

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**9th Day**

**Tuesday, February 26, 1963.**

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

On the Orders of the Day:

**AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE RATES**

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a short announcement to the Assembly with regard to the automobile insurance fees to be levied during the next licence year. New automobile insurance rates under the Automobile Accident Insurance Act will go into effect on May 1, 1963. They will apply when Saskatchewan motorists purchase their 1963-64 licence plates which are expected to go on sale about March 15. The new rates will represent an average increase of ten percent per motor vehicle. I am pleased to say, however, that owners of some of the older private passenger cars will actually receive reductions in their rates. In most cases the rate increase will be about \$4 per car.

There will be no change in rates for farm trucks of 1951 and earlier vintage. The premium rates for these models is presently \$4, the rates for newer models will increase by \$1 or \$2, depending on the year model of the truck.

On February 6, I report on the financial operations of the Automobile Accident Insurance Act for the year which ended December 31, 1962. At that time I reported an operating loss of \$961,000 for the calendar year. The results for the month of January, 1963 have since been obtained and show a loss of approximately \$30,000 for the month. Claims for February have substantially increased, compared with February a year ago, and there appears to be no indication of any improvement for March and April. It's now estimated that the probably operating loss for the licence year which will end on April 30, 1963 will be in the vicinity of \$1.3 million. Last Friday I announced an increase in benefits to Saskatchewan motorists. The liability limits under the Automobile Accident Insurance Act will be increased to \$35,000, inclusive for bodily injury and property damage. Previously these limits were \$10,000 for one person injured, with a maximum of \$20,000 for any one accident, \$5,000 for property damage. These additional benefits are estimated to cost the licence insurance fund \$270,000 for the new year.

**February 26, 1963**

Let us glance at the forecast then for next year. Assuming that the accident rate continues in the next licence year at the same level as during the current year, then the anticipated operating loss would be \$1.3 million plus the increase in benefits of \$270,000, to make a total projected loss of \$1.57 million. Offset against this will be a saving of about \$200,000 in the next licence year resulting from the discontinuance of certain medical care benefits, leaving a net projected loss of \$1.37 million. Expected from the increase yield under the new rates will be about \$916,000. This is expected to leave a deficit in next year's operations of approximately \$500,000, which will reduce the accumulated surplus from previous years to \$2.3 million.

### **CORRECTION TO HANSARD FOR FEBRUARY 25, 1963**

**Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation):** — I understand that I stated that the widow in the second case I discussed received \$1,000 for an insurance policy. This, of course, should have been \$10,000, the amount mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. This is the amount I had in my notes but there was a slip of the tongue.

Her social aid payments were suspended when this resource was discovered by the city of Regina welfare officials, not before, as my remarks might have suggested. I understand that I also gave the percentage of the payments as 7, 51, 51. This, of course, should have been 7 percent for municipalities, 51 percent by the province and 42 percent by the federal. One hon. member gave my staff credit for what seemed to be an excellent speech. I was prepared to let that ride but when later someone described it as a very bad speech, I thought I should make it clear that I dictated the whole speech myself and I should exonerate my staff from any credit or blame. I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for exonerating my staff from any blame in disclosing confidential materials from the files as he was quoted in this morning's press as saying he was given his information by reliable sources inside the city's welfare department. This completely exonerates everyone on the staff of the provincial Department of Social Welfare and fixes responsibility where it belongs on the council of the city of Regina.

### **DOG DERBY CHAMPIONSHIP**

**Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to draw to the attention of this house the World Championship Dog Derby at The Pas Trappers' Festival last

Saturday was won by Mr. Peter Morin, a Cree trapper from Reindeer Lake in my constituency. I am sure that the members on both sides of the house will wish to join with me in offering congratulations to Mr. Morin for his personal victory as well as for the honor that he brought to northern Saskatchewan.

### WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City):** — Before the orders of the day I would like to draw the attention of the members to a group of school children from the Fountain School in Saskatoon who are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Clayden. I am sure all the members will join with me in saying how pleased we are to have them here today and we hope that their trip will be an enjoyable one and also an informative one.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Semchuk (Meadow Lake) for an address-in-reply and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Gardiner (Melville).

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am very thankful to the Provincial Treasurer for helping me out a bit in what appeared to be still further restrictions on the time to express my opinions in this house.

**An Hon. Member:** — Cry baby. Stop crying.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Well, I'm not a cry baby, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to condense what I have to say as well as I can in a few well-chosen words.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech itself bespeaks comprehensive economic development and employment opportunities already provided and new employment opportunities for the future. First of all, I wish, Mr. Speaker, to deal with references made in the throne speech to the agricultural industry. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that although the throne speech mentioned the impressive recovery of the agricultural industry from the extensive crop failure in 1961, in fact the worst since 1937, the statement has been made by members opposite and other sources that nature played the prominent role in this recovery. This may be true, but nature also played a prominent role in the crop failure and feed disaster in 1961. And may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Agriculture also played a prominent role in providing income stability in 1961 from increased livestock production and by the emergency measures taken in that year to maintain our basic herds. As a result of the department's long-term policy, our livestock population was at a record high of over two million head in 1961. The income from the sale of

**February 26, 1963**

livestock in that year cushioned the blow of the disastrous grain crop failure. And as a result of the effective measures taken we saved our basic herds by providing assistance in moving over 328,000 tons of feed and fodder and providing financial and other encouragement to farmers to salvage every bit of fodder that it was possible for them to obtain locally. So a serious agricultural disaster was avoided. Saving our livestock herds in 1961 resulted in a good volume of livestock marketing and, indeed, marketings at higher prices in 1962, which also made an invaluable contribution to the improved farm income in 1962. The resulting benefits accrued to local governments, provincial government, business activity and employment opportunities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with further remarks, I would like to say something about the general attitude of the hon. members opposite, particularly their leader. He is rapidly acquiring a reputation for changing what was once known as the Liberal party to a party of Thatcherism. There is no doubt that we face great new problems as a result of the terrific technological progress that has been made over the past years. And that new responsibilities will be imposed on both the private and public sector of the economy, and that these problems can only be solved by mutual trust, understanding and co-operation. I submit that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and hon. members opposite, by pursuing an almost hysterical policy of creating mistrust, animosity and sharp political conflict, are creating an atmosphere in which it is not possible to find a solution to the great economic and social problems confronting both the private and public sectors of the economy. Instead of constructive criticism, Mr. Speaker, we are offered, session after session, on the hustings in the country, in and out of this legislature, the most destructive and bitter kind of, and unfounded, criticism that I have ever had to listen to. This government makes no claim to perfection. We have made mistakes, and I think there is ample opportunity for constructive criticism to point out some of those mistakes made. But we do maintain that we have not made the mistake of standing still, and that the economy of this province, as a result of policies pursued, has progressively improved. And no amount of endeavoring to place a wicked and evil connotation on the word socialism will remove that fact in the minds of the people of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members of the opposition would have the people of this province believe that socialism is something terrible and evil, that it is the root cause of all our troubles.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — The hon. members opposite say “hear, hear”. Well, I am going to endeavor to convince them, although I don’t expect to penetrate that overburden of substance that covers their inner thinking apparatus, Mr. Speaker, but I do wish to take the

opportunity of providing them with a few excerpts from the Prairie Messenger, statements expressed by a clergyman on this subject of socialism. Here's one article appearing in the Muenster Prairie Messenger of January 30 under the heading "Socialism Essential", and this is an outline of a talk given to the Newman Club at Kingston, Ontario by Rev. Peter A. Nearing of Ottawa, director of the social action department of the Canadian Catholic Conference. He says this:

To belong to a group means to give one's self to another, explained Father Nearing, and no man has yet discovered a more direct or more efficient way of attaining self-perfection.

He goes on:

Socialization, he added, is nothing more or less than the free and intelligent entrance of human persons into a union that is conducive to their mutual protection. Rugged individualism, he said, is self-centred and selfish. It is unenlightened self-interest. It sees its own good in a very narrow and limited way. It is anti-social.

And, if I heard correctly, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition the other day mentioned that this rugged individualism was a great motivation, this profit motivation, that this was the thing that stood for progress, that it was this sort of approach that has created all of the progress that we see about us. Rev. Nearing goes on to say:

This to my mind, from the point of view of the human person, is the greatest advantage that socialization offers, whether it is socialization on the international, national, local or family level.

Another quotation appearing in the same issue of this paper, from a person who contributed quite often to this particular paper, and sometimes in not very complimentary terms with reference to socialism. And in his article entitled "A Matter Approaching Socialism" he says this, and the author is John Patrick Gillesey:

To my way of thinking, there is a very serious flaw in socialism as it is presented to us today. I make that statement with honesty so as to mislead none. I do so also without any ill will. Quite the opposite, in fact. As far as I can determine the socialists are motivated by very high humanitarian principles. Indeed, their motives are Christian in their inspiration.

**February 26, 1963**

And he goes on to say, generally, that all people that believe in socialism, and there are all kinds of aspects of it, some have a materialistic approach and so on, but so we find these people within the free enterprise system too, perhaps more numerous than we do with the groups that believe in a social philosophy. And he goes on to say:

I was amazed to have an old-time CCF'er write me to tell me he had finally lived to see someone like myself advocate a policy all CCF members had advocated 30 years ago. To criticize this man's motives in being a socialist would be worse than unkind.

So I suggest to hon. members opposite that they pay heed to some of these statements and adopt an attitude that is a bit more constructive and not condemn socialism in all its forms as being something totally wicked and evil. I could quote much more. No doubt some hon. members opposite may take excerpts from these statements to try to deny what I am saying and to suggest that I have been taking excerpts at random — to satisfy my own point of view. But both articles very clearly stated the viewpoint of the writers — who also offer some criticism — but they said, as a whole, they said if somebody doesn't make a start some place along the road we will never achieve social advance, even though many of us may think the approach isn't absolutely right.

So we move ahead, Mr. Speaker, by trial and error and mistakes, but this government has endeavored to pull progressively ahead and I wish to answer as quickly as I can some of the statements made opposite that this socialism, so-called, has created stagnation in the province, that it has done nothing to contribute to employment opportunities or to new business opportunities, that the money invested in the public utility corporations is ill-spent, that it has done no good, that it represents a burden of debt on the taxpayers of Saskatchewan that they can never repay. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that statements of that kind are definitely harmful to the progressive development of our province. For example, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech mentions that good progress had been made on the South Saskatchewan Dam. To date, nearly \$5 million has been spent in my own department as a contribution, as our contribution to the construction of the dam and for irrigation works. Was this money ill-spent? Is this money, spent for the development of this resource, not going to improve living standards, business activities and employment opportunities? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is very obvious.

The other thing, the throne speech mentions extension of the community pasture development program. To date, as a result of community pasture development and as a result of the lease policy pursued by the provincial Department of Agriculture, over 26,000 farmers in this province have received

benefits. In the conservation development branch alone, \$18 million were spent for reclamation work, irrigation development, drainage, community pasture development, plus another \$3 million for earned assistance to co-operators of various kinds, to plant roadside and field shelter belts — some 3,000 to 4,000 miles planted to date — and regrassing roadsides — some 5,000 miles. Wasn't the expenditure of this money a valuable contribution to employment opportunities, to stabilizing agriculture and to improve business activities? Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no one can say that it has not.

Credit was mentioned. Perhaps it is not generally known that, through the administration of lands in the lands branch, credit is being provided for young farmers who would not otherwise become established in agriculture. We have 4,800 cultivation crown leases who have received benefits as a result of a policy introduced in 1952 under which the department paid for the clearing and breaking costs on behalf of lessees where such costs were over \$12.50 per acre. Over \$9 million in cash and rental remissions have been paid out to develop some 500,000 acres of crown land. This brought into production 500,000 new acres of cultivation and this, I suggest, has been helpful in providing employment opportunities — and particularly helpful to young farmers.

The agricultural machinery administration — this is one service that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said he would abolish. I would suggest again to the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) that he take his Leader of the Opposition out in the back room and tell him the facts of life in this regard. There is no service that is better appreciated by the farmers of this province, where machinery is the largest item of cost in the farmer's total cost. In fact, Saskatchewan consumes about, over 20 percent of all of the machinery and repair sales in Canada, and the prairie provinces together some 52 percent. It was about time, Mr. Speaker, that some agency was set up that would scrutinize farm machinery in the hope that improved machinery would be made available to farmers that would work and that wouldn't readily wear out.

Now, to go on, no one is going to suggest I think that this service should be abolished. I defy the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to abolish it if by any accident of circumstances — this won't happen, Mr. Speaker, he should ever be elected and placed at the helm of government in this province. All he needs to do to make sure, and our best insurance is that he remains the head of the Liberal party in this province.

The veterinary college was mentioned yesterday, and as I mentioned yesterday, I gave full explanation to all of the background and the present situation in that regard, I mentioned that the position of the government will be made known very shortly, and it has not been influenced whatsoever by the new

champions of the veterinary college for western Canada. I don't ever expect, Mr. Speaker, I will have to take a back seat for anyone when it comes to furthering the interests of the agriculture industry in this province, particularly to the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker). I am sure that he wouldn't have said some of the things had he known the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I mention the family farm improvement branch, a new service set up within the Department of Agriculture in 1960, which was vigorously and bitterly condemned by hon. members opposite as another piece of socialist regimentation. I am sorry the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) isn't in her seat. She was particularly vociferous, in this house and out of this house, in trying to tell the farm women of this province that now this socialist government was going to go into your home and tell you where your kitchen sink should be, where your bathtub should be, and where your wash-bowl should be. She ridiculed the whole program. Over 6,000 farms have been helped with modernization of farm homes and the entire farmstead under this program. Has this not benefited farmers? Was there any regimentation? I suggest to the hon. member for Humboldt to go back and ask the housewives who now have the benefit of this service if they don't appreciate it. It is this kind of criticism, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, that will re-elect this government in 1964. And, would anyone suggest that this program has not also stimulated business activities, that it has not provided new employment opportunities, that it has not improved living conditions on the farms, that it has not stimulated new industries? There is a new industry now being established, an expansion of one at Weyburn to provide supplies for the services rendered by the government in this particular area. I can't help but mention the municipal water assistance program, and this too was mentioned in the throne speech, that has brought the benefit of water and sewage to some 56 towns and villages, with over \$1.5 million provided in grants to those towns and villages to reach this objective. Has this program not been beneficial towards stimulating business and new employment opportunities by providing these greatly-needed modern conveniences? Good programs, Mr. Speaker. And I would say to the people of this province, you can gauge the benefits of programs introduced by this government is in almost exact ratio to the bitter criticism that is proffered against such programs. And these programs were all bitterly criticized, Mr. Speaker, because they know that they are good programs. They are afraid that the benefits may somehow reflect some political credit to the government. We certainly don't think of them in these narrow, political terms. We simply think of the services provided as something that is imperative and necessary in the progressive development of our province.



Now, to move on as rapidly as I can, I trespass again on the domain of the Minister of Municipal Affairs to mention the grid road program, and to only mention that to date expenditures by this department are nearly \$43 million to municipalities for the construction of grid roads. Never in any area has such a comprehensive program of providing good roads to the extensive and the sparsely-settled parts of Saskatchewan been offered by any province in Canada under similar circumstances.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — A good program. I repeat \$43 million, and yet hon. members opposite will go out and say that this government has done nothing to assist municipalities in meeting their service obligations and keeping the mill rate down on farm lands throughout the province. Utter nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and believe me this program is appreciated, particularly by parents who have school children that require transportation to and from school.

I mention, Mr. Speaker, the winter works program. Some members opposite mentioned that the government had done nothing to provide work and wages. Well, this program was a direct alternative to social aid. Nobody likes social aid, neither the government nor the people that receive it, nor anyone else. Everyone would prefer that able-bodied people be given work, but I am suggesting that the private and public sector of the economy are going to have to co-operate together to solve their growing problem, and must plan together, yes, plan, and you can call it socialist planning and this is the proper name for it — socialist planning — planning in the interests of a society that is made up of people. This will have to come about, and I'm suggesting that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the newly-acquired addition from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) are doing nothing to bring about a better atmosphere and a better climate of mutual trust between the public and private sectors of the economy.

In this winter works program, some \$2 million have been spent as the province's share to contribute to innumerable projects that have been undertaken and valued by local governments. Even my own department gives its contribution wherever it can, in terms of channel clearance and other such work. The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) rose to his feet the other day and he said, "Oh, you talk about all this northern development". Someone mentioned — I think the hon. member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) had mentioned the power line going up to Buffalo Narrows, and a road up to the same general area. The hon. member for Rosthern stood up and said, "Well, you talk about all this development. It's all off-set, and in fact hardly exists, because there are moral and social problems in Meadow Lake itself", and he attributed all this to social aid. Now,

**February 26, 1963**

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that without social aid there would be more moral degradation. But this is what he said; because of a situation in a community, and a reflection on that community, and I should say a reflection on himself too, Mr. Speaker and his inability to deal constructively with problems. It just so happens that I have a memo from the social services board at Meadow Lake, dated February 18, and the board says in connection with contributions that we made in my department for work and wages:

The board wished to express their appreciation and thanks to the Department of Agriculture for the joint effort with the other departments that provided winter work projects to facilitate the board's function of providing winter employment as an alternative to social aid, which indicates clearly the wishes and desire of the government to provide an alternative to social aid.

But to deal with this problem in a comprehensive manner will require expanded policies at the national level, and as I said before, the co-operation of the private enterprise sector of the economy as well.

One other thing that I can't help but mention in every throne speech, because it has proven to be of such tremendous benefit to our farm people. This is the expansion of power by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. The throne speech says, although hon. members opposite say there is nothing in the throne speech, but the throne speech in fact states, Mr. Speaker, that tremendous progress has been made for supplying electrical power to serve 200,000 customers and natural gas to serve 100,000 customers. This is news, Mr. Speaker; this is progress, Mr. Speaker; and would the hon. members suggest, and they do, that the monies invested in the activities of the power corporation which have brought these amenities over the width and breadth of Saskatchewan is a huge burden of indebtedness around their necks, and somehow infer that if their sacred cow of private enterprise had undertaken this kind of development it wouldn't have cost the people anything? What could be more ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. Everyone knows that money must be borrowed for development, whether the development is undertaken by a public or a private agency. The only difference being that if it is undertaken by a private agency, the users of that power pay handsome profits to shareholders who invest their money for one purpose, and that the utility is designed primarily for the purpose of making a profit. The Quebec Liberal government in Quebec, is now proposing to buy out, and even expropriate some private power utilities in that province. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the users of the services of these particular utilities have either in part, or in whole perhaps, paid for these facilities. Now, in order to bring them under public ownership, they will be required to buy them again from the former owner.

