worse than what they have been accused of.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have said that it is an offence against the house, it is against the rules of the house to impute motives and I do believe that his statement saying that the government was attempting to intimidate the employees, that is imputing motives.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, might I submit that the hon. member was interrupted in the midst of his statement, that he has further remarks with regard to this and that I have no doubt that he should be given the permission to present them to this house.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have asked the hon. member to withdraw his statement and proceed with his speech.

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, at the present time I am not going to withdraw my statement . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I request you to withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Guy:** — All right, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the statement and I will say again that it was obvious to all concerned that this was a very unpalatable pill for the government to swallow but it was certainly obvious in the eyes of the general public that the government were using intimidation to force their government employees to accept their wage offer that was being presented to them.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Members of this house are entitled to be protected by the rules of the house against unwarranted charges that they have committed offences. And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member withdraws the charge and then gets up and repeats it, and I suggest that's compounding the unparliamentary conduct which ought to be withdrawn.

**Mrs. Batten:** — On the point of order, I have to agree with the Hon. Attorney General on the point of order, even if the remark made by the member is warranted, where it is accusing them of something



criminal, then it must be withdrawn and it doesn't matter if it is warranted or not. In this case, even if it is warranted, if it is perfectly true, it still must be withdrawn, according to the rules.

**Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a cardinal principle of which I think we are all aware that when a member makes a statement of which he has personal knowledge it must be accepted by the house. This is one of the basic tenets of parliamentary procedure as I understand it, and the Premier has said here that he has knowledge, definite knowledge of what has transpired and he has made a definite statement that what has been said by the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is not true, and I think the Premier's statement must be accepted as the truth.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Speaking on a point of privilege. It would appear from the arguments presented by the Minister of Municipal Affairs that if the Premier makes a statement it must be accepted as true; if anybody else makes a statement it must be accepted as false, and I do submit, with all due deference to you, Sir, that the member from Athabasca has a perfect right to say what he considers in his own opinion the facts of the case.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have ruled that he must withdraw the statement of imputation. He did so, then proceeded to repeat the same statement which must once again be withdrawn. You cannot withdraw a statement and then turn around and repeat it.

**Mr. Guy:** — All right, Mr. Speaker, I will say it in this manner then, that in my opinion, and in the opinion of many of the boys of Saskatchewan Government Airways, it appeared that there was intimidation involved in the proposed sale of Saskatchewan Government Airways at that particular time.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — On a point of order. The hon. member is simply repeating the charge once more. He says that in his opinion — that doesn't change the fact that it is still . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, am I not allowed to have an opinion in this house as well as the Hon. Attorney General. Since when did the Attorney General control the opinions of this house.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**February 25, 1963**

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — The hon. member is entitled to have an opinion but if he expresses it in this house he must express it in parliamentary language and to say that it is his opinion the government is guilty of intimidation is unparliamentary language and he cannot say it in any fashion that is acceptable under the rules of this house.

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, in the same light, it is also the opinion of the Attorney General that we are followers of Thatcherism and in our view that is unparliamentary and therefore should be withdrawn.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Order! I would ask the member to withdraw the statement of intimidation and proceed with his speech.

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to withdraw the . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I am not asking you if it is difficult. I am asking you to withdraw.

**Mr. Guy:** — . . . because it was so obvious. However, if you say on behalf of the government that it must be withdrawn, then I will withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! And I shall ask you to withdraw the statement that I am acting on behalf of the government.

**Mr. Guy:** — I will withdraw the whole statement and go on to prove that things that were as I have said. Now, I've got to revise this since I can't use the word intimidate. Well, after the unanimous report of the conciliation board was received, it was only a few days that a headline appeared in the newspaper that the offer to buy S.G.A. was rejected. Now the reason given by the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources at that time was that service into northern areas could best be provided by the government. I think the exact words were "service into northern areas could best be provided by government operation". Now, Mr. Speaker, does it appear logical that from April to September the government was in doubt that their own carrier was able to provide the best services for northern Saskatchewan? To me it appeared a very weak excuse and as I have previously said, there appeared to be only one reason for this particular action of the government at that time. I don't dare say what it was.