In the case of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, this will never happen because this development has been undertaken by the public sector of the economy and when the users of this service repay the capital and the interest on the investment made, they will own the facilities in perpetuity.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That is the sharp difference.

Now, reference has been made by the members opposite to high taxes. May I suggest this, that taxes are high for two primary reasons. One legitimate, and one illegitimate. The legitimate one is the natural urge of people to progressively improve their living standards and the standards of their services. If the Leader of the Opposition wishes to remove his taxes, the best way he can do it is for him to go way up in the far north and live by himself, and he wouldn't have to pay taxes because he could live under very primitive conditions; but the facts are that no matter where people settle, they tend to improve their surroundings; when they ask for school buses and better health services, this is legitimate but the complaint, Mr. Speaker, that is also a legitimate complaint is the illegitimate cause for high taxes brought on as a result of inflation. The goods and services required by all of us, whether we purchase them as private citizens from the private enterprise sector of the economy or purchase them from our local government, or our provincial government, are furnished by and large by the private enterprise sector of the economy. If anyone doesn't believe this, just ask a farmer who is buying a new tractor if the price of tractors hasn't gone up much more rapidly and higher than the cost of the services provided to him by local government. He will give you the answer.

Ask the housewife who buys the children's clothing, shoes, etc. if inflation hasn't hurt her. Or the owner of a home who is paying off a mortgage, plus interest over a long term of years, if increased values of building materials has not hurt him. And in the certain knowledge that if he is fortunate enough to ever pay for a, say \$15,000 house, he will wind up with a house depreciated to the value of \$7,000. So this hue and cry about high taxes, and attributing this to governments, hasn't any real foundation in fact.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of their arguments have no foundation in fact; they are like a sieve, they won't hold water. The people of this province know this, Mr. Speaker, but it doesn't seem to penetrate, as I said before, the heavy overburden that covers their inner thinking. I'm reminded sometimes of the story of the Scandinavian who got involved in a fracas and he went before the judge. One of his fellow countrymen had been throwing stones at him, and the prosecuting attorney asked Ollie, "Ollie, how big was this stone this man threw at

**February 26, 1963**

you. Was it so big?" — describing a circle with his index finger and thumb — and Ollie said, "No, no, much bigger, much, much bigger." Then he stuck out his fist, "Was it as big as this?" "No, no, he said, much, much, much bigger." In desperation the attorney finally point to his own head and he said, "Was it this big, Ollie?" "Well, Ollie said, Yust about, but not quite so thick". I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that there isn't that same overburden covering the inner thinking of the people of this province — they will realize that facts are facts and that the physical proof is evident on every hand.

Because the throne speech so well sets out the progress that has already been made and the hopes for the new progress ahead, I will vote against the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and vote for the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with all those in the house who have spoken so far, particularly with the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart). In view of the limited time allowed on radio, I would like to tell the people of my constituency that the many problems that probably should be brought up in the debate will not be done at this time. I believe time does not allow for these grievances to be aired today.

You will all agree that provincial problems generally affect my constituency, as well as other constituencies of the province. The Hon. Premier, when speaking, did mention something though that I felt was not bringing out all the true facts. He was mentioning the growth of the province. He said as well that the size of the farms in Saskatchewan have increased by 45 percent. Well, that may be true, the size may have increased, but according to the reports of the Department of Municipal Affairs, we find that the number of farmers have certainly decreased substantially.

Now, what have you people got to crow about regarding growth? Is it growth when farmers are leaving the farms? Where are your family farms? What is happening to your family farms that you so often talked about? You know they were taxed out of existence, Mr. Speaker, and then to put the final touch to it they drove that power spike into the yard, that \$500 spike, that really put the final nail into their coffin.

I hope to disprove some of the statements that have been made by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture shortly. But first I would like to bring out some fundamental principles of our way of life. You know we have people that have taken

democracy for granted for hundreds of years. And we begin to see that democracy, like everything else, has to be taken out and looked at to see how far we have strayed — please take note, government members opposite — from the original paths and how this has happened. How many of us know what democracy really is? I think that the fact that there is a question in our minds is proof enough that the subject has been quite frightfully neglected.

There are so many definitions that again we need to have a new look at it with changing times and conditions. If we want more evidence, all we need to do is to look at the democratic world swing to the border line and minority and destructive types of governments, dividing splinter parties of which the party across, Mr. Speaker, is part.

Let's try to take a look at what democracy really means. Now, democracy is based on the individual. Democracy was founded on the assumption that man is a reasonable and a reasoning animal as well. If the individual, for example such as municipal councillors, school trustees, hospital boards, business people, are confronted with a choice of precisely defined facts and are put in possession of these facts — not by government planners, by special pleaders or power groups, or educated decision, always with his own interests in mind; man being what he is and not what socialists think he should be. Not only this, but his decision would be based on the natural patriotic view of security, justice, and the general welfare of his fellow man, and the preservation of liberty for himself and his family.

Now, on the other hand, let us define socialism as practised by our friends across the way. I should like to tell the Minister of Agriculture, at this point, that there is a difference between socialism and socialization. They believe that the individual freedoms should be subjected to the interests of the community, as judged by men as fallible as we are; that ownership or regulations and controls are the means of the production should be in the hands of the state.

Oh, I could prove that to you, time and time again by using your speaker's handbook. Now, we look at this socialist government that calls itself democratic. We find that under the guise of democracy the path has led to one hidden objective — gradual loss of our freedom by controls implemented under the guise of licensing and powers delegated to arbitrary boards. In practically all those cases of the boards, decisions and regulations are final and very often not subject to review by the courts.

So this march of socialism has destroyed this democracy with its many controls. Just have a look at your attitudes since you have been in this office. You have established more boards and handed regulatory and arbitrary powers

**February 26, 1963**

to the people or to yourselves more than all the governments probably put together. And here are some of your boards. You have your timber board, your fur marketing board, your planning board, your mineral contracts board, your insurance boards, your marketing boards, and many other boards. You could go on here mentioning them for over an hour alone. What have you done? You have regimented the whole provincial economy by monopolies, by controls, by boards, and orders-in-council, and here are a few of those regulations.

You have your highway traffic board. Its regulations are not reviewed by this legislature for approval by this body, which should be, and the very livelihood of a person, at times, by these regulations is put in jeopardy. Often the regulations are applied without justice.

You have your liquor board. Its regulations are arbitrary. Your liquor licensing commission; you should just apply for a liquor licence in a small town hotel, and if you have ever been under the third degree and a raking over the coals, this is where you get it.

Your labor relations board. Often times regulations are handed down without applying true principles of justice.

Your timber board. Deliveries to the board — there is no freedom of choice — has reduced the effective distribution and curtailed that industry. Stagnation. We've got it in this province; no wonder we have no pulp mills, and what has happened, our pulp is going to waste.

Your fish marketing boards. Our fishermen at one time were put under the hard, calloused finger of the fish board; respecting these operations, but finally those people have got enough nerve to stand up to the government and you had to make some changes.

Your fur marketing boards. Restricted sale of certain pelts to the board. Any type of restriction is not conducive to creating a good sound economy. You are well-known for that. No wonder we have not progressed in the style that this province — a province like Saskatchewan — should. The socialists, Mr. Speaker believe that the duty of the state is to care for its citizens from the cradle to the grave. Maybe these socialists view the state and its employees and experts as better judge of what individuals need or want than the individual himself. It appears that way. I don't think so.

The inadequacy and the incompetence of the government and its ministers is reflected in the tremendous powers delegated to its many boards and commissions. And this is a public admission of your inability to handle the affairs of this province.

They felt that they had a municipal problem, Mr. Speaker, so suggestions were made by the now hon. treasurer that there should be a change in municipal boundaries. So, what do they do? They can't make the decision themselves so they appoint a committee, the Van Vliet committee. It has cost the people of this province \$32,000. And then they appointed the Baker commission. This has cost the people of Saskatchewan \$458,000. And then the local government committee under Mr. McCaskill, cost \$295,000. And these committees, some of them are still continuing and others have not even handed in reports, and now they have the municipal advisory committee for another \$45,000.

Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that in a free society people concerned cannot make their own decisions if they have to? Of course, this would not be conducive to the thinking of the socialists and their planners. They seem to think they know more than the people themselves. Who and what is responsible for the finalization of the proposed county boundaries. The many committees you have, where you have spent over a million dollars to study. And how do you regard their recommendations? You are still searching for something, it seems. Something that you, or your experts, don't seem to know. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if ever an investigation is to be had in this province, the first and foremost duty of those responsible for this investigation will be for the immediate re-establishment of freedom and opportunities of the courts for whatever happens.

We, as Liberals, when we are elected in Saskatchewan, will re-define the true meaning of democracy and the people of this province will have the opportunity to feel that what is it is to be living under true, proper freedom with proper recourse to the courts.

I have just mentioned the exorbitant costs of these boards and these commissions. This is only part of it. These taxes are taken out of the profits and the pay cheques of the people by sales tax and other means; or they borrow an excessive amount on the world market, foreign markets, on account of the future generations. Your children, Mr. Speaker, my children, and our children's children, will have to pay dearly for these excessive expenditures. But they never emphasize or even mention, when they promise their give-away programs, where the money is coming from.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this money is coming from our own taxpayers' pockets. Our own pockets. Everything that a government puts in the left hand pocket of a citizen, it has to take out of the right. A question of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The socialist governments create no wealth whatever and can only distribute what it forces, under heavy penalty, out of the taxpayers' pockets, in taxes, licences, overcharges, etc.

**February 26, 1963**

No government can give, Mr. Speaker, or pass on, what they neither possess nor own, except by compulsion. A socialist does not create wealth, Mr. Speaker, but they create debts. Socialism, in whatever form, cannot exist without free enterprise to pay its bills.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — Who are the free enterprisers, Mr. Speaker? You and I, all of us. We are free to work where we wish. We are free to work at what we want to. Free to leave if we wish. Free to be in business for yourself. Free to be in business collectively, as in the co-operatives. Just plain free, Mr. Speaker, without boards or commission, to tell us what to do.

Socialism, Mr. Speaker, whether it comes gradually or suddenly by revolution, has so far invariably led to the extinction of liberty, economic, social or political freedoms.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — The splinter parties, Mr. Speaker, weaken our democracy to the extent that foreign ideology grows into their minds and weakens our democratic system. Until we are prepared, Mr. Speaker, to teach to our young the basic and fundamental beliefs of our democratic system, we will always be in the dangerous position of the ignorant who has lost the privilege, because of lack of knowledge of freedom.

And that is what this government has done. It is hard to teach the wisdom that democracy and its applications can develop an economic growth that can go beyond all expectations of the people of this province.

Before this session ends, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the government that they really tackle these problems, honestly and sincerely, in view of re-establishing freedom to the people, without your boards or commissions or arbitrary boards. But if you are not prepared to do this, I would suggest that you let the people of Saskatchewan decide what they want to say about this stagnation, socialist decay, or go on to the horizon of a bright industrial development and a bright future for the people of Saskatchewan.

Socialism has made a mess of the administration with its commissions and its powerful arbitrary boards. A Liberal government, Mr. Speaker, when they are elected will do away with these boards, or at least restore to the courts and pay attention, Mr. Attorney General, at least restore to the courts the final say into all these regulations. That is democracy.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!



**Mr. Coderre:** — That is the way democracy works. The great Liberal, David Lloyd George, once said:

You cannot trust the battle of freedom to socialists. Socialism in no way is interested in liberty; it is like the sands of the desert; it gets into your food, into your clothes; your machinery and into the very air that you breathe. The collectivist idea is all gritty with regulations, orders, rules, and decrees.

That is what socialism means.

The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, have lost confidence in the government, as proven by the four by-elections. Let's prove it again in the next election.

And with these reasons that I have defined, I will support the amendment and I cannot support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.W. Erb (Milestone):** — In rising to take part in the debate, I should first of all like to offer my congratulations to my seat mate, the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) in winning his seat in this legislature.

I am sure that all members in this house, Mr. Speaker, will welcome the hon. member to this body of representatives of the people of this province. It is my hope that he will find his work in this legislature an enriching and rewarding experience; that his contribution will be ever a very worthwhile one. Certainly in his maiden speech he has indicated that he is capable of just that.

I should also like to congratulate the hon. member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) on his appointment to the position as Minister of Natural Resources. This honor that has been conferred upon him, Mr. Speaker, I am sure is welcomed by his supporters who for a considerable time have desired cabinet representation from their area. And I am sure I am joined by everyone here in wishing him well in his responsibilities.

**February 26, 1963**

Also, I want to congratulate the hon. member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) on his appointment as Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development. As one who has been associated with the co-operative movement for many years and am keenly interested in its objectives, it is my hope, and I am sure the hope of all members of this house, that he will make a worthy contribution in this larger area of responsibility.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Erb:** — The co-operative movement, Mr. Speaker, in all its phases of organization throughout the world has added immeasurably to the economic security of its members. In its manner of organization and control and expression, it is the quintessence of democracy. And it is largely for this reason that it has gained universal acceptance.

But I submit that the ideals, hopes and legitimate aims of the co-operative movement can only be fully realized when men and women of all classes can participate in its activities without the subtle, and sometimes not so subtle, political interference by politically-oriented elements within the organization.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that this government and its supporters in the co-operative movement have come to regard it as synonymous with the political party that they represent, or it has become a special preserve of their political organization.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Erb:** — It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial and national hierarchies of the NDP have endeavored to encourage the co-operative movement to take political action through the NDP organization. A clear indication of such an attempt was found in a circular letter from the NDP candidate for the Regina federal constituency and the NDP national leader, T.C. Douglas, to all members of the Sherwood Co-operative Association during the federal election campaign last year.

Now, of course, it is not a sin, Mr. Speaker, on the part of any politician to try and garner as many votes as he possibly can, but I submit that it is quite irregular for a political party to gain access to a co-operative membership file in order to solicit support for a particular political organization.

One of the original and fundamental principles laid down by the Rochdale pioneers governing the conduct and the integrity of co-operatives was political neutrality. Well, this

sentiment was expressed not long ago by the president of a great co-operative, Mr. Charles Gibbings, president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, and I would like to quote what he has to say. This is from the Western Producer of February 21, 1963. Mr. Gibbings says:

That if the co-operatives are to capture the public sympathy, they must, however, do certain things. Primarily they must emphasize a political neutrality. It must be a case of policies, not politics. Part of the problem was that co-operatives invariably were identified with whatever particular government happened to be in power by everyone except the government in question.

Now, the Western Producer had this to say about co-operatives in its editorial, which was a reply to the Hon. Attorney General:

Another letter from the Saskatchewan Attorney General, Robert Walker, appears in this week's open forum. It is not our intention to discuss in detail some of the things Mr. Walker evidently feels the Western Producer and the co-operative movement should or shouldn't be doing, but only to outline once again that the position of this newspaper with regard to politics and political parties. The Western Producer's concern is not with parties, but with policies and what, in our estimation, they are likely to do for co-operatives. As in the past, we will continue to examine policies of all parties in terms of criticism or approval as we see them, regardless of party. As to the position of co-operatives in politics, we would say that any involvement of co-operatives as to organizations in politics, or alignment as organizations with any particular party, would benefit neither the co-operatives themselves nor any party with which they might align themselves.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Erb:** —

No one who goes to join a co-op today is asked about his politics, or religion, or any other matter which is one of purely free decision and conviction on the part of the individual. This is how it has been and this is how it should be. What Mr. Walker apparently appears to want is a co-operative movement in which the membership would be available only to those of the political faith of the Attorney General himself.

**February 26, 1963**

Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that just as the unity of church membership cannot long endure when political partisanship attempts to dominate its affairs, similarly a co-operative becomes disunited and sterile when, through the activities of political zealots within its organization, it is reduced to simply a mutual admiration society.

During the budget debate in the house last year, the former Minister of Mineral Resources and now the Provincial Treasurer — I want to congratulate him on his elevation — made what I feel was a disquieting observation. He said “I never see a Liberal at the Sherwood Co-op”. I have ever since, Mr. Speaker, pondered the statement of the minister, and I could never quite conclude whether he was happy over his observation or unhappy. If he found pleasure in the absence of Liberals at the Sherwood Co-op, then it would appear he favors a circumscribed membership. If, on the other hand, he regretted the absence of Liberals at the Sherwood Co-op, and if, in fact, such absence is the case, then the hon. gentleman ought to look to the reason for the disinterest that he has observed. Certainly one of the reasons cannot be that Liberals are not members of the Sherwood Co-op. I suggest that a most noteworthy contribution the present Minister of Co-operation could make would be in promoting the traditional political neutrality of co-operatives.

This strict observance of this principle is fundamental, Mr. Speaker, to the maximum development of co-operatives and their proper functioning, and I would commend this principle to the Attorney General.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on the reasons why I have chosen to take my position on this side of the house and with the Liberal party. In doing so I haven't the slightest intention to try to disabuse the minds of some of my former colleagues and associates in the NDP of their opinions, expressed or otherwise, in response of my actions. That would be a useless exercise of the art of persuasion; and I have learned through long experience that there is virtually nothing so impenetrable as a closed and prejudiced mind.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Erb:** — Neither is there any need for me to direct my remarks to my constituents of Milestone, and the people of Saskatchewan generally. Their assessment of my actions has been expressed directly and indirectly to the consternation, I am sure, of the fanatics of the NDP.

I have taken my position with the Liberal party, Mr. Speaker, because I realize, as people everywhere in Canada have come to realize once more, that the Liberal party is, in the long run, the party of reform. Reform — ah, they shake their heads, they look nonchalant — reform, Mr. Speaker, not in a context of the kind espoused by the NDP but reform that is responsible and realistic, and, above all, democratic.

The Liberal party, as far as I'm concerned, has demonstrated throughout its long and honorable history that it is sensitive to all those areas of human needs in which the involvement and responsibility of government is indicated; that it recognizes the dignity of every individual in our society; that the individual is supreme, and not the state; that in a free, democratic society, human progress must be by way of evolution, and not through revolution; and that such progress is best achieved through individual initiative and enterprise.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Erb:** — I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that it can be expected that in anticipation of what I have stated some of my former colleagues will have assiduously perused the journals and Hansards of this house since 1948, in order to discover statements by me that might be derogatory of the Liberal party, or critical of its policies. And they hope, of course, that when they quote them, it will have the effect of diluting the validity of my actions and what I say here.

I have found, in the Liberal party, that debate is lively; that one can disagree and even leave the party, all with impunity, whether he is a minister of the crown, whether he is a member of the legislature or the house of commons, or simply a party supporter. And, of course, this is true of all political parties, with one exception, and that is the NDP. Particularly its hierarchy and its press. It is pathetic, and it is amusing, to observe the attitude of the NDP as it reacts to different stimuli as does a chameleon. This is the political party, Mr. Speaker, that considers itself a cut above all other political parties in political morality and virtue and rectitude. They presume to be the only party that has regard for human needs and want. This is the party that exhorts the observance of the divine injunctions "Bear ye another's burdens", "The strong should help the weak", "The rich should help the poor", "We are our brother's keeper". Well, indeed, Mr. Speaker, all mankind ought to observe these injunctions because they are fundamental in the exercise of our Christian faith. But, alas, when the chips are down and their bluff is called, these paragons of virtue lose all their saintly façade and hell hath no such fury as when they vent their spleen.

**February 26, 1963**

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Erb:** — When Hazen Argue resigned from the NDP and I resigned from the government and the NDP shortly after, the Canadian public were given a classic demonstration of vilification and character assassination by the self-styled humanitarians.

Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth, this scurrilous and bigoted rag that calls itself a newspaper and which is the mouthpiece of the NDP, what had it to say about Hazen Argue's resignation? What had it to say? Well, I will just read a little part — it says:

How shocked and disgusted must be the moral segment of the Liberal party, who are self-respecting, when they learned that their provincial and federal leaders had for days stood on tiptoe, with arms outstretched, eager to welcome into their midst a scab as a prospective leader in the upper ranks of the Liberal party.

and "The loss of another scab does not halt the progressive spirit", Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — They have many left.

**Mr. H.A. McDonald (Moosomin):** — They sure have.

**Mr. Erb:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, for anyone to leave the NDP apparently constitutes an act of brazen political immorality. That the individual involved does so in consideration of some sort of pay off; that he has consorted with the opponents of the NDP in an infamous conspiracy to their disadvantage. And so, Mr. Speaker, such an individual, in the eyes of the NDP and its leaders, becomes a traitor, an abject betrayer, a Judas and a scab. But, Mr. Speaker, again like a chameleon which changes its color to suit the particular environment in which it finds itself, the NDP reacts very quickly and very differently when a member resigns from the Liberal party or takes issue with Liberal policies, which we have all witnessed during the last few weeks.

What sort of treatment, Mr. Speaker, did the NDP and their party organ accord the three Liberals who differed or resigned from the Liberal party, Mr. Speaker. Well, in the eyes

of the NDP, they became courageous men, men with intestinal fortitude. Now, Mr. Speaker, how is it possible for men of conscience and conviction to be labelled traitors, Judases, betrayers and scabs on one hand, and, on the other, courageous men. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that such definitions, in which the NDP have been indulging, are a product of a Dr. Jekyll and a Mr. Hyde personality, with a pathological penchant for duplicity.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Erb:** — Is it any wonder, therefore, that the citizens of Regina and the people of Saskatchewan repudiated outright the NDP on June 18, 1962? Well, one of the cardinal reasons for this outright rejection of the NDP I think — as the government is well aware; and if it isn't it ought to be — was the manner in which the Premier and the majority of his cabinet presumed to ram down the throats of the doctors and the people the Medical Care Act which was unacceptable to the profession.

Previous emphasis of this rejection was observed in the deferred election in Athabasca and the provincial by-elections that followed in Turtleford, Weyburn and Prince Albert; and all but the last by-election, medical care was the issue.

I think it should be particularly emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that at no time was the issue medical care versus no medical care. Saskatchewan doctors and the people, since 1914 up until July 1, 1962, mutually worked out arrangements whereby medical care insurance was made possible, and as a result of their efforts over the years, over 70 percent of our population had the benefits of prepaid medical insurance.

No one will deny that the principle of universality is desirable and in order to achieve it government involvement is indicated. But such involvement, I submit, Mr. Speaker, must at all times have regard for our traditional pattern of development and progress of medical insurance. To argue, as the Premier has, that the present medical care insurance plan is an extension of our traditional development, is completely fallacious.

What in fact the Medical Insurance Act has done is that it has wiped out our traditional development, and which has been replaced by an imposed plan of the state. To say that this is an extension of the traditional patterns of development is about as logical as if one were to say, if the CPR were nationalized, that such nationalization was a further extension of the private enterprise system.

Notwithstanding the amendment to the Medical Care Act and the Saskatoon agreement, the plan is not working well. That it does not do so is obvious from the widespread dissatisfaction of tens of thousands of people throughout Saskatchewan who now,

upon requiring medical care, find they are charged in many instances for services such as X-ray and pathology, that were supposed to be provided under the Medical Care Insurance Act and which they received freely under their voluntary plans.

Certainly the profession cannot be enthused when many doctors have been forced to seek loans from their banks in order to meet their operating and living costs as a result of tardy and partial payments by the medical care commission for services rendered.

Certainly the people are not happy about the fact that Saskatchewan has lost many of her fine doctors and many of her finest specialists in internal medicine, heart diseases, gynaecology, radiology, allergies, and our finest neuro-surgeons, as well as many of our general practitioners. Does the loss of these highly trained and skilled professional men upgrade the quality of medical care? The people were told, of course, that one of the effects of the Medical Care Insurance Act would be the upgrading of medical care. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the reverse has taken place — that there has been a deterioration in the quality of medical care and that we will be a generation or more until the high quality of medical services to which the people of this province had been accustomed will be restored.

And this is no reflection, Mr. Speaker, on any practitioner in private practice today, or any specialists. The fact that these services have deteriorated is because the numbers of the people giving these services has been reduced. It has been stated that the medical care plan will have teething problems. I think rather it is suffering from a chronic malaise; and its indisposition, Mr. Speaker, is not ameliorated by statements made outside the province by the present Minister of Public Health or the Premier concerning the medical profession in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Erb:** — When the present Minister of Health, speaking in Toronto on October 29, 1962, states — and this is from the Toronto Star: “Saskatchewan’s doctors are trying to defeat the CCF government, and have the province’s medicare plan dismembered or scrapped”, Saskatchewan’s Minister of Health, Mr. Blakeney said. “I have no doubt they are financing opposition parties”, he told the Star in an interview. Now, Mr. Blakeney, of course, was addressing the New Democratic Party’s Toronto area council, and he said that the plan is working satisfactorily although there are some difficulties.

How prophetic was the statement by the former premier, Mr. T.C. Douglas, when he said “we recognize that a plan of this sort will not work unless there is goodwill and co-operation



on both sides". How different it might have been had this government, knowing that after the Medical Care Insurance Act was passed it was not acceptable to take the profession, had heeded what Mr. Douglas had remonstrated when he said "We must, therefore, keep on trying and negotiating until we work out a plan that is acceptable to both sides".

What a contract to this assurance was a statement in this house last April by the Premier, when he stated that the Medical Care Insurance Act will come into force on July 1 "with or without the co-operation of the doctors". Certainly the people and the doctors of this province had every right to expect the Premier to be capable of better logic. The tragedy, of course, Mr. Speaker, has been the inordinate haste that has characterized the medical plan in its planning, legislation and implementation.

Several years ago we set up a royal commission to study agricultural and rural life regarding the cause and effect of its changing pattern, and so forth. No one was overly concerned about the time the commission was taking to complete its study; it wasn't pushed. The continuing committee on reorganization of local government and municipal boundaries occupied itself for three years; no great urge was manifest for completion of its studies and recommendations. But, Mr. Speaker, not so with the medical care program. Time was never of such essence. An over-powering urgency possessed every phase of its activity, and the dictum of haste characterized it throughout.

The chairman of the advisory planning committee on medical care, Dr. W.P. Thompson, in his letter to me on September 25, 1962, prefaced the interim report of the committee with a letter, and I read it in part:

I have been directed by the members of the committee to express to you their regret that the lack of time has been responsible for the incompleteness and other imperfections of this report.

The lack of time, Mr. Speaker, incompleteness, imperfections, these were the inhibitory elements that accounted for an act which is unacceptable. This is the syndrome of the plan's malaise.

I affirm, Mr. Speaker, that the medical care plan was conceived in and born out of sheer political expediency. It was to be the jewel in the grand design that would give shape and lustre to the destiny of a political segment of our nation. But it failed to enhance the political fortunes of the NDP. Indeed, the reverse was the case, because it was inimical to the democratic process in its design and its application.

**February 26, 1963**

When a government presumes to place the services of one economic group on the political auction block in order to serve political expediency and political ambitions, and then by statute endeavors to enforce this kind of proposition, the time has come for a serious reappraisal of such an administration, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Erb:** — If a government can relieve one economic group of its professional freedom and economic self-determination with impunity, then I submit all segments of society stand in jeopardy of this kind of intrusion by the state.

There can be no question, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP government and its national party are oriented towards statism, which is the warp and the woof of its philosophy. Of course, Mr. Speaker, in a democracy every individual or political party has the right to his own views. And the opportunity to test those views at intervals is assured, of course. It would appear that the people of Saskatchewan, however, gave eloquent expressions to their rejection of statism on June 18, 1962. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the great majority of the people of Saskatchewan feel greatly indebted to their doctors for their stand that they have taken towards the kind of statism inherent in the Medical Insurance Act, and the manner of its intended implementation. For by doing so, the majority of our citizens in Saskatchewan saw the wider implications of this encroachment on liberty by the state. And they reacted to it accordingly.

Prepaid medical care insurance inevitably will come to all provinces of Canada and every state in the Union to the south. It is part of our social progress and it is desirable as it is inevitable. But I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that when other jurisdictions become involved in medical insurance it will be with great regard for the traditional freedoms of the practice of medicine, and its established relationships within society.

The one cardinal lesson that they will have learned — an ancient lesson — learned by every succeeding generation, Mr. Speaker, that “you can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink”.

I should now like to make a few comments on the community health service clinics organization. The Premier took great umbrage at the suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition when he stated in his speech that this government circumvented Article 14 of the Saskatoon agreement and Section 27a of the Medical Care Insurance Act, by enabling the Community Clinic to use the facilities of Saskatchewan House, 26 Chester Street, howbeit by way of its back door entrance,

19 Chester Mews, the alley entrance to Saskatchewan House, to interview and recruit British doctors. Well, in his rebuttal, the Premier launched a bitter attack on the Leader of the Opposition. But the significant aspect of his attack, and obvious to everyone, was the labor and bluster of its performance in contrast to the artistry of his predecessor to which this house had become accustomed, and which contrast, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, overshadowed what the Hon. Premier was trying to prove to the Leader of the Opposition in this connection. Whatever may be said to the contrary, 19 Chester Mews connotes a back door approach. "The Strange Case of Chester Mews" — what a title for a London thriller, Mr. Speaker!

Well, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and others of the NDP are very sensitive to and become extremely annoyed at any suggestion that their conduct is not always governed by the highest motives and that their guilelessness is not always that of the dove. And then their wrath and indignation mount in proportion to the evidence which reveals their frailty. But, Mr. Speaker, how quickly the Premier and others of the NDP can impugn motives of their opponents and how quickly they can impute base motives to those with whom they disagree — because I know whereof I speak.

For example, Mr. Speaker, my letter of resignation from the government and the NDP party was delivered to the Premier's office on May 3, 1962 at 8:30 a.m. At 9:30 a.m. a copy of my letter was given to the press. At 10:00 a.m. radio station CKCK announced my resignation over the air. At 11:00 a.m. of the same date, Premier Lloyd addressed the doctors who were gathered at a meeting at the Trianon Ballroom. It was several minutes before Mr. Lloyd arrived at the meeting when the doctors learned of my resignation. They first learned about my resignation, notwithstanding that it had been announced several times over the air since 10 o'clock. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the NDP party accused me of sneaking a copy of my letter of resignation to Dr. Dalglish, the then president of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, which, of course, needless to say, is a contemptible falsehood.

It will be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that Premier Lloyd attempted to make the timing of my resignation appear as a treacherous and unmitigated attempt at conspiracy between the College of Physicians and Surgeons and myself to his advantage. He indulged in a fabricated supposition that certain leaders of this College of Physician and Surgeons had been in consultation with me in recent weeks. Not a single shred of evidence, Mr. Speaker, to corroborate those allegations by the NDP press and the Premier — allegations barren of evidence as the depravity out of which they arose.

Well, referring to the K.O.D., the Premier in his speech alleged that some people were paid to attend the mass protest meeting held on the legislative grounds last July.

**February 26, 1963**

Well, again, Mr. Speaker, here is a sweeping statement by the Premier, not a shred of evidence to corroborate his allegation. And he didn't even make a proper count of those who had attended. I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that either the Premier, in deference to the high office which he holds, refrains from this kind of indulgence or else observe the most elementary requirement of debate by substantiating his statements with evidence and facts.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Erb:** — Well, I must say I wasn't in the house when the Premier adjourned the debate after the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had spoken and so I don't know what sort of proof he produced, but this one thing I can say about the Leader of the Opposition, he didn't make any allegation, certainly he brought with him evidence to substantiate what he was saying.

I think it is clear to all people in those areas where community clinics have been set up, that they are politically inspired, and to which this government is lending somewhat more than moral support. According to Article 14 of the Saskatoon agreement, Mr. Speaker, the initiative for the establishment of premises and inviting doctors who wish to enrol for direct payments with the commission should come from the citizens in their particular communities. I think that it is quite evident that the government, frustrated in its first attempt to place all practising physicians under direct payment by the commission, welcomes any kind of development which would ultimately force or otherwise cause all practising physicians to enrol with the commission. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the community clinics are politically inspired from Regina, and to support my contention I am going to read from a photostatic copy of the document which was sent to key NDP supporters throughout Saskatchewan before the Saskatoon agreement was signed between the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the government. Now this document, dated July 17, 1962, six days before the Saskatoon agreement was signed July 23, 1962, set out in detail all the necessary steps which citizens of a community should take in respect of establishing premises and contacting the medical personnel whom they presumed would enrol with the commission or by inviting doctors who would enrol for direct payment with the commission. Now then, Mr. Speaker, Article 14 of the Saskatoon agreement is for all practical purposes identical with the procedures to be taken as outlined by this document from which I am going to read shortly. One can only conclude that on the basis of these almost identical procedures outlined in this document and Article 14 of the Saskatoon agreement, that the author of this document either was in very close contact with those negotiating on behalf of the government and who, presumably, were reasonably sure that agreement would be reached on what is now Article 14 of the Saskatoon agreement.

As I read this document, Mr. Speaker, hon. members of the house will observe that this was presumed to be a sort of crash program; and it has all the trappings of "The Strange Case of 19 Chester Mews". Well, I want to quote from the first page of this document, Mr. Speaker, and I trust I am not wearying the house.

The sole purpose of this type of activity is to bring about the situation in your community in which medical services under the medical care insurance act are available to everyone. Key persons from the various localities of your hospital community should be called together to plan the activity. You wish to persuade your doctor (doctors) to operate inside the medical care act so that the people of your community can take advantage of the medical care insurance plan and will not need to make any additional payments to the doctor or to private organizations, such as Medical Services Incorporation. You will find that the doctor(s) is/are much more readily persuaded if you have signed up several hundred families who are prepared to insist on the availability of medical services under the medical care insurance act. The preliminary meeting must therefore plan how this body of members can be rapidly built up. Sign up from 200 to 500 or more families of any and all political persuasion as members within a 48-hour period. This should be done quickly and without publicity . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Under the table.

**Mr. Erb:** —

This should be done quickly and without publicity in order that the K.O.D. committees do not have time to become active opponents. Do not use party telephone lines. Membership is immaterial, it might be \$1 to \$5 per family. Explore the availability of suitable clinic premises. Make arrangements to lease or purchase a building; procure some furniture and medical equipment. Contact the Saskatchewan medical care commission to locate temporary or permanent doctors for a staff. Should any help be required at any stage of the above developments, contact Mr. W.G. Harding, 2236 Smith Street, Regina, or C. Lyons, E. Mahood, F. Coburne, in Saskatoon — the latter might be located through Community Health Services Office, Avenue Building, Saskatoon.

**February 26, 1963**

Well, Mr. Speaker, who is Mr. C. Lyons? Well, if he hasn't changed, he is still the vice-president of the NDP organization of Saskatchewan and a member of the NDP provincial council. And E. Mahood is Dr. Mahood, I presume, Dr. Ed Mahood was the former NDP candidate in 1958 for Saskatoon and is the present NDP candidate — nominated just very recently in Saskatoon for the NDP. F. Coburne is Dr. F. Coburne, a psychiatrist who is very prominent in the councils of the NDP.

**Mr. Guy:** — Non-political.

**Mr. Erb:** — Well, we will come to that, I would like to now quote, Mr. Speaker, from Article 14 of the Saskatoon agreement. I don't think I have to quote the whole thing, but the relevant portions in this case.

There may be places where few or no doctors have enrolled for direct payment by the medical care insurance commission so that patients are denied the choice of such doctors. It is not for the commission to appoint doctors in such places, the remedy is in the hands of the citizens themselves. They can establish premises and invite doctors who wish to enrol for direct payment to rent such premises and set up practice in them. If citizens wish advice about establishing such premises and assisting in choosing such doctors, this can be made available by the medical care insurance commission (and so on). In some places citizens may want a doctor where there is no medical need and where a doctor's skill would be wasted. Caution must be exercised in that regard not to over-doctor an area.

By way of comparison, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from the document — the instructions that are laid out as to the course of action to take.