Now it would be very nice if I could say that the situation was closed and that everyone lived happily ever after. The employees got their raise, we still have S.G.A. and everyone is happy. However, this is not the case, at least for many of the employees of Saskatchewan Government Airways because many of these employees live in accommodation that is provided by Saskatchewan Government Airways. And following the wage increase which was implemented, there was a maximum increase of \$20-\$25 per month to these employees but at the same time the government turned around and they raised the rent of this accommodation by \$40 a month, so here are the employees getting a raise of from \$20 to \$25 a month and turning around and paying an extra \$40 a month rent. This another example of socialist more abundant living. The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away.

**An Hon. Member:** — The Lord giveth and Lloyd taketh away.

**Mr. Guy:** — Now, I realize as I said before that this is a very unpalatable pill for the government to swallow and I am not surprised that they showed considerable opposition in having the facts placed before this house.

Now, I would like to go on for a few minutes and say that I was pleased that further attention has been given to the special problems of the Indian and native population of this province. The provision for special up-grading classes and integrated schools, vocational and technical education are most beneficial, but here again the full value of these courses cannot be achieved until economic and resource expansion takes place. We have in northern Saskatchewan one of the few undeveloped areas left in Canada and at a time when people and industry should be moving northward to expand and develop this rich and vast area, we find that just the opposite is true. Under the policies, or lack of policies of this government, the people living there already are starving to death, many are forced to leave their homes, their families and a familiar environment to try and compete with the workers in the southern part of the province where unemployment is already high.

Now other provinces have developed over the last few years a plan of economic expansion that is paying big dividends in job opportunities and increased population. Last fall our sister province of Alberta announced the establishment of a northern development council as part of a multi-million dollar project to bring about northern expansion. This council will operate out of a northern community and will plan, promote, co-ordinate and advise the government on ways to foster and advance northern development. This is what is needed in Saskatchewan. Instead of the haphazard organization that presently exists, where there is a considerable overlapping of policy, a considerable overlapping of cost, duplication of

**February 25, 1963**

services in many respects and decisions made by people in the southern part of the province that have never been any farther north than Prince Albert. So, while northern Alberta and northern Manitoba are getting the mines, the roads, the railways, the pulp mills and the industry, northern Saskatchewan are getting roads that end in dead ends, promises of pulp mills, factories in the sky, regulations that drive any hope of future development into oblivion, and, finally a report from the centre of community studies saying that there are already too many people for the too few resources that are available in this northern part of our province. And, unfortunately, this is true at present because the natural resources fail to be developed under the policies of this government. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this will not be so as soon as the Liberal government is elected in 1964, which will start a program of northern expansion which will bring work and stability benefiting the whole province.

Now, I would be remiss if before closing I did not refer to the performance we were given this afternoon by the Minister of Social Welfare. In our northern area we are also faced with the same scandal in social aid as is prevalent in the south. This afternoon we were subjected for more than an hour to one of the most disorganized speeches ever prepared by the government speech writers and read by a cabinet minister. After listening to this harangue I am sure that the people of the province, particularly those receiving social aid, wished he would show as much concern for the problems of his department as he showed for the — or he is going to show for the person who will represent the constituency of MacKenzie in the next federal election. For one hour he attempted to misrepresent the Liberal position in regard to social aid. It is this fear of criticism, attacks on the Leader of the Opposition, as well as these meetings that were held across the province only a few weeks ago which are serving to prove to the people of this province that there is serious mishandling of this particular department. The crocodile tears that he shed for social aid recipients this afternoon would have far more effect if he had ended his speech by assuring the people of this province that the weaknesses and the shortcomings of the social aid department, were being corrected, instead of putting his head in the sand and ignoring the true conditions as they exist. Never can it be said that the Liberal party are not sincerely interested in the social welfare of this province. We are in complete agreement that there are people who deserve help from federal and provincial governments and we have been on record for years to this particular point. It is for this reason that we are so concerned at the manner that social aid is being administered in this province at the present time. We feel that if only the people who deserve social aid received aid, then those people would receive a much higher standard of living than they are today under the present regulations. However, this government's policy of giving social aid to their friends, irrespective of need, lowers the standard for those who truly need it. Those who have need of social aid need have no fear of not receiving . . .

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the hon. member has accused this government of giving social aid to its friends and not to others. This is a reflection on the integrity of this government and must be withdrawn because this government does not pay directly social aid to anyone in Saskatchewan. All social aid is paid by the municipal officials. The hon. member must withdraw this charge he has made against the government of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, of course I did not make the statement that the minister suggested that I did. I did not at any time say that social aid was only given to those who were friends of the government. It is the guilty conscience across the way that brings this suggestion on the part of the minister.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I haven't the transcript of what the hon. member said but those who heard would hear him charge this government with giving public funds directly to people on social aid in Saskatchewan. That is a false charge and must be withdrawn.