Contacting local doctors: The first role of the society, particularly in rural areas, should be to make a direct approach to the local doctor and ask him straight if he intends to return to practice, giving him a deadline on behalf of his community. It is important to show strength at this point in large membership, preferably with money behind it so the doctor knows that the community is determined. The next step of the organization

is to find suitable building, equip it properly and then search for the necessary ancillary staff, nurses, receptionist. Remember the payment for cost of medical services of which reasonable rent is a part is now provided under the medical care insurance act. The medical care commission is now bringing doctors to Saskatchewan. If a doctor is required in a community, it is quite proper for a community group such as these to formerly request that the medical care commission supply a doctor or doctors to the community. In fact, the commission would probably prefer to have a request from the community and to have a strong organization behind that request.

The question of financing of the provincial organization will require assessment on each member of the association. It is planned to place suitable technical people at their disposal as soon as possible.

Dated July 17, 1962. For further information contact W.M. Harding, 2236 Smith Street, Regina, Saskatchewan.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse):** — Who is Harding?

**Mr. Erb:** — Well, now, it is well-known that Mr. Harding has been employed in several capacities over several years by this government. He is prominent in the councils of the NDP organization and upon relinquishing his position as executive director of a community health services clinic organization, he has become the director of education and publicity for the Saskatchewan section of the NDP. And, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, his former position as executive director has been filled by an order-in-council appointment of the government, who has been given one-year leave of absence and who is also a prominent individual in NDP councils.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there can be little argument against the merit of the clinic structure or group practice of medicine. These principles have been accepted by doctors and people alike throughout Saskatchewan for many years. The people, over a long course of time, have benefited from the high quality of medical services made possible through this kind of progress. But, Mr. Speaker, community health services clinics have not, by any stretch of the imagination, upgraded medical care because, firstly, their medical personnel are

**February 26, 1963**

generally not well trained in comparison with Canadian standards and requirements, and, secondly, many fine physicians in rural areas have been forced out of their communities by these clinics and have left our province.

But what perhaps is the most disturbing of all is that these community clinics, politically inspired and oriented as they are, have as a result divided communities and set neighbor against neighbor and house against house. The Saskatchewan people, and I am sure people throughout Canada, have demonstrated their aversion towards mixing politics with religion; they view with equal distaste mixing politics with the practice of medicine.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Erb:** — Well, as has already been indicated by the members to your right, Sir, they will try to persuade the people that when a Liberal government is elected it will destroy the medical plan, and so forth. Well, I think the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Thatcher, could not have stated the position of the Liberal party more forcefully or more clearly in this regard, when he stated that a Liberal government would perfect a scheme that would be a credit to the people, to the doctors and to the government, and that it would be a comprehensive scheme and available to all. And I should like to add this, Mr. Speaker, that if this kind of situation obtains, then, of course, the province can look forward to the return to Saskatchewan of the many fine surgeons, specialists and so forth, general practitioners we have lost. I think this will be one of the effects of an acceptable medical care plan — I am sure.

Well, I fully endorse the Liberal party's position on prepaid medical insurance. I would endorse no other plan that did not commend itself to the people, to the doctors, and to the government, for, Mr. Speaker, we have all learned that unless a plan is acceptable to all concerned it will not work. Needless to say, that is one of the reasons that I stand on this side of the house, Mr. Speaker.

The NDP and their propagandists would like the people of Saskatchewan to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal government would tear down and destroy all those things which have added to our social and economic progress, which are accepted by the people and the Liberal party as necessary, rational developments. Surely, Mr. Speaker, no one would accept such nonsense for one moment. In fact, it is an insult to the people of Saskatchewan who have placed their confidence in the members on this side of the house and, as has been observed in four by-elections, a growing confidence in these members and in the Liberal party. For, after all, Mr. Speaker, the number of



people who hold the views of the members to your right, Sir, is decreasing by the thousands. Certainly over 60 percent of the people of Saskatchewan have indicated that they do not have confidence in the NDP government.

Well, actually we in the Liberal party are not disturbed over their propaganda that a Liberal government would destroy the progress that has been made in our province. Indeed, for selfish reasons, we should welcome such rubbish, because it simply adds to the acceleration of this government and the NDP on their way to political oblivion. I am confident that the people of Saskatchewan welcome the clear, positive and realistic position of the Liberal party as so ably presented by the Leader of the Opposition. Because, Sir, our quarrel, and that of the people, with this government is not about rural electrification and power development, or highways, or the air ambulance — one would think we were going to shoot the air ambulance down in flames — or the crown corporations that are successful operations, or the welfare programs where they are filling a real and legitimate need for our people. Our deep concern is rather what is happening to our province and to our people. Any government in times of prosperity, such as all Canada enjoyed during the post-war years, that is of World War II — a period of 10 or 12 years of unprecedented prosperity — would have been extremely derelict in its responsibilities — and I, as a former member of that government, would have felt this way — had it not used its buoyant revenues to provide for better schools, highways, hospitals, welfare programs and so forth, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, every provincial jurisdiction in Canada has done just that. But what is so disappointing from supposedly responsible people like members to your right is that they would try to leave the impression that progress in Canada has been limited to within the boundaries of Saskatchewan.

When we speak of progress, we must consider it in its full context — the social and economic. These two aspects complement each other and to a great extent are interdependent. It is therefore extremely important, Mr. Speaker, that a balanced relationship between economic progress and social progress be maintained. Our social services, education, health and welfare, and so forth, rest on an economic base or foundation. For example, when an architect, in designing a building, upon which the superstructure will rest. And in no case will a good architect provide a superstructure greater than the dimensions of the superstructure, he will then, at the same time, commensurately increase the strength of the foundation. In like manner, Mr. Speaker, in building the superstructure of social services, great care must be exercised that they do not exceed the economic foundation upon which they rest, and which is their support. It is at this point, Mr. Speaker, where we disagree or quarrel. The social services that have been

**February 26, 1963**

developed in Saskatchewan are both essential and desirable and no one for a moment suggests that they be curtailed or eliminated. But the concern of the people of Saskatchewan and the Liberal party is that our ability to pay for these services is actually diminishing as the costs of these services steadily increase.

To see what is taking place, Mr. Speaker, let us just consider briefly for a moment the two services, hospitalization and medical care insurance. These two services, as everyone knows, are financed by a \$36 and \$72 per capita tax, half of the five percent sales tax and the six percent surcharge on income tax and a one percent corporation tax for medical care. The total estimated cost of just these two services for 1963 will no doubt approximate \$60 million. Now the yearly increment in the cost of these services will be, I judge, no less than five percent. Certainly from my experience as Minister of Health for several years, the increment of the hospital services plan stood around 8.3 percent over several years, until the hospitals were directed to trim down their budgets to an increase of three percent over the previous year. No such direction has been issued by the medical care commission to the doctors, at least not yet, so one can reasonably assume that five percent will be the increment in the cost of these two services, hospital and medical care. This, of course, means that for 1964 the cost of hospital and medical services will increase by \$3 million. The same, or at least a similar experience can be applied to all other services, such as education and the like. The question, therefore, is, Mr. Speaker, who is going to pay the additional \$3 million for hospital and medical care, or the inevitable increase in other costs of education and other services. Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, the answer is very simple: the people of Saskatchewan are going to pay it. And they are going to pay through increased taxes and premiums. And this can be seen from a reply given by the former Minister of Health to a question put to him by the Hall commission during its sittings in Regina. I quote from this, the Leader-Post, January 22, 1962:

Mr. Davies outlined tax sources by which Saskatchewan will finance its medical care plan. In reply to questions by Chief Justice Hall, Mr. Davies said the tax money would be voted by the legislature to the medical insurance fund. 'Or not voted', suggested the commission chairman. 'That would take a brave man', said Mr. Davies. 'I would worry rather that there might not be enough revenue from the taxes, then consolidated revenues would bear the brunt, or tax increases'.

Well, it is quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that the extra money required to pay these services will not be forthcoming from resource development such as pulp mills, petro-chemical industry, mine development and general industrial expansion. There is very little evidence of this increasing development. In short, the kind of economic growth that is required to meet these ever-rising costs which I have outlined, and others, simply is not there.

And I reiterate, who is going to pay? Well, the people are going to pay through increased taxation, increased premiums and increased surcharges. Saskatchewan is now the highest — among the highest, if not the highest, taxed province in Canada. Yet our ability to pay these taxes that are imposed is about the lowest in Canada when based on per capita incomes, Mr. Speaker. This is no myth. My friends, I hope I can call them my friends, not former friends, are very agile with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That socialist arithmetic.

**Mr. Erb:** — But the per capita personal income, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and I have it for 1961, places Saskatchewan just ahead of Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, with a per capita income of \$1,184. That was in 1961. Well, of course, if they argue that these figures are out of date, by virtue of being 1961, and that 1962 would show a better figure, I want to point out that in 1960, Saskatchewan's personal, per capita personal income was \$1,451, almost \$400 better than in 1961. So you see, Mr. Speaker, that our ability to pay these increased taxes, which are now among the highest, and certainly higher than the sister provinces here, is becoming less and less.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what is the solution to our problem? The answer, of course, is very simple. Accelerated economic growth. But I submit that economic growth is only possible in an atmosphere that inspires confidence, engenders goodwill and understanding. And I submit that such an atmosphere is significantly lacking in our province, which accounts for the lethargic pace of our economic growth; and until this atmosphere changes, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan will continue to lag behind the other provinces and will continue to show this kind of per capita income in relation to the other provinces.

Well, it is to be hoped that that portion of the throne speech devoted to creating industrial incentive in our province through changed regulations will help bring about economic growth. But I am afraid that this will not be the case. It requires more than changing regulations; it requires a change in attitudes. The attitudes expressed on many occasions in this house, and outside it, by members of this house to your right, Sir, towards free enterprise, towards capitalism and the

**February 26, 1963**

United States, from whence flows most of the development capital of this continent and this country, is such that has discouraged potential developers of resources in Saskatchewan that would give us this necessary economic growth to meet the ever rising costs of services. I say again, so long as the NDP remain oriented towards statism, just so long will Saskatchewan lag behind other provinces in Canada. It is tragically as simple as that.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Thatcher, has clearly stated what a Liberal government would do to get our economy moving, and it needs no further elaboration by me, except to say, Mr. Speaker, that to get economic growth we need people, and to have people we need jobs, and in order to have jobs we need investments, and in order to get investments we need to restore and inspire confidence and goodwill and understanding, and this is what a Liberal government is pledged to do.

Recently we have been hearing terms; we heard them expressed this afternoon; terms expressed by the Premier and others of the NDP, such terms as “Thatcherism” and “Thatcherites”. Well, Mr. Speaker, if Thatcherism means freedom of enterprise, the dignity of the individual, the respect of civil liberties, and opposition to the statism of the NDP, then I can assure the members to your right, Sir, the political submersion of the NDP by Thatcherites is near at hand. But, Mr. Speaker, if Saskatchewan is going to have “isms” in order to identify a party and its creed, then let us apply it all around. It follows that we have “Lloydism” in this province — that is something very recent. And what describes it? Well, Mr. Speaker, when the people of this province were told that the medical care plan would come in on July 1 “with or without the co-operation of the doctors”, that’s “Lloydism”. The statement by the Premier when he was exhorting his cohorts to see that they get this plan going through states “when the going gets tough, it’s time for tough men to get going” — and I don’t accept their interpretation — that’s “Lloydism”. The Premier’s concept of togetherness on the kind of terms that he would dictate, well, to me that’s “Lloydism”. And as we have learned in this debate, particularly, the sweeping statements and allegations by the Premier, without a shred of evidence to prove their veracity — that’s “Lloydism”.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, two can play at this game. Very simply, then, the people of Saskatchewan will have to choose either between “Thatcherism” or “Lloydism” in the next provincial election. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope, and I am sure the hope of all our fine citizens of Saskatchewan, that they will be able to make their choice in an atmosphere that contains a modicum of respectability, and which may be a credit to the politics of this province. They began the “isms”, Mr. Speaker, we didn’t.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, from what I have said in this hour and almost fifteen minutes, it ought to be clear that I shall support the amendment and oppose the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.T. Stone:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to congratulate all those who have taken part in this speech to the throne, especially do my congratulations go to the mover and the seconder. I don't believe that I have ever heard two finer speeches on the throne speech since I have sat in this house.

I also offer my congratulations to the new member for the constituency of Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart). There is no denying that we on this side are disappointed in not being able to retain this seat but I think the result was very gratifying in that at least our candidate polled a bigger vote in the by-election than we did in the general election in spite of the predictions that four or five out of every six persons were against the government because of its medicare program. I think we showed a very gratifying result in that election.

Now the previous speaker clearly showed where he stands and where he belongs, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I won't take as long to show where I stand in the matter. Now the heat of the medicare crisis has subsided somewhat and the emotions of most people are back to normal, it is possible to assess the pros and cons and find some of the answers to what was possibly the most outstanding upheaval in the political life of this province. To me at least it appears that what has happened throughout the history of the world. Whenever the people, the common people, tried to bring about a change for the betterment of themselves, history will show the struggle and sacrifice and the suffering of the common people that was necessary to gain a little betterment for themselves. I refer to such things as free universal education, the right of universal franchise, the idea of people to play a part in the government of their own country, matters such as the abolition of child labor, better working conditions, better health programs, better housing and security in old age. All these were violently opposed by the class at the top, the upper, privileged group.

Although there wasn't the bloodshed and the many atrocities that were connected with similar events of history, yet, Mr. Speaker, the medicare crisis assumed unbelievable heights in a modern day society, such as threats against people in high public places, the desire of a few to incite mob rule by taking up arms and clubs to turn the government out. We even had the Queen's representative threatening to throw out the democratically-elected government of the people, and surely this brings memories of the days of King John. Now there are people . . .

**February 26, 1963**

**Mrs. M.J. Batten (Humboldt):** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is this not an infringement of the rules? This is a remark against the representative of the Queen, threatening to throw out the established government. It certainly is privilege. If Her Majesty's representative has no question of privilege in this house . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The question is not a point of privilege, but it could have been raised on a point of order.

**Mr. Stone:** — Mr. Speaker, there are those people who believe that the fight was between the government and the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, will that remark be withdrawn by the speaker?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think with respect to the point which was raised by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) that — the rules are quite plain. In these debates you cannot speak disrespectfully of the Queen's representative. I think you should withdraw the statement.

**Mr. Stone:** — I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I will withdraw the statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are people who believe the fight was between the government and the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and of course those people are hoping to maintain this smoke-screen until the next election for very obvious reasons. Who, Mr. Speaker, were the real villains behind the medicare crisis? I suggest it was the self-satisfied, upper middle class people, those people who scream the loudest about the freedom of the individual, those people who have never done better in their lives. Many of them are millionaires two and three times over, and some of them are top executives of the Liberal party. Their concern, Mr. Speaker, for the freedom of the individual is their own freedom and they are hoping that the right kind of government would be here in Regina so it would be possible for them to make four or five million instead of the two or three that they have now.

Let us take a good look behind the "Kill our Democracy" organization. And I don't mean the Rod Thomsons and the Hans Taals, because they were just the stooges. I am referring to the real people behind it, the people who put up the money and made the bullets. Then I refer to the Free Citizens Association, the Canadian arm of the United States John Birch Society, an organization

that has to stay pretty well underground like the Communist party because no decent-minded citizen would want it publicly known that he was connected with it. And, of course, there were some of the boards of trade, some of them are quite reactionary. There were also the insurance companies who stood to lose a great deal by this medicare program. And, of course, there was the press, T.V. and the radio.

Now I know that it will be said that the big support for the doctors came from people in all walks of life. This is quite true. Farm people, workers, co-ops, church organizations, friends and relatives were split right down the centre. The most discouraging aspect to my point of view, Mr. Speaker, were those with large families, trying to exist on a substandard wage, the kind of people who would be put in some financial jeopardy by even a \$5.00 doctor bill. When these people kick you in the teeth — it certainly was discouraging to me. I at times wondered if the whole thing was worthwhile, if it wouldn't be better to let these people stew in their own juice. But when the heat of the battle was over and I realized the propaganda that these people were subjected to, I would appreciate the emotional strain that these people were under by press, T.V., radio and some of the members of the college. And since that time many of these people have come to me and told me how foolish they were to become so frenzied over the crisis of last July.

It is rather amusing that the local daily press were protesting that they were the only ones in step and that all the other papers, almost all the other papers in Canada and the United States and Great Britain were out of step. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the local dailies were suggesting that those who were representing papers from outside the province were incompetent. This seemed quite a slur on the people, some of them were the top in their business — their prestige was too valuable to them to stoop to the reporting of mis-statements, innuendoes and conjectures and lies such as were put in our local dailies. Well, we expect the press and radio in this province to take the opposite view to the government of this province. That is their privilege, their democratic right, but they are really getting into the gutter when they had to resort to the kind of journalism they did during the medicare crisis.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't a fact that all the doctors in the province were going to leave. It wasn't a fact that all the hospitals would be closed down. It wasn't a fact that the nurses would walk off the job. It wasn't a fact that the medical college would have to close down because of lack of staff and students. It wasn't a fact that doctors from Nigeria and Pakistan and the darkest spots of Africa would replace the doctors of this province. It wasn't a fact either that the medical services of this province would be crippled. These were deliberate lies, Mr. Speaker, done with only one purpose in mind, that of frightening the people of this province,

and they did a good job along these lines, especially with the mothers and the sick people of this province. What a golden opportunity the press of this province had to rise to great heights, to pour oil on troubled waters, to give the people the kind of leadership that they needed to reason the problems out sensibly. No, Mr. Speaker, we weren't fighting the College of Physicians and Surgeons. We were not fighting the Liberal party. We have beaten the Liberal party five times, Mr. Speaker, and we could beat them another five times. And the Leader of the Opposition knows this, he knows this quite well, he knows he is banging his head against a brick wall by continually going to the people with this pathetic, negative approach of the Liberal party. We know, and most people know, a year ago there was a very strong disagreement in the Liberal caucus, not because of any personal like or dislike of their leader, but it was because of what he was desirous of doing to the Liberal party, and the ardent supporters of the Liberal party honestly believe that theirs is the middle of the road party, whatever that means. But they honestly believe that they are all things to all people. The leader of the Liberal party says, "I can't follow that kind of line and expect to win elections against a government that has such a remarkable record, I can't . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Who said that? Who wrote the speech?