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, I said, and these are the exact words — the government's policy of giving social aid to their friends, irrespective of need — and I did not say that they were not providing it for anyone else at that time. The fact that these people are receiving it lowers the standard of living for those who are in dire need of this assistance. Those who have need of social aid have no fear of not receiving it under a Liberal government because they will — those who do not deserve it will be eliminated and the funds available will be there to increase the payments to those who are in true need of social aid.

Liberals across Canada, in every province, have been responsible for most of the basic legislation that are on the books in regard to social welfare for the people of these provinces and the dominion as a whole. No Liberal government has ever turned a deaf ear to the needs of the unfortunate. They have accepted their responsibility without fear and without favor. The only people who need to fear the social aid program are those friends of the socialists opposite who are trying to live off the benefits which should be provided to the truly needy. Those who need social aid under a Liberal government will receive it, and in far more beneficent means than what have been provided at present.

Well, needless to say, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the fact that the government has not come up with any solution in the throne speech and by their actions tonight are showing their fears and their sensitivity to the fact that their last days on this earth are near to conclusion, I would like to say that I will certainly support the amendment which calls for this government to go to the . . . at the earliest possible opportunity and I will oppose the motion.

**February 25, 1963**

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to join with my colleague from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) in welcoming the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) to our ranks. I am confident that he has demonstrated to this government in strongest possible terms that he will be a valuable asset to the Liberal opposition and a very capable representative of the constituency of Prince Albert.

I would also like to join those who have congratulated the mover and seconder, and the previous speakers in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, after witnessing the events of the past few moments in this legislature, I believe it raises certain very fundamental questions with regard to all legislative and parliamentary debates. If we have arrived at the stage, Mr. Speaker, when a man cannot express his personal opinions and his assessment of a situation without a display such as we have witnessed by the members who sit on your right, I believe our Rules of Procedure should be reviewed. As far as I am concerned, this is the place where all opinions should have equal consideration. This is the chamber where the business of the province is conducted.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — On a point of order. The hon. member is casting a very serious reflection on the Speaker and on the behavior and conduct in this house. It is simply ridiculous to say that you can express any of your opinions. If I expressed my opinion of the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) in this house I would be out of order, and this kind of reflection cast by the hon. member is quite improper.

**Mr. Foley:** — If I expressed my opinion of the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources or the Hon. Provincial Treasurer, I am afraid I would be doubly out of order.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I said it first.

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, if there was any reflection upon yourself, I certainly did not intend it. My remarks were directed at the conduct of the members on your right, who have indeed protested too much, and only guilty consciences can account for their squirming in the past while. I believe we owe a debt to members on this side of the house who are bringing to the attention of the public some of the very serious problems in this province.

The continued efforts, Mr. Speaker, of this government over the past number of years to completely redraw the map of Saskatchewan are a cause of great concern. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that one can tear up the municipal maps of this province, can redraw the boundaries, but at the same time the habits and the customs of people are very well established, and no amount of map-making can change that.

I suggest that when we are attempting to assess the matter of the reorganization of local governments, we should take these matters into consideration. One of the principles of municipal reorganization which must be taken into consideration is the service being provided to rural people throughout the province. What effect will the proposals of the government boundary commission have on the essential services of health, and education: What effect will they have on future road and communication policy?

When we consider that many of our municipal councils throughout the province have flatly opposed the change in boundaries, when we consider that this government in successive by-elections have posed this as an issue, and in each case have been soundly defeated, it seems to me that this warrants serious reconsideration on the part of this government. And yet I have not detected in the speech from the throne, nor in any of the statements of those who have spoken in this debate, any suggestion that they are going to change the stand which they have taken. The only change I have noted was after the Turtleford by-election when the present Provincial Treasurer reversed his previous stand and finally agreed that the people of this province should be given a vote.

Mr. Speaker, the government which sits on your right is interested in serving the political party of their persuasion ahead of the people of this province. In almost every one of our major issues, the first question in their minds is "How is it going to affect our political future?" and "What support will our political party receive in this province?" rather than what benefit will it be to all the people in this province. Now this is a very serious matter, since governments are elected to serve all the people. We have had several illustrations of this tendency, one of which has been raised already in this assembly. Should a minister of the crown intervene in activities or matters which are of no concern to the people of the province generally, and which are of first concern to a political party, namely his own, and which reflect upon the financial future of his political party?