**Mr. Stone:** — . . . I can't go every election to the people and expect to win votes by offering tax-free farm fuel, by offering the removal of the mineral tax — bless my soul, he said, I even promised the farmers a refund on their power installation and they wouldn't bite". He says, "It's no good telling the people that there will never be an oil well developed under a socialist government; it's no good stirring up dissatisfaction over the larger unit of school administration and with the municipal governments. We've done all these so many times and it gets us nowhere. It doesn't make sense to go to the people and tell them that they were better off under a Liberal government, because he had his individual freedom even though he was in debt to the point where the mortgage companies were ready to take their farms and their homes. It doesn't make sense to say you were better off under a Liberal government when the municipalities, school districts, provincial government were so far in debt that they couldn't borrow a nickel on the open market to do the things that were so badly needed in this province. It is silly to go and tell the farmer he was better off under a Liberal government when he would have his individual freedom, he could at least breathe the fresh air, it is better to have his freedom and to enjoy his coal-oil lamp and a pump out in the yard, rather than to have the comforts of power and water connections. It is silly to tell the farmer that he was better to have a dirt trail to the market centre, which he could use only when the weather was good, rather than have a good grid road which he has today to a centre which provides all the services that he and his family need."



It is rather difficult to convince a farmer that he would be better off under a Liberal government and have his individual freedoms and have a one-room, broken-down school with a teacher who enjoys his individual freedom but hardly has enough to keep body and soul together.

Think how hard it is for the Liberal party to go to the people of urban centres and tell them how much better off they were under a Liberal government when they had their individual freedom, and they could enjoy working longer hours for smaller pay, with no holidays with pay and very poor compensation should they be injured on the job.

How silly it is to go and tell the people that they would be better off firing their furnaces with coal and taking the ashes out instead of enjoying the natural gas, with at least a one-third saving on fuel. How silly it is to go to the people and tell the people it is better under a Liberal government to have your individual freedom to pay your own hospital bills instead of having them paid under the Hospitalization Act.

How about telling the old age people, the people on relief that they would be better under a Liberal government; they would at least have their freedom, but they wouldn't get enough to keep body and soul together.

Now, the leader of the Liberal party knows this, so he says "We will get all the free enterprisers together — that is a nice word, everybody likes to be a free enterpriser — now we will get rid of the socialists — that is a nasty word and a lot of people don't like to be called a socialist — and so we will nail our flag to these groups and I am sure that they will do a job for us at the next election."!

If you thought the people were emotionally disturbed last July on the medicare, then you haven't seen anything yet. These people, I understand, sent a group down to get training by the John Birch Society in the United States of America, and I have no doubt they will put on one of the most vicious campaigns when we go to the people at the next election.

**An Hon. Member:** — You're dreaming.

**Mr. Stone:** — The member over on the other side says I'm dreaming. Well, the Free Citizens Association are still keeping their rabbleroising tactics going, and here I have some unsigned John Birch garbage put out by one, from the office of one S.C. Atkinson. This shows you the kind of warped minds of these individuals, but the Leader of the Opposition had a little difficult time selling it to his Liberal friends. Many of his Liberal friends, of course, the ardent Liberal supporters, are a little sceptical, whereas they might make a few temporary gains, yet what will be the long-term effect on the Liberal party? Many of you

**February 26, 1963**

remember the 1929 election, the religious fight we had in the 1929 election, and many of us recall what happened to the Anderson government. We know what happened to the provincial Progressive Conservative party, and I doubt very much whether the provincial Conservative party will ever gain back the confidence of the people of this province.

The people of the Liberal party in this province knew that the leader of their party is Canada's top opportunist. They know that he sold his good friends in Moose Jaw, his good CCF friends in Moose Jaw, down the line. Now he is not only prepared to sell the Liberal party but also the Progressive Conservative and the Social Credit party down the line.

I want to say that the Leader of the Opposition and his friends of the John Birch society believe they have a pushover the next election, but I want to warn him that they will have many thousands of good solid citizens to contend with before he and his friends destroy all the good things that the people of this province have built up in the last 20 years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stone:** — I said, Mr. Speaker, that it was the satisfied upper middle class that we have to contend with, the people that honestly believe that they were put on this earth to be waited upon and served by the masses of the people, the people that think it is their God-given right to push other people around, who took the attitude that they built and they paid for and they gave people the medical services that they enjoyed, and by heaven, they could take them away.

They went a little too far, Mr. Speaker. They tried to push the people a little too far. When they talked of closing down hospitals and evacuating whole communities, then the real solid citizen of this province stood up and protested, and reminded these people that these institutions were built by all the people for the use of all the people and they would remain as such.

I have sat here for some 19 sittings, Mr. Speaker, and I can't recall hardly a session that the opposition haven't called upon the government to go to the people. They claimed the government had lost the confidence of the people. Certainly amongst the people I mix with I can't find any sign of lost confidence; but this I do know; I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that there isn't that bubbling-over of enthusiasm that the Leader of the Opposition told us about the other day. There isn't that enthusiasm to elect a Liberal government, either federally or provincially. Now, no doubt the Leader of the Opposition mixes with different people than I do, and I have no doubt that these quick-buck artists that he mixes with really are rubbing their hands and are full of enthusiasm with the idea of getting back after being out of power so long.

I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, at one of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech the other day. He spoke of some under-the-table deals with the co-operatives. This is an amazing remark by one who aspires to one day be the premier of this province. He not only admits he is opposed to co-operatives, but that he is ignorant of the purposes and the aims of the co-operatives.

**Mr. Steuart:** — When did he say that?

**Mr. Stone:** — If he would take the trouble and the time to learn something about co-operatives, he would realize that there are hundreds of thousands of citizens of Saskatchewan who own and operate the co-operatives of this province and there haven't been any business enterprises anywhere in this province that have contributed more to the economy than have the co-operatives. The co-operatives were instrumental in preventing hundreds of millions of dollars from being siphoned out of the economy of this province, and ever since we have sat on this side of the house, Mr. Speaker, it has been the policy of this government to prevent monies being siphoned away from this province. That is why we set up the government insurance office and the sodium sulphate and one of the reasons why we set up the timber board. We make no apologies for assisting in every way possible the co-ops in their endeavor to stimulate the economy of this province. Many people all across Canada are concerned over the loss of Canada's natural resources to outside capital. We have enjoyed prosperity, we have had good times while the capital is being invested to develop these resources, but now we and generations to come will suffer because millions and millions of dollars will be lost to the Canadian economy.

Now, while I am speaking along these lines, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a short news report that appeared in the Star-Phoenix of Saturday, February 23, headed "Australia is Warned" and it comes from Sydney, Australia.

Lieutenant-General Howard D. Graham, president of the Toronto Stock Exchange, has warned Australia about the dangers of losing ownership of her natural oil resources. Graham, 63, a former Chief of the General Staff, arrived in Australia from New Zealand on a private trip to visit stock exchanges in Sydney and Melbourne. Discussing recent oil discoveries in Queensland, Graham said in an interview, 'I hope the Australian people will try to retain their ownership in these natural resources and not have foreign capital bringing in all the oil wells'. He said 75 to 80 percent of all Canadian oil interests are owned by the United States. Hundreds of millions of dollars leave Canada every year. He said 'I would be much happier if the inflow of capital into Canada diminished and the Canadian share of ownership increased'.

**February 26, 1963**

Now I am sure, Mr. Speaker, Lieut.-General Graham is not a socialist, and if he is quoted correctly then I am sure he is expressing what is in the minds of thousands of Canadians today. It may be a little late to close the barn door now that the old parties have let the horse out, but if we are to stop the down-grading of our economy and if we are ever to hope to improve the lot of the unemployed, the chronic unemployment situation, then we must have a government that is prepared to deal with this problem, and plan to develop our natural resources for the benefit of Canadian people. So far the Saskatchewan government is the only government in Canada that has adopted that policy to try and retain some of the natural resources for the benefit of the people, and we will continue to do that. It is quite obvious from the remarks from members on the opposite side that they are prepared to sell all of our resources for a few pieces of silver.

It is quite obvious from the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition the other day that he wasn't happy about our labor laws, and it may be just coincidental that his friends of the Free Citizens Association are also unhappy with our labor laws. And I suppose if he were ever fortunate enough to be on this side, that he would consult with the Free Citizens Association to make the changes needed for the best interests of the working people. I have lived in this province for 50 years, mostly under a Liberal government, and that is just the way Liberal governments have always done. Some individual who has never done a day's manual work in his life knows what is best for the working class. Even after consulting with the workers, he still doesn't know the workers' problems.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech indicates further developments of the programs which will bring greater benefits to all our people. The greater expansion in technical and vocational education will be of great assistance in the training of our young people in this rapidly changing world. Further pastures and extension of the family farm improvement will bring benefits to our farmers. The continuation of good roads and extension of our natural gas program will be welcome. It will be, I am sure, greatly welcomed by those on old age assistance to know that now they will be covered by the medical care plan.

And because I believe the throne speech contains a program that will bring continued benefits to the people of Saskatchewan, I will vote against the amendment and support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I would like to draw the attention of the house to our standing order 30, paragraph 3, which directs that the vote on the amendment must be taken this day. I would like to know if it is the intention of the house to sit this evening. If so, the vote will be taken this evening on the amendment.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there are some speakers on each side of the house that have indicated an interest in continuing the debate after the supper hour, so I think we are quite safe in postponing the vote until then.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Thiessen (Shellbrook):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'm going to be too long and you will be able to get the vote in tonight as far as I am concerned.

I want to first of all offer my congratulations to my neighbor who was the seconder of the speech from the throne. I thought he did a good job, he is an outstanding speaker and, when he stands up here, he makes me feel very small.

But I want to pay tribute to the member from Meadow Lake, (Mr. Semchuk). In a speech that he made, he not only made a speech but he told us what is happening in the north country, and this is being duplicated in the province of Saskatchewan. It made me feel that we are getting something across in creating a vacuum which is assisting people, or drawing people into this, which will eventually, if continued, draw some people from the low level which they are on now — then the member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) will not be able to find people whom he can talk about, reading from articles in the paper which we have not been able to find, where it states that an unmarried mother and her daughter, both in hospital, on confinement. Mr. Speaker, the member from Meadow Lake has done something about this. I think all the northern parts are doing something about this and eventually, if continued, they are not going to find this type of people.

The impression that I got was that these are people he found in the Meadow Lake area, and he would find some of these in my area, and what I want to say is that we have lived ten years in the spot that we are in at this time, and we have some of these girls, unmarried mothers, quite a number of them, but having lived in this spot for ten years now I find that the Metis people, the Indian people, respect our women much more than our men will respect the Indian and Metis women.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**February 26, 1963**

**Mr. Thiessen:** — My wife has never at any time been molested or treated disrespectfully by any Indian, be they drunk or sober, or having a good time, or by a Metis; but twice have white men been disrespectful of her in a back yard because we lived next to a beer parlor and they wanted to go in and have a bottle of beer with her. And I was just a little bit hurt when the hon. member made the reference to the people in the north doing this type of thing, and I want to again congratulate the member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) on the things that he said about the north.

I want to also congratulate the Premier of the province for the stand that he took in the medical care crisis. The stand was taken that when going gets tough, then tough men better get going. I don't think that the Premier at any time was tough, but I do think that he got going. He was doing something for the people of the province and doing something that his people wanted him to do. And we could never, at any time, have had a better man to lead us to what we wanted in Saskatchewan than we had in Mr. Lloyd.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thiessen:** — I want to, too, congratulate the former Minister of Health, Mr. Davies, and the present Minister of Health, Mr. Blakeney because they have taken a great load, they have taken a great burden from the rest of the population of the province. I said when we were doing the medical act that I wanted medical coverage for 15,000 men and women and children in my constituency who had never had any coverage before. Today this is true. I have 16,000 in my constituency, roughly, that now have something better than they have ever had, and, Mr. Speaker, they are making use of it.

I have a number of fellows who have come to me who have had major operations that they should have had years ago. But the beauty of the thing is that last week-end when I was home I find that two of my neighbors in my village have been in hospital for three weeks and each one of them had a major operation; and both of these fellows had given me a lot of abuse during the medical crisis. When these gentlemen come home, healed up and everything else, I want to go and tell them that I have taken a lot of abuse from them and I want part of their doctor bills to help the CCF parliament in the province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thiessen:** — I didn't rise in this house to speak for a long time, but I thought I should dwell in a little while on welfare. There has been a lot of abuse made of welfare possibly — there have been statements made, I should say, on welfare. I think that I have

probably dealt with welfare longer than anyone in this house. Thirty years ago last January, the first Saturday of that month, I attended my first council meeting as a councillor of division 2, in RM 373. Thinking back to this, we had social aid at that time too, and thinking back to that day, I remember a case of welfare — the member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) is not in his seat — but my dad was the reeve in the municipality at that time, and this was a case dealing with a man who moved from the rural municipality of Warham into the rural municipality of Aberdeen. And father of the member from Rosthern was the reeve at Warham at that time. However, this is immaterial, it is just how this thing was set up.

He came to our meeting and he was told by our council well, you are going to have to move back to Warham; so we dealt with all the pros and cons — I remember there were half a dozen people sitting around in the office, waiting their turn to be dealt with. This was all new to me. And this gentleman made a couple of attempts to try and get the council to do something for him but he was told that he had to go back to Warham, so he walked over to the door and took hold of the knob and he looked around and he gave us a good look, and he opened the door and he walked half way out, and he turned around and he said, “Thank you, gentlemen. May you all burn in hell.” I shall never forget this. This is something that when I thought we were doing something for people, and then to have to burn in hell for doing something. This was my inauguration into relief.

I find that through the days of the Liberal government we had problems and we had lots of them. People got a little bit and they should have had a little bit less as far as the inspectors were concerned.

We dealt with relief under the Conservative government and at that time it was taken away from the municipality and dealt with by Regina. Then they had fellows who went around, something like we do today with PFAA; they wanted to know whether you had to have relief, and how much you needed, and so forth, and then it was dished out from the municipal office.

Then the Liberals were re-elected again, and we went back on the basis we had before, with relief inspectors and everything else. I maintain this, that as long as anyone, whether they are Liberals, Social Credit, CCF, or whatever you are, when you have something to give away, then you are in trouble, and I would even suggest that if the Leader of the Opposition wanted to give all his cattle that he has got to people, to the needy ones of his constituency, he would be in more dire trouble than he is in this moment. Because you cannot give things away and make friends. In our welfare act we have, I think, a better act than has ever been created before. It is not perfect, I have never maintained that it was perfect, but I think we have an act which can work and which does work. I know that possibly the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) is

**February 26, 1963**

probably also a welfare official, and I thought I would for just a short while dwell on the local level of welfare, and I don't think we start this much different than we did at any other time.

This applicant must come to the municipal office or to the welfare officials and make an application, and I don't think there is anybody in the province of Saskatchewan that can sit down and say that this man is getting too much or this man is getting too little, unless he knows what is in that welfare file. I can go into my office and I can show you hundreds of files, and I know I had a welfare meeting with my boys last Saturday, and I have a new reeve and he wanted two or three cases to look at, and when we dealt with these and went through the file and showed him what was there, he said, "Well, I never knew this; I've been told that this was a reckless thing and maybe some of the things I said I should take back". I think this is the case of many people; I think there are statements made when they don't know the facts.

When this applicant has made his application, then the welfare official has the power at this time to deal with it. We never did have under the old act. Under the old act I had to wait till my council sat and I would lay it before them and give this man \$75, and it was their say so and their say so on how much they got.

In all of us, in myself and everyone else, you will find that when I have the authority to tell the other one how he must live, that I am going to make sure that he lives with less than I do, and I have found this in councils too; they will say that this man should get along with \$45. I have had a councillor come to me and say that this man is getting \$110, is spending more in the store than I do with a family of six children, so I asked him to go home and every time he used a quart of milk to charge himself with it; every time he used a dozen eggs to charge himself with it; and when he got a pound of meat out of his fridge or deep freeze, charge himself and see how much that would come out to at the end of the month. When he came in at the next meeting, when the council was meeting on welfare, he said, "I have nothing to say, Sir, I am not going to say anything. I know what it costs at home, I never dreamed it was so expensive." But when you see a farmer having to go to the store, and he buys his flour, possibly his sugar, he possibly does not consider what these other people are buying.

This is one of the reasons why we in the rural municipality of Canwood have started a potato and a garden project. We have a lot of Metis people — I may be dwelling on this too long, Mr. Speaker.



I was then dealing with the case; the welfare officials has the power to deal with a case, and if he feels these people should have something, he can issue a cheque, providing that the council has passed a bylaw which creates a fund from which he can draw.

At the end of the month, what I do with my accounts is that my council receives the number of the cheque and the name and amount issued to every social recipient in my municipality. Then if they find there is someone who should not be getting it this is taken up by committee or by council who may be in at that time. So that at no time could I, as an M.L.A. — and I don't think that at any time could the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) or anywhere else, as an M.L.A. — issue cheques to recipients who may be good CCF'ers or anyone else, and get away with it.

This should all be taken care of at a meeting and I think that all municipalities are trying to make a good job of welfare, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is 5:30.

I will not support the amendment but I will support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

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

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, first I want to associate myself with the remarks which have been addressed to you in congratulation in respect of your representing this legislature, and I am sure representing it very ably, at the parliamentary conference in Nigeria this summer.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, formally to record my congratulations to the hon. member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and the hon. member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) on their appointment to the cabinet, and particularly to express my congratulations to the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) on taking his seat in this house. I have no doubt that he will prove to be an able representative of the people in Prince Albert. The thought has already been expressed that his stay in this house may be of limited duration. This, perhaps, remains to be seen.

**February 26, 1963**

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter this debate and I do not intend to speak at length. There were one or two things which I felt ought perhaps properly to be said in view of the remarks of some of the previous speakers in this debate.

I want to make it perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that I don't intend to disinter the medical care controversy. The Saskatoon agreement has been signed, we for our part intend to live up to its terms and we think this is quite inconsistent with a disinterment of the controversy. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatoon agreement provides a basis upon which is being built a good medical care plan, a sound medical care plan, one of which I am already proud and one which I am sure will in a few short years be claimed by hon. members opposite as their own. Mr. Speaker, I think the people of this province are tired of bickering, tired of these transparent attempts to stem the growth of public acceptance, tired of the rehash of this controversy and its antecedents.