The costly interference of the NDP and the Attorney General, in appealing the Supreme Court decision outlawing the use of union check-off dues for political purposes in B.C., is not in the best interests of the residents of Saskatchewan. And I submit that on this issue alone, Mr. Speaker, when those who sit to your right once again go to the people they will be repudiated in no uncertain terms for this unwarranted act.

**February 25, 1963**

In this and in many other actions by this government which cannot be attributed to the desire to work for the welfare of the people of this province, one can only surmise that the motivation is purely and simply to deflect public concern from one of the basic issues in this province, that of proper health and medical service. These are ways in which this government hopes to wiggle out from under the responsibilities which they have to provide all of the people of this province, our professional groups and our trade groups, the type of atmosphere necessary to grow in a desirable pattern and to progress forward.

One can only feel, Mr. Speaker, that if this government has been so callous and so unconcerned about one professional group, what then must be the outcome of all other groups in this province at the present time? What type of atmosphere has been created. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I say that this government has been serving the New Democratic Party first, the people of Saskatchewan second. When I heard the speech of the hon. member this afternoon, I couldn't help but feel that he had lost contact completely with the administration of his department. All voices on this side of the house that have been raised in criticism have been accused of criticizing not the minister, not the people in his department, but municipal people and others throughout the province. If my interpretation was correct, then, Mr. Speaker, he apparently takes no responsibility whatsoever for the administration of policy in his department. This might be said for some of the other departments in this government. When anything happens which may reflect favorably upon their department, the minister takes sole credit for it, but, of course, when anything is brought out, Mr. Speaker, that may reflect otherside, then, of course, it is the old song of the opposition attempting to vilify elected representatives in local government bodies in this province. I feel that this is a regrettable attitude for any minister of this government to take, and I would like to see just once, Mr. Speaker, in this debate, a minister of the crown stand up and answer directly and not by innuendo some of the charges which may be made from time to time by the opposition. I would like to see them stand up, Mr. Speaker, and talk from their heads or their hearts, if they could, and not through the coldly mechanical process of reproducing printed words whose origin at the best is very uncertain.

I believe that all of the members of this legislature have a responsibility to bring into this chamber their own thinking and their own philosophy and not something they have borrowed from a salaried brain-trust in some corridor of the government. And far too often, Mr. Speaker, this is what we get.

Mr. Speaker, in the short time allotted to me in this debate, I would like to make reference for a moment to one or two remarks made by the members on your right. I was



interested to note the hon. lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) referred to the need for a new hospital in the city. I couldn't help but feel, Mr. Speaker, when driving down town the other day and seeing the very imposing edifice, the new headquarters building of the power corporation, that if the \$9 million that will eventually pour out of the provincial coffers for this building had been devoted to projects such as the hon. lady member of Regina mentioned, projects in the northern part of this province, how much more worthy it might have been on the part of this government. When I think of all of their sanctimonious promises; when I think of the manner in which they attempt to propagate the idea of abundant living for this province; when I see the millions of dollars which are spent on projects of this nature, while many thousands of our citizens go without much needed services. \$3 million for a new telephone building . . .

**Mr. McFarlane:** — A million dollars for booze.

**Mr. Foley:** — A four-lane highway entering the city of Regina.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — They still believe in the backwoods theory, no progress.

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, I still believe that before we build four-lane highways in the province of Saskatchewan the farmers of the northern part of this province at least deserve a graded road; that the fishermen and the trappers and many of our Indian people at least deserve the basic necessities of life; that before we spend millions of dollars on modernization of urban telephone facilities for the second and for the third time more effort might be made to assist our rural people in getting these much-needed facilities. I was particularly interested to note, Mr. Speaker, in the throne speech here it states as follows:

More than two hundred thousand telephones are now being serviced in Saskatchewan. During 1962, 21 communities were converted to automatic operation. One-third of all rural telephones are now dial operated. An increased number of rural telephone companies took advantage of the assistance program, which has provided grants for pole replacement and higher standards of maintenance.

Only 5,000 additional rural subscribers were connected to these additional exchanges.

Mr. Speaker, this represents little more than a small percentage of the large number of people without these services. I would like to have seen something in the throne address much more definite with regard to a continuing program of rural telephone expansion.