I have no quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with the College of Physicians and Surgeons; they are not formally represented in this house. I join the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) in viewing with distaste the mixture of politics with the practice of medicine. I have said through the public media that I think it entirely appropriate for individual members of the medical profession to engage in political activity and I think it entirely inappropriate for the statutory medical licensing body to engage in partisan political activity. I have explained my thinking in this regard in a fairly lengthy letter to the Star Phoenix, which appeared in December. I made my point and I don't intend to say anything more about that tonight.

I do, however, Mr. Speaker, intend to say one or two things about remarks which have been made by previous speakers in this debate. I have to comment on some remarks of the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) which I think were concurred in very largely by the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb). We have heard time after time, Mr. Speaker, these shotgun attacks on public administration in the form of boards and commissions. We have heard it stated time and time again that there should in every and all cases be an appeal to the courts in respect to these commissions. We have heard the courts eulogized as the appropriate place for making decisions with respect to the rights of private citizens. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone will accuse me of not being fully conversant with the value of our system of justice. Nor, I would suspect, of having any wish to bar business from the courts. I will be known to the hon. members that the nature of a legal profession is such that the training for this profession inculcates in the students an appreciation, I would almost say a reverence, for the forms of justice which we have evolved over the centuries. But, Mr. Speaker, we have

found that, with respect to some aspects of life, the courts have proved to be somewhat less than a completely adequate way to make decisions as between private citizens.

Now, one of the boards, I think probably the board which makes the largest number of decisions with respect to the rights of private citizens, has been operating in this province for many years. I take it that members opposite are now advocating that there should be an appeal from the decisions of this board to the courts. I refer of course to the Workmen's Compensation Board. Now this is almost a classic example of an administrative tribunal from whose decisions on points of fact there is no appeal, no appeal to the courts. I take it, therefore, that hon. members opposite are in fact advocating a system whereby there would be appeal to the courts from the decisions of this tribunal. I want to make it clear that this system which they advocate has operated in many places; it operates in many states of the union; it operates I think a great deal less satisfactorily than our present system and I think a good many people of this province, more particularly wage earners, will be very interested to know that members opposite propose to put them through the ordeal of having their cases very possibly appealed from court to court before they can have any assurance of getting reimbursement or compensation for injuries which they may suffer in the course of their employment.

Another agency which decides a great many issues as between individual citizens — true, it is not a tribunal in the strict sense of the word — is the automobile accident insurance fund. Members will be perfectly aware that when two cars crash on the streets of Winnipeg, the likelihood is that two insurance adjusters dash to the scene, each making an assessment of the accident; each, if the liability is in dispute, engages legal counsel, and the matter ends up in the courts. Now, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that this is very fine for the legal profession and supports them in the manner to which they are accustomed and which they have every right to expect. But I suggest to you that it is really not an appropriate way to decide issues of this nature as between citizens. In our province, when two cars crash in the streets of Regina, it is almost certain that each is covered by the same insurer, one adjuster goes to the scene — in many cases it is completely pointless to attempt to ascertain the finer points of liability since the insurer is the same and he is going to pay in any case. The matter can be disposed of quickly — the lawyers, I regret to say, are deprived of some briefs to take to court, but I am sure that all would agree that the citizens are much better and more satisfactorily served. Now, we noted with a great deal of interest the remarks of the hon. member for Morse, the Leader of the Opposition, in which he indicated that the automobile accident insurance fund would be done away with in its present form. He was perfectly clear in stating

**February 26, 1963**

that, while the Liberal party would require all motorists to take out liability insurance, they would not require them to take out insurance with any particular insurers. This will have the effect, of course, of introducing into Saskatchewan the system which obtains in Manitoba, the one I have described, or in Ontario, or in most other provinces of Canada and which has the result of meaning that, rather than somewhat over 80¢ in the dollar as in Saskatchewan going to pay for claims, somewhat less than 50¢ in the dollar will go to pay for claims — the additional expense would be taken up with commissions, additional administration, lawyers fees, and the like.

Mr. Speaker, one can understand how doctrinaire free enterprisers like our friends opposite would take the view that the motorists have no right to save this money, that it is perfectly proper to spend this extra 30¢ of the motorists' dollar by frittering it away in useless administration, but we on this side take the view that if a government forces someone to carry insurance, then that government has an obligation to provide that insurance to him at the lowest possible price.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think all of us were interested in a good number of the remarks of the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Erb). I think we were particularly interested in his rather remarkable statement to the effect that in the long run the Liberal party is the party of reform. Now, I have a friend, Mr. Speaker, who used to say that in the long run we are all dead, and I can only say that before any Liberal government would introduce a medical care plan in this province, or in this country, we'd all be dead, if it was going to be introduced for the first time by a Liberal government.

**Premier Lloyd:** — No hurry.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — In no hurry. The Premier made perfectly clear in his remarks that, notwithstanding the adoption of a medical care plank in the Liberal platform in 1919, and notwithstanding the fact that they have been in power in all the provinces in Canada and in the federal house for in excess of two and a half centuries, they have still not got around to introducing a medical care plan in any province in Canada. This indeed is a long run. Well, now, we have seen examples of this with respect to hospitalization — we don't have to go very far back . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . on the proposed medical care plan.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — With respect to hospitalization, we know well that it was first introduced into this province in a Social Credit province before any Liberal province adopted it; it was introduced in a Conservative province before any Liberal province adopted it, and only by the pressure of events in provinces where other parties were in power were these people of the Liberal party disposed to introduce hospital insurance in any province in Canada. Indeed we know, nationally, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal government, notwithstanding the fact that it was in power at Ottawa up until 1957, paid out not one 5¢ piece under a national hospitalization program. Now this, Mr. Speaker, is indeed a long run. They are not in any hurry.

I don't know whether the NDP will be in power in Ottawa, but I tell you this, Mr. Speaker, if and when they do get in power in Ottawa, they won't wait for 30 or 40 years to implement their promises.

**An Hon. Member:** — They'll never get there

**An Hon. Member:** — They'll never make it.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, we heard this afternoon a number of remarks from the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) and he described us here in this chamber as representatives of the people. I note that he neglected to advise us what people he claims to represent or the basis of his claim. Not only, Mr. Speaker, when he walked across the house did he not offer himself to his electorate, but if I can understand newspaper reports, he doesn't intend to offer himself to the electors of Milestone.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . want another by-election.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, this could well be. I don't know . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You don't want another by-election.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — He can give it a try. The hon. member for Milestone is still free to give it a try.

**An Hon. Member:** — You may find yourselves with one. You won't like it.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think his decision was a wise one if perhaps not particularly courageous. He also told us that the Medical

**February 26, 1963**

Care Insurance Act was introduced with inordinate haste. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the act was based upon the report of the Thompson committee, the final report of the Thompson committee with respect to medical care. The report is perfectly clear on this. I would recommend it for the perusal of the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker). Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the report was prepared by a committee to which all interested parties, including the medical profession and many others, made full representations and submissions. We know that the committee was made up of representatives of a number of groups, including six medical doctors, three representatives of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. We know too that the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) did not always hold the view which he now holds. Mr. Speaker, his memory too is unreliable. Let me give you his words as they appear at page 38, vol. 12 of Hansard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our friends in the opposition have been saying, what is the hurry in getting this bill through. Others have been saying that we ought to have implemented a medical care plan a long time ago. (That's the hon. member for Melville.) I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that we are in no hurry, that this is according to the policy of the government as I outlined earlier. The medical care plan becomes a part of our overall policy in bringing about a balanced health service in the province of Saskatchewan. This is in keeping with social progress. I say, Mr. Speaker, just as we progressed technologically we must progress socially, and we cannot keep our social progress and our technological progress too far apart. They must improve and advance together. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the great and overwhelming majority of the people of Saskatchewan are in favor of the kind of medical care program that we have proposed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this was after the Athabasca alleged by-election. This was after the Turtleford alleged by-election.

**An Hon. Member:** — The actual fact . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — This, Mr. Speaker — these are the by-elections which are said to prove that the people do not approve of this medical care program.

**Mr. Erb:** — You've got a poor case; you've got a poor case.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I will ask the member to refrain from this constant interruption.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that I will just say that I have no doubt that the great and overwhelming majority of the people of Saskatchewan are in favor of the kind of medical care program that we have proposed. This, Mr. Speaker, was the bill in its unchanged form, this was the bill which was introduced in 1961, and this is the bill which upon second reading, every member voted for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) had a number of other things to say. He talked about community clinics, and he quoted from a document circulated by the community health services organization, dated July 17, 1962. Well, he noted the similarity between that document and the Saskatoon agreement and from this he concluded that the authors of the July 17 agreement must have known what was going to appear in the Saskatoon agreement. Well, now, I think most of us know that the Saskatoon agreement wasn't even conceived on July 17. Surely, the logical conclusion to be drawn from this, the logical explanation, is that the authors of the Saskatoon agreement knew of the activities of the community health organizations as set out in the document and that both parties to the Saskatoon agreement — both parties, Mr. Speaker — agreed that this was an entirely appropriate thing for citizens to do. This is surely the logical conclusion to be drawn from the fact that a document is circulated by a citizen group in early July, that the same ideas are incorporated in a later agreement between the government and the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Now, of course, Mr. Speaker, there were members of the CCF among the community health clinic members. They are citizens too, you know. I know members opposite often take the view that anyone who votes CCF is not a citizen, or ought not to be. But just the same, Mr. Speaker, these people are citizens and they have every right to exercise the rights of the citizenship. I was particularly happy, Mr. Speaker, to have this mention of the Saskatoon agreement because the agreement makes it abundantly clear that community clinics are contemplated by the government, and contemplated by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. It acknowledges that they have an appropriate place in the provision of medical services in Saskatchewan. And Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that a member who is a professed supporter of co-operatives, and community-based organizations, would have welcomed this further extension of consumer-sponsored organizations.

**Mr. Erb:** — Not that kind, not a political kind of co-operation. I believe in political . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member had a number of other things to say. He made some, what I thought were quite unwarranted, slurs upon

**February 26, 1963**

The qualifications of community clinic doctors. And I want to say that his reflection on such men as have been the chief of surgery of one of our major urban hospitals, men who have been on the staff of the college of medicine — I think these types of slurs are quite inappropriate.

**Mr. Erb:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I did not say all doctors. I said some of them.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is not a point of privilege.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Ah, yes, he was very careful not to identify the ones, no he tars everyone with the brush of incompetence.

**Mr. Erb:** — Dr. Hjertas is very well qualified . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I would have thought so, I would have thought so indeed, and so are a great many others of the community clinic doctors — so are a great many others of the community clinic doctors.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — So are a great many you chased out, too.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — No one was chased out. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members opposite, I know the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) is . . .

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — It's the first thing he has said.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Well, you will hear from him, don't worry about that.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this. I don't know when I have heard the competence of professional men attacked in this house before, and I think we can regard this as just a momentary slip amidst the outpourings of purple polysyllabics from the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb). Sir, certainly the reputations of the men I have mentioned don't need any defence from me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member spoke of private plans, and I want to join in congratulating those who have pioneered private medical care plans and municipal medical care



plans in this province. We have a lengthy and distinguished history of building medical care plans in this province, one that goes back to early days of municipal doctor plans, goes back to private co-operative plans organized in the 1930's, goes back to the Swift Current health region — the first public plan over a major area in North America — and goes back to somewhat later days than some of these, to the doctor-sponsored plans. These plans certainly served a very useful role. But I think many of us had reached the conclusion that they were not able to do the job properly in its entirety. I think the idea is put very well by the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) in his remarks in this house in Hansard, vol. 8, page 17.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, I think for the most people everywhere, it is felt that the time has come when voluntary programs have become inadequate. If our people are to receive the proper kind of medical care universally, this can only be provided through a government-sponsored medical care program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a proposition with which we all can agree, or all could agree — most of us. I think that . . .

**Mr. Erb:** — You're not proving very much.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Very well. These things, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, are beyond proof. They are acknowledged by anyone who has thought his way into the twentieth century, and this includes the members on this side of the house and one or two opposite, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . almost thought themselves out of your party.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Now I want to refer to some remarks of the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) in vol. 15 of Hansard at page 8, and here he makes clear that a tax-supported, publicly-sponsored medical care plan is really the only answer to our problems. And he goes on to say:

We have used this same principle in spreading the costs among everyone in a wide varieties of ways, and it is evident that we must now apply the same sort of reasoning to the provision of health services, and to make sure that everyone of us gets the care and attention he needs. Anything less, I suggest, would be a return to the law of the jungle.

**Mr. Cameron:** — There is nothing wrong with that, is there?

**February 26, 1963**

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — No, Sir, nothing wrong with this — this certainly implies a tax-supported, comprehensive medical care plan open to all. This is what we have in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McDonald:** — We have no such thing.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — This is what we do not have in any Liberal province in this country and this is what we will not have in any Liberal province in this country until it is forced upon them by the actions of governments like ours; actions of Conservative governments, actions of Social Credit governments.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Would the Minister of Public Health tell me what he has done with the unpaid bills for medical care which I have submitted to him since this house was in session?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, however improper a question that is, I will answer it by the simple, direct and truthful statement that no single bill for medical care has been presented to me by the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) or anyone else with respect to this.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to . . . He can make his speech . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! You haven't got a point of privilege. You asked him a question.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Oh! Oh!

**Mr. McDonald:** — How do you know whether I have a point of privilege or not? Who do you think you are?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am the Speaker. Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . I will state my point of privilege if I am given the opportunity.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has been in this legislature a long while, but not long enough to learn many manners of the legislature. The member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) has just

said to the Speaker, "Mr. Speaker, who do you think you are?" The gentleman is the Speaker of this house, he ought not to be referred to in those terms. The member from Moosomin, if he is courteous at all will withdraw that statement and desist from doing it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You stated in this house a few minutes ago that I had . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Withdraw, withdraw.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! This is not debatable. I am asking you to withdraw the statement.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Which statement?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The statement which you made, when you asked the Speaker, "Who do you think you are?" I ask that you withdraw this statement.

**An Hon. Member:** — Democracy in action.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I certainly will be glad to, Mr. Speaker. But now may I state my point.

**Mr. Speaker:** — State your point of privilege then.

**Mr. McDonald:** — The minister a moment ago said that no bills had been presented to him. A week ago yesterday I sent across the floor of this house with a page boy, a letter requesting information with regard to payment for medical services and I have found that the medical care commission refused to pay . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Oh! Oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! That is still not a point of privilege. I with the hon. members would check the references as to what a privilege is. A privilege pertains to something which affects a member as his rights as a member. And this is a part of the debate. You did not have a privilege.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, the minister said he never received the bills.

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, come on, come on.

**February 26, 1963**

**Mr. McDonald:** — Yes, he did, that is exactly what he said.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I said I did not receive a bill. What I received from the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) was a copy of a letter from a municipality in Manitoba to the Saskatchewan cancer commission, a copy of which was directed to the member from Moosomin. Now, this may well be a copy of the bill, in his mind. It is most assuredly not a copy of a medical bill in my mind. Now he may well say “This is simply not the fact.”

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, am I to be allowed to proceed. Is he going to make his speech now or when he is on his feet? Is he going to keep quiet, as required by the rules of this house, or is he going to be allowed to interrupt constantly and persistently in this way?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I’ll ask for a point of order. Will the hon. member from Moosomin refrain from interrupting.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, I just want to say again that if the hon. member from Moosomin is saying that I am not telling the truth, then I just say that he is not telling the truth.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Well, you are certainly not telling the truth.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — All right.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Why haven’t you answered it?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I will I think persevere over these objections which must obviously be nettling the hon. member from Moosomin and will carry on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) made a number of comments with respect to the alleged non-payment of doctors’ accounts by the medical care insurance commission.

I want to say very briefly, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a shred of evidence — a favored phrase of the hon. member from Milestone — not a shred of evidence to suggest that the medical care insurance commission is not paying accounts which

are submitted to it by approved health agencies. If, indeed, doctors are not receiving their money from approved health agencies, this could be due to a number of reasons. It could be that they are not submitting the accounts, or that the accounts are not being submitted by the approved health agencies to the commission; it could obviously be that the commission is not paying the approved health agency; it could be that the approved health agency, having been paid, is not remitting the amount to the doctor. There are four or five possible ones, I do not know the reason, but I do know what the reason is not, and it is not that the medical care insurance commission is not paying the approved health agencies.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — The records have been published in the press a good number of times. I won't bore the house by giving figures on the extent of payments, but it is perfectly clear that accounts are paid, the gross amount which has been paid to approved health agencies, in respect of processed accounts, is about equal to the volume of accounts submitted for a period up to about four weeks from the date of calculation, and that, with respect to the four-weeks period, very substantial advances have been made, so that in point of fact, the approved health agencies have received funds totalling very nearly the total amount of accounts submitted at any given date.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) made one or two other comments on which I feel I should make a remark or two. He told us that the present plan, the present medical care plan, somehow violates professional freedom of the physicians.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that all will know that if the present Medical Care Act, with the changes which were made in August, violates professional freedoms, the Medical Care Act which was passed in the fall of 1961 is equally guilty in that regard, and I think we are clear on the position at that time, when it was stated by the then Minister of Health, and I think it was stated correctly then, that:

The experience throughout the world, where medical care plans have operated for many years under the aegis of government, there is no evidence to say that the status of the doctor has been lowered; the doctor-patient relationship has been interfered with; and what is even more important, that there has been a lessening of the quality of medical care.

Mr. Speaker, I think that a very correct statement of the evidence as it has been gathered throughout the world.

**February 26, 1963**

Well, Mr. Speaker, we heard him this afternoon declaiming that there is not a shred of evidence of this, there is not a shred of evidence of that. He was dealing with his departure from this particular political movement, and I think the less said about that the better. It appears that this phrase “not a shred of evidence” is a favorite of his. He has used it again in Hansard, vol. 8, on page 40, and this time he said:

Mr. Speaker, before discussing this matter further, I should like for a moment to comment on what appears to be an apprehension relating to physician's status under a medical care insurance plan. In my view there is not a shred of evidence that the statue of the physician, or the relationship between a physician and his patient, is altered in any way. I think there is ample evidence for my contention.