What has the throne speech to say on the time question, Mr. Speaker? Here we have a matter which has caused a tremendous amount of concern and unhappiness in this province between rural and urban folks and which has been debated for a number of years. Not at that time or even now has the government attempted to set out any well-defined means of approaching a solution to this problem. I'm not suggesting it is a simple solution, Mr. Speaker, but I am suggesting that this government might have done more to have brought the various segments of our economy together in a determined effort to arrive at a solution and, furthermore, to stick to whatever solution is reached, and not to be wavering back and forth on this very important matter.

The hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) has mentioned our Indian people. Here again I feel that this government have been notable not for what they may have done in the past, but for what they have definitely not done, and for the manner in which they have disregarded the needs of this important segment of our province.

I can recall the former premier of this province, in the past election campaign in my area, telling the Indian people that he was going to send representatives from this government to Ottawa to negotiate on their behalf for housing assistance, for the introduction of some power and telephone services to our reservations. Well, that is quite some time ago, Mr. Speaker, I have not yet seen any tangible evidence of progress in this direction, at least in the northern part of the province. I am aware of the fact that there have been a few reserves that have received some service, and I might say that I am pleased to see that a start has been made although it has been a small one. I feel that when we can find means of providing these facilities for our Indian people we will have gone a long way towards encouraging them to assist themselves in a better fashion.

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — I would like to remind the hon. member, on a question of privilege, that I have a time question too.

**Mr. Foley:** — I was told that the hon. minister wished to adjourn the debate, and I can assure him that I do not intend to take more than a few minutes more. There is one further matter that caused me considerable concern. Last summer, Mr. Speaker, when the medicare controversy in this province was at its height, several departmental examinations presented to our high school students in June contained questions concerning the pros and cons of medicare. If we are to maintain a policy in this province, Mr. Speaker, of providing for young people an education which does not favor any political philosophy, then an action of this nature must not be allowed to occur again. I was pleased to note that several officials of the Department of Education expressed similar views.

Mr. Speaker, in the north-west part of the province, which I have the honor to represent, after all these years we are still without the services of natural gas in many of our communities. We are only 40 miles from the nearest gas pipeline at North Battleford and we have natural gas fields at Lloydminster, just south of the river. While I realize that the gas reserves at Lloydminster are not considered adequate for any great expansion, I do feel it is the responsibility of this government to bring the services of natural gas to northwest Saskatchewan at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Speaker, because the members of this government are continuing to impose more and more of their socialist principles on the people of this province, because, Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne does not, in my opinion, fully or courageously deal with some of our pressing problems, I will support the amendment and vote against the speech from the throne.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, like everyone else, I want to first of all congratulate the mover and the seconder on the wonderful contribution that they gave to the throne speech debate. Indeed, these two speeches will be recorded as the most constructive speeches, at least that I have heard, in this legislature, and I regret very much that I can't say the same for the comments made by the hon. members opposite in rebuttal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a good example was the speaker that just took his seat. After complaining bitterly that he didn't have the opportunity to express his opinions in this house, we all agreed that we could express our opinions, but I would think, too, Mr. Speaker, that when I go beyond my particular opinions and impute motives, as the hon. member did, and make statements that are unfounded, then I expect, Mr. Speaker, you will call me to order, and I can assure you that if this is the case, I will certainly acquiesce to your request.

I want to, in the time at my disposal, make some reference to the veterinary college since it was raised by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) who, to my mind, would not like to pose as champion of a western veterinary college.

I appreciate his keen interest in this matter — we are all very much interested in a veterinary college — but I don't appreciate him trying to pose as the champion of it, and to suggest that somehow or other the Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan is dragging his legs in this regard. I am sure he wouldn't have said some of the things he said, had he known some of the facts. I will try to recite them in the time remaining at my disposal this evening.

**February 25, 1963**

The matter of a western veterinary college was discussed at a conference of provincial ministers held in Guelph, Ontario, the site of the Ontario veterinary college, in 1959. We were assured then by the officials concerned that they would be able to take all of the students that western Canada wished to send to them for training, and so, 1960 they continued to take our students, in fact they told us that they would cut down on some of the students that were coming to them from outside of Canada in order to make this possible. In 1961, however, the reverse picture was presented to us. Now I do not know why the difference in viewpoint occurred in such a short period of time. However, we were told in 1961 that Ontario would not be able to continue to accommodate the numbers of young people in Canada who wished to take a veterinary course, and, as a result of our discussions at the provincial conference of 1961, it was agreed between provincial ministers for the western provinces that a western veterinary college was a necessity and that it ought to be a co-operative project, to which each of the western provinces and the federal government, we hoped, would contribute. As a result of that meeting it was agreed that the four western ministers would meet in Edmonton. This we did in January, 1962, and at that meeting the western ministers, as a result, agreed to ask the federal government to contribute 50 percent to the capital cost of a western veterinary college.

After I came home from the conference, the chairman, Mr. Halmrast, the Minister of Agriculture for Alberta, advised me he presented the decision of the conference to his cabinet. His cabinet decided the federal government ought to pay 75 percent of the cost. Mr. Halmrast got in touch with me again and asked me what I thought. Well, I said I thought it was unrealistic to ask the federal government to contribute 75 percent but I said if the other ministers go along, and you want to ask it, go ahead. And Alberta, therefore, asked for a 75 percent contribution which, of course, produced a profound silence in Ottawa for the balance of 1962, and I think quite justifiably so.

Then, subsequently, the premier of the province of Alberta, as you know and it was rightly said by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker), said that Alberta was not going ahead, wasn't interested in a veterinary college, and as a result there was a very serious, widespread repercussion against this statement made by the premier of Alberta and I too was most disappointed when it was made, because this was supposed to be a co-operative project and I thought the project was probably killed because Alberta indicated that they weren't interested.

We had previously stated that we would contribute on a co-operative basis, without talking about location whatsoever. This was our position and this is what I was permitted to advise at the conference in Edmonton. I put this matter

on the agenda again for last year's annual agricultural conference held in Ottawa., November 18. I resurrected this issue again, and it was discussed again, and it appeared more urgent than ever that we need such a college. The federal Minister of Agriculture advised us that he would be prepared to recommend to his government that they contribute 25 percent to capital costs and 25 percent to continued operation, of such a college. It must be remembered that it costs as much to educate a veterinarian as it does a doctor. There is a lot of clinical material involved and I think these are some of the reasons that we are talking about a co-operative project.

After the meeting in Ottawa in November, 1962, I and the Minister of Agriculture for Alberta were delegated to act as a committee to go back to our respective universities and ask them to give us an estimate of costs at the respective campuses, taking into consideration facilities that might be available and that could be used, particularly during the initial stages of the development of a veterinary college. Furthermore, to go back to the conference held in Edmonton, it was suggested by the federal government that since they were contemplating building a western animal diseases laboratory, that it might be integrated with a veterinary college. Now, Alberta, in January, 1962, took the attitude that this could not be done, possibly because they felt that we revived the project again and, unfortunately, certain statements were made, I think, without consultation and information, that otherwise may not have been made. The minister for Alberta and myself were under obligation to report back to the other two ministers and the federal government regarding the estimate figures given to us as to the cost of a veterinary college at the respective universities. We arranged with Dr. Ken Wells, the director general of the federal health of animals branch, to sit down with the universities when they were preparing their material.

Now, in view of the statements that have been made in our neighbor province, that they are very anxious to have a veterinary college, they also say they are not going it alone. They are saying that they are prepared to go, provided substantial federal help is available.

Well, we would like a veterinary medical college here too. And I don't need any prodding, and the government doesn't need any prodding by the hon. members opposite at all. I want to say this to the hon. member for Saltcoats, that I could bet you anything, my bottom dollar, that if we had in our estimates in the 1962 session of the legislature, when he introduced his motion, at this time say a sum of a million or a million and a half dollars in our estimates, I bet the hon. members opposite would have voted against it. They say, oh, yeah, Mr. Speaker.

**February 25, 1963**

**Mrs. Batten:** — On a point of privilege. Is it parliamentary to lay bets in the house?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Okay, Mr. Speaker. I would certainly say from the past performance of the hon. members, we could be sure that they would vote against such a budget. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, the government has made a decision regarding Saskatchewan's position in this regard, and the decision of the government will be made known in due course, regarding Saskatchewan's position and attitude to a new western veterinary medical college. Certainly, we are interested in having it here, but by the same token, if it is a co-operative project, I do have some regard and some responsibility to the other participating agencies.

Since, Mr. Speaker, it is 10 o'clock and you are glowering at me a bit, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.