**Mr. Erb:** — But experience proved differently.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — The act, Mr. Speaker, was not more favorable to the physicians then than it is now. I know, Mr. Speaker, that before making many of these remarks the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb), the then Minister of Public Health, had done a great deal of research in this field. He had studied medical care plans from many parts of the world and he had assessed the evidence, and, Mr. Speaker, he had assessed it properly. Now, this was the bill, as I say, it was before it was amended. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the passages which I have quoted from the hon. member from Milestone are the passages spoken by a man who had done a good deal of work and who had done a good deal of research, and a good deal of thought with respect to medical care.

And they are not the words of a man who was ramming something down anybody's throat. They are the words of a man who, Mr. Speaker, before disappointment and frustration set in, had an ideal, had a vision of what could be done in this great area of human need. Let me again state, Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do.

**Mr. Erb:** — Co-operation.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Let me again state, Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do.

**Mr. McDonald:** — We'd sure like to know.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and I quote the hon. member from Milestone in Hansard, vol. 8 at page 49. He said then:

Now in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I feel sure that all hon. members of this legislature share with me the pride that this historic responsibility and opportunity affords. For what we are in the course of doing here, and will have done, is that we shall have written a new Magna Carta for the health and well-being of the people of this province. Moreover, I am sure that we shall have set the pattern for other jurisdictions to follow in the years to come. It is in this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I hope this bill will be debated, and finally that future generations will acclaim the men and women of this legislature for their vision, their courage to pioneer, and their sensitivity to human needs.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with these sentiments, and those future generations, Mr. Speaker, will only lament that some who pioneered the bill and some who supported the bill proved faint-hearted in the face of adversity.

From my remarks, Mr. Speaker, you will have gathered that I will oppose the amendment and support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the members of this house in congratulating my friends on their elevation to the cabinet. Both members are highly regarded by me and the house, I am sure, and by those who know them outside of this house; and I am quite certain, because of their inborn ability and dedication to their work, they are going to make a tremendous contribution to the government of this province.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to talk about the little people. And I will start out with a verse that was written by Edward Markham, when he wrote it in respect of Millet's picture called "The Man with a Hoe". The last verse of this poem says this:

Oh, Masters, Lords and Rulers, in all lands,  
How will the future reckon with this man?  
How answer the brute question in that hour  
When whirlwinds of rebellion shake the world?  
How long will it be with kingdoms and with Kings,  
With those who shaped him to the thing he is,  
When this dumb terror shall reply to God,  
After the silence of centuries.

**February 26, 1963**

Mr. Speaker, listening to the debates since the throne speech has been introduced, I have noticed differences in this house insofar as the welfare of the working man is concerned. We have heard a lot about democracy, and I hope we continue to live to dedicate ourselves to legislate for democracy, because I, as I am sure every member of this house, would like to see many of the betridden and the poor and the hungry people of this world have a better life in the future.

But I have noticed in the house, that it is this side, in the main, which was concerned with the welfare and the future of the working man while the arguments from the other side were always about big business, about taxation, and about all those things that really are not the heart of the question. Because we have heard so much today about democracy, then I will add that we all know that the government in this country, and various province of this country, are elected to rule the people. As governments in a democracy we are custodians of our natural wealth, but more important the custodians of the human resources that we have in this country. And, therefore, I think it is our responsibility to plan, to legislate and to dedicate ourselves to the welfare of the people who have given us this kind of confidence. We have heard much today about the medical health plan, and it would appear from what has been said by the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) when he was talking about statism, that this was the only party that ever considered compulsory features in an act that was necessary for the people of the province.

Well, it just so happened, not long ago, there fell into my hands a certain act from the province of British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, and I was rather surprised because I thought that we were the first to bring in a medical health insurance act; in fact we were because this is only half an act in British Columbia. There is a very interesting history behind this act and I think when the history of the Liberal party is written, some day in the future, historials will wonder what was wrong with the party.

Now, you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the past two or three years, we have been told what we should have done about this kind of legislation. First of all we were told the royal commission should have studied the situation. Well, in British Columbia, before 1930, they had a royal commission to study the situation. Secondly, we were told in this house, Sir, that we should have the people vote on the legislation itself. And the facts of the case are that in British Columbia in 1930 the people voted, did vote for this legislation, and they voted in favor of it. Such legislation was passed in 1930, and is presently called the Health Insurance Act, Chapter 171, and I have a copy of it here, Sir.

Now, it doesn't cover all the people of the province, but it does cover all the working people, and it was provided that anybody else could benefit under the provision of this



act. But the interesting part is that when I listened to the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) as he talked about statism, how their party, the Liberal party, didn't believe in any kind of compulsion or conscription, here was a British Columbia act full of compulsion, and I refer hon. member to one or two sections of this act, passed by a Liberal government in 1930, and it is still on the books of the province of British Columbia. It has never been proclaimed and the reason it wasn't proclaimed was because of a section which says "That this act shall come into force after a date to be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Here is what we mean when we say to the Liberals, "You neither go left nor right, but you stay where you are". You passed an act and it is still on the statute books of the province of British Columbia unproclaimed.

But let me get down to the act. I might mention section 26. Section 26 says that doctors could be hired on a salary basis, a per capita basis, and a fee system, and that is all I need to say about that. That is the remuneration.

And then we get down to section 27. I would like the hon. members to listen to this. It says:

In addition to all other penalties (they must have considered all kinds of penalties for doctors and other people to carry out the law) prescribed by or under this act, the commission (by the way, there was a medical commission there too) may penalize any person, including any physician, pharmacist, and the manager of any hospital or laboratory who fails to provide services according to the standards prescribed by the commission, and who wilfully violates any provision of this act or of the regulations by debarring him, either permanently or for a limited period, from all rights, or serving, or providing benefits for insured persons under this act.

Now I would like to see the doctors of Saskatchewan read this one and then they will know who their real friends are. This is a Liberal act.

I will repeat, Sir, that they had a royal commission that recommended this act; they gave the people of British Columbia a plebiscite and they voted for the act; the government at that time passed the act; but the Liberal party as usual didn't have the courage to go ahead and proclaimed it as law. They left it as the section states, "To come into effect when the date is fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor".

**February 26, 1963**

There is your Liberal party. Tonight we have heard the ultimate of erudition from them, and I can assure the hon. members here that what I am going to talk about tonight is not going to be erudite or controversial at all. So you will have a rest.

I would like to point out that the throne speech has indicated much of the past progress and indicates future progress for the province of Saskatchewan, and, being a northern member, of course I am interested in what has been done and what is going to be done and I will say that no one can deny that there has been progress. As a matter of fact I recall the Leader of the Opposition, I think, last year, Sir saying that he admits that there has been progress, but it would have come with any party. Well, I don't quite agree with him on that. I think our party has been particularly interested in helping the small people to get ahead, and so we have all kinds of welfare and other programs, educational programs, and so forth, that are of very great benefit to our people. And I can only say at this time that, in my opinion, we need these kinds of programs because the needs of mankind are varied and complex, and it seems to me that we have to have laws also that will regulate the way of life because, as our society becomes more complicated and as we find that there are more inventions, it is necessary to control the situation a little more.

I need not point out, Sir, that the basic necessities, of course, that our people are interested in are things such as food, shelter, education, clothing, health and other services, and, of course, recreation, for survival and good physical health.

Now, Goldsmith said that those who think must govern for those who toil. And, therefore, I say again, our responsibility is to make good laws. Now, we had a by-election in Prince Albert sometime in October and I saw many things and I heard many strange things, and I mention some of them tonight.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You had all the cabinet ministers there, and civil servants.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Not any. We had no government people, but what the hon. member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) said — I think it was that we are loaded with cabinet ministers and civil servants. It is not true, not true, there weren't any at all. I was the campaign manager and he can take my word for it. They weren't there; we fought a clean, decent election, which his party can't say they did.

But, however, in that city, as I went around, I saw a lot of things. In spite of the good laws that this government has implemented, I saw people living in poverty; I saw people living in tar shacks. I would say that in my estimation there

are one or two thousand people in the city of Prince Albert who could live under better conditions. The laws that have been legislated in this assembly are there to help them, if we would have the co-operation of the city government of the city of Prince Albert. And not only in the city of Prince Albert because we see the same kind of condition in other cities, but I wanted to point out this — that in 1955 or 1956, we — I have it right here — passed an act for subsidizing housing. The hon. member for Prince Albert was, at that time, I think, the mayor — I'm not quite sure — 1956 was it? He nods his head and he says this is so. Yes, 1956 I think to 1958. I will give him credit that under his administration they did start 30 houses, where they needed 2,000.

Now, possibly the load on this city was too high. I don't know. But let's look at some of the figures.

These houses, 30 of them, cost \$340,299.75. And Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the housing authority, paid 75 percent of the cost of those houses, to a total of some \$239,120, the province paid 15 percent at that time, \$47,824 and the city was required to pay or provide land to the value of \$31,882. As a matter of fact, I think they provided the land only. The hon. member can correct me. He says that is so, so they didn't put out any money themselves.

The interesting thing is this, that over a period of years, because of these houses, this housing in the city of Prince Albert, the city obtained in taxes, mind you, they got taxes from low income people; in 1957 \$6,031; it went up until in 1961 it was \$7,433.76, to be exact. The economic rent during that period began with \$64.02 and ended with the rent being \$73.09, as a result of which the city had to subsidize the housing at \$12.17 each. Now you must consider the small amount of subsidy that the city had to pay on the loss, because this money that had been invested in these houses was some \$346,000. This had to be repaid, of course, to the mortgage corporation. But when you consider the taxes that the city received, and the value of these houses for those people in low income brackets, where their children could live in decent surroundings and associate with children of the same or higher income groups, with better opportunities to live an improved way of life, then you can see that this subsidy is a very small price.

Now, the interesting thing is this. The hon. member, as I have said, was mayor for four years, and I do give him credit for what he did, but since 1956, in the city of Prince Albert there were no more subsidized houses built. This government in 1959, Sir, went ahead and amended the act because we were told that the ten percent was too big a load — in spite of the fact that eventually the city gets these houses for nothing, being paid up through the rental, as I understand it — yet since that time no further houses were built. So in 1959 this government passed legislation amending the act concerning housing requiring the city to put only five percent of the initial investment and five percent of the subsidy, if a subsidy was necessary.

**February 26, 1963**

Now, when one listens to members like the hon. member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) and the Leader of the Opposition, and all the Liberal members on the other side of the house, when one hears them get up and say how concerned they are with the welfare of people of this province, of situations that you see in every city of this province, and probably right across the country, one asks what was done about it when they were in municipal offices as mayors, and as other officials. Nothing! Nothing!

It is a betrayal of the people of this province, it is a betrayal of the people of Prince Albert, it is a betrayal of the people in every city in this province, and they can't get out of it.

This government has legislated good laws for the benefit of the people, and they have not taken advantage of them when they could have taken advantage of them. What did we hear, Sir, about a Liberal platform. Here is the real platform I should say, if you take it is reverse, that the Liberals have. This is the real platform, not the one we heard the other day.

Well, starting from the bottom up, like the Chinese do, they said that we tried to force socialized medicine on all and only backed down in the face of great public indignation. I say nobody that knows the truth will agree with that statement, because no one forced socialized medicine on the people. We brought in a health insurance act that the people had asked this government to bring in and the only ones that backed down were the ones that I told you about in British Columbia, the Liberals, when they had an act people wanted, yet they betrayed the people.

They say we tried to force the county system on the people. That is the advertisement of the Liberals. No one to this day, that I know of, has tried or attempted to force the county system on the rural people. That is the picture the hon. member from Prince Albert draws, and if he wants the date of the paper, I think it is October 24, the Prince Albert Herald.

Compulsion. What kind of compulsion? Implement dealers are forced to carry a certain amount of stock, which removes their right to do business, he says.

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — Right. Right.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — The hon. member says right, he says right, and yet every farmer in this province has asked for that kind of legislation. I, as a farmer . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Would the hon. member permit a question? Is that not right. Are you denying that? That you have an act on the books that forces . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I have never heard anything more ridiculous in my life. I don't know of any act passed by this legislature or any other legislature or by any government that isn't compulsory. Of course it is compulsory, because it is law.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Do you deny it?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Of course I don't deny it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Pursue your question.

**Mr. Steuart:** — He won't answer it.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — What I am pointing out is the insidious kind of campaigning that the hon. member and his Liberal party have carried on. Fooling the people. Scaring them with compulsion, when every act and whatever act it is, whether it is the highways act or the implement act, any act has to have compulsion to be of any value. And I can tell you this, Sir, that the implement dealers have asked me personally to intercede on their behalf to see that the act remains there to protect the farmers, and to protect them. The party opposite are the people that would get rid of the act. That's the real program of the Liberal party — to get rid of the act, to throw it open so that you could have an implement dealer on every corner and the farmer would have no help from anyone at all. The hon. members there — that's what they want. That's free enterprise. You buy the machinery, but you try to get the repairs, and God help you if you can get repairs.

Another item he has in his program, which the Liberals have in their program is they say the fishermen under certain circumstances are forced to sell their catch to a designated buyer. Mr. Speaker, I have lived in the north for a long time and I've seen the fishermen struggle for emancipation, for some freedom, for a long time. And the free fishermen today are organizing themselves into co-operatives and into various organizations where they can sell their fish together. I will recall to this house when some years ago an hon. member from Athabasca at that time said that we only paid 50¢ for sturgeon down at Cumberland House, which is my constituency. And when we got the real facts the facts were these. That there was a deposit of 50¢ per pound, and when they got the final payment, it amounted to \$1 per pound, and more, while the private enterprise buyers were paying 50¢ or 60¢ a

**February 26, 1963**

pound in Manitoba. We were able to give that kind of a price because those people there were organized into a co-op. I know you don't like it. You don't like co-ops.

**Mr. Steuart:** — How about the fishermen . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — These fishermen, all across the north, have found it to their advantage to organize themselves into co-operatives and if it were not good for them you wouldn't have any co-operatives, but they do know that being organized brings them considerable more revenue for their product than otherwise they would be able to get. And so the story goes.

Another charge we heard is high taxes. The hon. member and his party were telling the people all across the province that the taxes are too high — generalization — “taxes are too high”, “compulsion” and things like that. Just take a look at those taxes. When the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) was cornered, and also the other day the Hon. Leader of the Opposition — what did he say? That taxes for the corporations are too high. Oh, yes, I remember the time when the Liberals were in power and we had a mine — and we still have it up in my constituency in Flin Flon — when they didn't collect any royalties. And for 20 years they didn't collect any royalties. They eventually smartened up a little bit and I think over a period of years they collected something like \$600,000 — I haven't got the exact figure.

**Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — \$200,000.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — \$200,000. I am corrected. We collect a million or a million and a half each year, and this company is glad to pay. They make lots of money, they make \$15 million, and sometimes \$20 million clear a year. But the royalties that we collect today across the province from the mining companies, from oil companies may amount to \$20-\$30 million or more. This is the kind of money that helps us to give the kind of services that the people of this province require and need, and if we didn't get it from those that can pay, then who are we going to get it from, and if we can't get it from the poor people, Mr. Speaker, then what happens — we wouldn't have the services as was the case history of the Liberal party. They never collected any taxes, and that's why we never had any services.

**Mr. K.F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch)** — . . . collected \$2,000 a year.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You are lucky to have \$2,000 so you can pay a little bit of income tax out of your \$2,000. What about the people that I have in the north that make \$400 a year, \$300 a year, and maybe a maximum of \$1,000 a year. What about them?

**An Hon. Member:** — Why haven't they got better income?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Now don't argue. That's exactly what I have been saying tonight, Sir. Hon. members to your left are not concerned with ordinary people. That's their philosophy. They're concerned to save taxes, not to pay taxes out. My God, if I had money enough to pay taxes, I would be glad to pay taxes to provide services for the people that need them, to provide for education and other things.

Talking about housing, I mentioned something about housing in the city of Prince Albert and other cities I suppose are the same. We have a bad situation across the north. I am very glad that the throne speech points out that there is going to be more activity in the direction of housing for the natives. At this time I would like to commend the Department of Natural Resources, and particularly an employee of theirs who is a former M.L.A. and sat in this house, for the program that was initiated in both Beauval and up at Pine House. I think this has been an excellent start. I will urge the government to continue that program. We can't force houses upon people, but when people want those houses and are willing to try and share in paying them, I think the least that we can do is to help them out, to see that they have decent homes. I might point out why it is so important to do that because whether it is in a large city where you have slums, or whether you have areas in the far north, you will find that where you have poor housing, then you have poor morals, you have a population explosion, and I have some figures here for example.

**Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern):** — Shame.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Yes, we should all be ashamed of this, all of us. It is not funny, and if you had a Liberal government you'd have this kind of situation everywhere in Saskatchewan. We just started 30 years too late to do something about it in the north. Now I will tell you what this situation is. You will find it in the hon. member for Rosthern's (Mr. Boldt) constituency, too, the same kind of thing where there is poverty and poor housing. This will we find.

Illegitimate births, Mr. Speaker, were over 32 percent in 1960 — those are facts that we should be ashamed of but those are facts so let's face it — as compared to four percent in the southern part of the province. I say, think about it. Think about it very seriously because if there were satisfactory homes maybe the rate wouldn't be quite that high. Maybe something else is required, I don't know, but we had better look into it. We find, for example, that births — talking about population increase — that the population has doubled in the north — 35 percent per thousand I think it is, compared to 13 percent down around Yorkton. Now all you need to have an inducement for a big population is poverty, poor homes, Liberals in government, and then you will have lots of people in this province. Anyway, it seems to me that the implications of this thing in the north, not only in Saskatchewan, it's all across Canada is lack of action. I am not blaming any particular government, any particular group of people, I am saying that we as Canadians should look into this because we are all to blame, whether Liberals, CCF, Conservatives, whatever we may be. And the implications as we see them across the north are very important and I think we should look at the situation and do something about it.

We find in the north, as elsewhere, considerable unemployment. I am glad to see that the government is doing something. We have winter works programs, housing programs, and other activities which I think will remedy to some extent the unemployment in the north. What surprises me is hon. members opposite and the Liberal party having orthodox thinking on this matter, wondering who is going to finance unemployment. I recall in the city of Prince Albert they had a winter works program not so long ago this winter — I think the hon. member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) took some objection when the question of wages came into the picture. Apparently he felt, according to the press — he can deny it if he wants to, I'll take his word for it — but according to the press he made some statement that a man working on social aid shouldn't get as much wages as the man that is employed by some private enterprise industry.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of — I don't know whether it is order or privilege — but I never said such a thing and I am sure he will take my word for it. The work and wages program was stopped in the city of Prince Albert, the part that employed people on social aid. Part of the reason was the wages . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! You can't make an explanation. He said he would accept your denial but you can't expound on it.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I accept the denial. But there has been some difficulty in the city of Prince Albert insofar as employment is concerned. But



I still do say this, that surely governments who can find billions of dollars for defence purposes — and I don't say we shouldn't have defence, I don't want to be misunderstood — surely should be able to find some millions of dollars to provide some kind of public works to take in the slack when we have unemployment. And this unemployment isn't only in the cities; it isn't only in the rural areas; it is found also in the northern areas where we have native people living. And I say as far as work is concerned I am glad we have good minimum wages, probably not high enough, that we have holiday pay and things like that; I think that when a person works, it shouldn't make any difference where he works, work is work, and if his time is taken up and he is required to work, surely he should have the right to the same wages as other people. And there are many things that could be done in the north. I think at this time we should be looking at the rebuilding of a lot of the schools that we built in 1945 and 1946. I think we need nursing homes. I think we need more teacherages. I think we could have one or two more hospitals, certainly the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) will recall that I asked him on four or five different occasions when he was the Minister of Public Health that I needed a hospital at Cumberland House, where we have a little log, two-bed building, and I wasn't successful. I hope I have more success with the present Minister of Public Health.

**Mr. Erb:** — We spent \$75,000 for repairs.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — That's the way they do it — the Liberals. They do it always that way — we'll spend \$75,000 for repairs and have a thousand population depending upon a two room log hospital. I am very disappointed that during his time he couldn't have done something about it, and, as I say, I do hope that we will have a hospital in the very near future.

I am quite happy about the agricultural program of the government, such as community and co-op pastures. I am glad to see that in the throne speech it mentions that again these will be extended, that we are now getting into a program with ARDA and that it will help a lot of the people in the low income groups to make a better living.

Particularly today I would like to speak to the government. I want to make an appeal today on behalf of northern trappers. I just happened to be going over a report the last day or two and I considered the resolution in respect to royalties. It struck me that it is rather strange that in this day and age we should still be collecting royalties from people who cannot pay. I would like to point out that in the 1960-61 report of the Department of Natural Resources, we find that there are 22,468 beaver caught and the income to the trappers is \$251,764; and muskrat 103,119 and the income was \$80,974; and then we have mink, squirrel, weasel, lynx, and I have the figures here, and this total income to trappers amounts to \$1,581,801. And when

you take \$110,000 out of \$1,500,000 you find that's just over seven percent. In other words, our trappers in the north are paying about seven percent in tax or royalties to the government.

Now I do know that this money is being returned to them in social aid and in other ways, but it still looks wrong when you have a low income group like that, with \$400 or \$500 income a year, for the crown to extract seven percent of a tax from them. As a matter of fact this must have come under discussion at the trappers' convention because I noticed the resolution there — I have it here some place — where the trappers asked the provincial government to use the royalty money to help out trappers, and I think if the trappers asked the government to do that much, maybe what the government should consider is taking off the royalty completely instead of having to collect it and then return it to the trappers. Now the reason for my thinking is very obvious. Firstly, it is a very high tax. When my hon. friend from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) said that he has to pay a tax after \$2,000 — that's what I meant when I said he should be happy to pay a tax only after \$2,000 because a lot of our people are paying a tax immediately they get any income. At times it is tragic. It may happen as in the case of a damaged pelt of mink — a pelt that is worth maybe only a dollar; the trapper can't add 75¢ or 50¢ royalty to that mink and say, "I want \$1.50". He can't do that. The oil companies, when they pay royalty to the government, they can add royalties to their cost. The timber people, when they cut timber and pay dues, they can add the dues to their cost, but a trapper can't do this. When he sells fur, and if it is damaged then he gets a dollar for a mink, then the royalty of 75¢ or whatever the rate may be is deducted from the value of that pelt and may leave him only a few cents for his work. Of course, if he gets a better graded pelt, he is not so badly off. This does rather exaggerate the situation but shows you that it is not a good situation insofar as those people are concerned.

I think it can be said that the same picture pertains to the fishermen in the north, and again I appeal to the government to take a look and see if something couldn't be done to remove the royalties. I do know, and I thank the government on behalf of the fishermen in the north that the government guarantees a minimum price — I think this is the only province that does that, and I am very happy about it, but, at the same time, we do collect a royalty which often is returned so maybe we had better not collect any royalty at all.

As a matter of fact, we do that, Mr. Speaker. We do that. When a fisherman goes out with a sports licence, he doesn't pay any royalty, does he?

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

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Well, the minister says he does, so maybe he does. Maybe I am wrong, but I am not aware that he does.

Mr. Speaker, the minister says they pay fishing licences — well these trappers pay a licence too, and they can pay a higher licence if necessary. I think that even if we raise the licence to \$10 for trapping, it would be better than paying, say seven percent on the value of one's furs. Anyway I have some strong feelings on this subject and I am leaving it up to the government to consider.

I would like to thank the government for favorably thinking about the mining interests. I think something should be done. I am very sorry that the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) had nothing to say about the incentives we should have for mining. I think there is much that we can do for the prospecting and mining fraternity so they will find mines; let's not think that because we have incentives they will find mines. The ore isn't everywhere, you have to look for it — sometimes it's there and sometimes it's not there. But I do hope there is much of it in Saskatchewan. I am pleased about the incentives that we are going to grant. And I am going to suggest a few more. I think for one thing that we could have more, say assistance to prospectors in training. I noticed the other day that somebody asked a question, and I understood that about 14 or 15 prospectors train each year. I think probably we could spend more money on the training of prospectors and in giving them assistance to go out in the field. We are not spending too much at this time and I think it would be a very good thing. It might help a lot of the northern people too. Another incentive I am thinking about is giving some assistance to persons who have claims, for example we could have geo-physical crews go out and make surveys, and if there is a good potential indicated, then the geologists through the department could advise the owner of these claims, or the person who possesses these claims, that this is a good area to do some work in. And we could even assist with a percentage of the cost. Supposing the company spends \$100,000 in drilling, I don't see anything wrong in helping them out with about ten percent or 15 percent of the cost. These are the kind of incentives we need and I am sure that the minister is giving much consideration to the problem. I think that answers will be found and will bring about a lot of activity in the north.

When I get going, Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to stop because I have so much to talk about, and I really should sit down but I do wish to mention one or two more matters of some urgency.

Recently I flew through the north, along the east side — I was in the constituency as well as my own — and concerning schools, I do want to say once more that I think that the Department of Education would be well advised to take a very

**February 26, 1963**

good look at the educational needs of the north. I am very happy to hear from the minister that we may have a school at Cumberland soon. The old school has been a pretty good one but it is getting old, and these people — they haven't got local boards who speak up as we have in the more settled communities and so it is necessary for the member to speak up for them. I am always very regretful that the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) never talks about the needs of his people. He tells us how to run our business but he doesn't come into the house and tell us what they need at Pelican Narrows or Island Falls or some other place. As a matter of fact he could have told them just the other day there was a delegation asking for roads from Island Falls — and this I want to mention now. We need a road to Cumberland House, we need roads to Island Falls, we need a road to Reindeer Lake — and I think it is my job to point these things out to the government, that is why we are here, to discuss our problems and bring in our grievances, and make suggestions.

I would also like to suggest to the Minister of Public Works that it is high time that the community of Creighton should have a government building. We have a lot of activity there of various departments. I think it would be very desirable if favorable consideration were given this year or in the very near future for a government building at Creighton. I noticed that a core building is going to be built in La Ronge and the member from Athabasca didn't thank the Minister of Mineral Resources. I wish to thank him on behalf of the mining fraternity at this time, as it was mentioned in the throne speech. I think it is long overdue and I think it is a very good idea but on the other hand, as I say, when you come to buildings, I think we shouldn't forget the administration buildings, and we do need one in Creighton, I am sure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I can summarize in saying this, that we must have goals towards building up our province, we must have goals for building up our nation, and even though sometimes, politically, we don't agree, I think there should be a little more co-operation between members on the opposition and members in the government. I think it is very bad to build on sandstone, which can be eroded as they say be saline waters, and because we fight as we do I could say eroded by Liberalism. I think it is better if we build on a strong foundation, build a good province so our people will move on towards prosperity. I think I can say with all certainty, I am absolutely sure that whatever this government has done in the past has been for the welfare of the people generally. I am very happy to be associated with the government. I know that the people of Saskatchewan appreciate what the government has done and I know that this government will be returned to office whenever an election is called, to continue the good work of state.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the amendment and support the motion.

**Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — It has never been so apparent in this history of this province that if there ever was a time when the attention of the actions or inactions of this government should be brought to the people, it is today. And so I deem it a privilege to second the amendment submitted by the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) and that amendment of course reads: "We respectfully submit that your Honour's advisers do not possess the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan". I am going to remind this government that we have now sat in this house for some ten days. The people of this province are faced with a debt of some \$500 million. The people of this province must raise through taxation or extraction by this government the sum of between \$200 million and \$300 million this year alone. That is how much the people of this province are paying for the services of the people who sit to your right. Mr. Speaker.

During the past ten days we have seen cabinet minister after cabinet minister stand up under this new ism called Lloydism, not one presenting the policies of their department before the people of this province who are paying so much money for these services. Not one cabinet minister has stood in his place and laid down a practical policy for the people of this province, nor has any private member on the other side tried to establish a progressive platform from the speech from the throne.

It is no wonder then, Mr. Speaker, that today we are confronted by one of the most bare and sterile throne speeches ever presented in the province of Saskatchewan. And, of course, there is a reason for that because of colorless, callous and cold leadership, and, of course, a sterile government behind that leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take too much of your time tonight. I just want to point out to the people of this province and the members of this house, some of the statements that have been made by members of the government side. And, as I have stated already, it has been a bitter disappointment to have to sit here and hear no constructive program emanating from the government that sits to your right.

The Minister of Agriculture this afternoon was a bitter disappointment. Once again he did not lay down any practical program for agriculture in this province, all he tried to do was take some of the credit from the opposition on this side of the house and some of the credit from the member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) who, in his opinion, thought that he should offer to the government some policies that he thought would benefit the people of this province, especially to the farmers of Saskatchewan. I don't think a case was ever presented in a more effective and practical manner than the case for a veterinary college as presented by the member for Saltcoats, and I assure

**February 26, 1963**

you that we on this side of the house are deeply concerned about this matter and we owe a lot to the member from Saltcoats in bringing it to the attention of the government, and bringing it to the government on behalf of the livestock men in Saskatchewan.

There is quite a history behind the need for a veterinary college, and the record of the government up until this date has been one of dragging its feet. The record of the government to this date was — Well, let George do it. And up until the present time it is my opinion that they were hoping that the province of Alberta would go ahead and set up a veterinary college. Early events, as the member for Saltcoats said, would not indicate that Alberta was ready to do this, but as of latter days, now that the federal government, in a matter of deathbed repentance, has suggested that it may now be in a position to carry out a part of the cost of both constructing the college and of the operation of the college, now the position of the government of Alberta, of course, has changed. But I want to indicate to the minister that this has borne quite a hardship on some of the young people in this province. These are a great many people, young people, in Saskatchewan who wanted to take up the profession of veterinary science — this was their chosen field, and because we only have the facilities of a college down in Ontario not every person in Saskatchewan who wished to follow this vocation had the chance to do so, and then some of these young farm boys, some that I know of in the minister's own seat, some who are very fond of livestock and made quite a creditable name for themselves with livestock and especially in the 4H groups, naturally they wanted to follow the vocation of a veterinarian, but because rules and regulations were such, and because they had to attain a certain academic standing, they were barred from taking this course. And, because of the limited facilities, this is one way in which these young people were not able to choose the vocation that they have sought. And that is how our young people have suffered.

And the minister has said, he assures the people of this province and the livestock men of this province that the livestock numbers are going to be doubled within a few short years. Well, we know this because we know that the same thing is going to happen in Alberta, and it is going to happen in Manitoba. Then, in Saskatchewan over the years, farmers have got together in municipalities and they have been trying to set up these veterinary service districts. These districts have been set up but they have lacked the services of a veterinarian. And so here again we have the potential rise in livestock numbers, but we are not going to be able to service these numbers. A few years ago the lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) introduced a bill into this house to try and have more humane methods established in the killing of livestock in the packing plants. But this, of course, was socialist thinking. Whereas

when the animals get to the packing plants, the period of suffering is very short, a matter of a few seconds, but if they had been thinking along humane lines and wanted to ease suffering among livestock, well, she would have realized that the first thing she should have done, and the most constructive and practical thing she could have done was to see to it that there were veterinarians throughout the province to try and relieve the suffering among some 2.09 million head of cattle, plus all the pigs and poultry, etc.

But this shows you the backward thinking of socialism. So there are two reasons why we need a veterinary college, and need veterinarians, than then the other reason I think is one of the most important, because naturally we are interested in international trade.

Here in the city of Regina, the livestock breeders in this province have built up one of the best pure-bred sire sales anywhere in Western Canada. And it is now a matter of record that in this city we export more purebred sires to the United States than any other province in Canada. That accomplishment you owe to the livestock breeders in this province, but my hon. friend from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) should know that if this is to be carried on, then under the regulations in international trade, and especially in the movement of livestock, these animals have to be inspected by veterinarians and cleared. And when we have the possibilities of these sales, naturally these men that buy these cattle want services as quickly as possible. And so I want to point out to the minister here tonight, we have on this side of the house offered constructive criticism, offered practical programs, which he tried to pooh-pooh and nullify this afternoon.

There is another instance of where, if the government, on that side of the house, had listened to the opposition here, maybe something could be done. The unfortunate part of this session so far is the attitude taken by members on the government side to members on this side, and it follows, of course, the pattern of the Premier. When the premier got up to answer the Leader of the Opposition, all he could accuse the opposition of was misinformation, mis-statements and so on, all down the line. This, of course, has been a tactic that he acquired from his predecessor; this, of course, has spilled over to all members on that side of the house, and that is why when we come into session as we have done this time, when we have sat here now for ten days, and when this government is extracting from the people of this province \$300 million a year and can only present in the throne speech a sterile program, it is because of the fact that they have got so old in their thinking that they will not listen to constructive suggestions from this side of the house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**February 26, 1963**

**Mr. McFarlane:** — The reason the people of this province have no longer confidence in this government is because the old philosophy and thinking of the members to your right, Mr. Speaker, goes back prior to the 1930's or the term of the 1930's.

These men, Mr. Speaker, are thirty years behind the times, and because you have a government in this province whose thinking is 30 years behind the times, it is no wonder then, Mr. Speaker, that our industrial development and the advances that we should have, of course, do not measure up to our other two western provinces.

The minister has complained on many occasions, in fact all members to the right have complained on many occasions that we have offered nothing constructive. Again in this debate everything that has been offered has been criticized. Last year, maybe prior to that, two years ago, and I am going to refresh the Minister of Agriculture's memory again, we asked that this government set up an independent board to regulate and administer the leasing of lands held in the name of the crown. At the present time this government controls in the neighborhood of nine million acres of land in this province. Now, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is quite a lever to work with. This, over the years, has caused a great deal of criticism, destroyed a lot of faith in this government by people who have had to make a living from the land acquired by way of lease from this government.

I refer to the one group of people, of course, who were bitterly disillusioned at the outset — those were the veterans of the last war. Time after time in this house, we have pointed out to the minister, we have pointed out to the government, the conditions that these men had to try and live under. Every time a member on this side of the house brought this up, he was treated the same way as it has been in this session; it got to the point in the end, too many of these families had to give up the land and the life that they had hoped for.

And then, of course, as we go over the province today, what is the main criticism by the farming people of Saskatchewan who had to deal with this government through leases? In nearly every part of the province you go into, the criticism you hear is that these leases are being issued on a political basis. I don't care whether you go into the south-west part or whether you go up into the minister's own seat, as I have done; whether you go into the central areas of the province or down in the south-east. Time after time, a young man, or an elderly man, or somebody will come up to you and ask if something can be done. And that is why we suggested to you, Mr. Minister, some two years ago, that you take this whole business of leasing crown lands out of the realm of politics, put it in the hands of an independent board, and let the people at least feel they are being dealt with on a fair and just basis. Now, this is something that you can be doing; this is some of the criticism;



this is some of the policies and programs that you might put into effect, and save the people of the province from losing all faith in your government.

Then, of course, time after time, we have heard the story about Liberals being against the co-ops. Time after time they have heard criticism about misinformation coming from this side of the house. Figures are incorrect, were misquoted. Well, Mr. Speaker, I've heard every daily and weekly newspaper in this province get the same treatment, but I suggest it is no comfort, it is no honor to the government who sits at your right, and it is no honor, especially, to the Premier of this province, whose brother is now the president of the co-operative union in Saskatchewan, or Federated Co-ops, to now finally have the Attorney General of Saskatchewan level a bitter charge at the editor of the Western Producer. What is the editor of the Western Producer, Mr. Speaker? The editor of the Western Producer speaks for the largest co-operative in the world. The editor of the Western Producer speaks for the largest and one of the most sincere and best-known farm organizations in Canada, and I of course refer to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. And now, after all the members to your right, including the member for Elrose (Mr. Turnbull) — the new Minister of Education, who is yapping over in the corner — including him, every one, time after time, have got up and levelled charges at the opposition, levelled charges at the newspapers, especially the daily newspapers; now they are levelling charges at the voice of the co-ops and the voice of the farm organization.

And I want to read to you what the Attorney General said, and he starts out in the opening paragraph with complete disregard for misinformation, disregard for facts, that he is levelling at the Western Producer, and he says this:

In a recent letter to the open forum, I showed how you had exhibited bias and a certain disregard for the readily available facts in your editorial contained in your January 24 issue.

How many times in this house, Mr. Speaker, have we heard the same words levelled at us by either the Premier or the Attorney General, and every cabinet minister on that side of the house.

**Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Why can't you tell the truth for a change?

**An Hon. Member:** — The Attorney General wouldn't know.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — This is the Western Producer. If this isn't the truth, then you tell them, as the Attorney General has told them. And he goes on, down a little further to say this: "The long record of

anti-CCF bias by the editorial page of your paper is too notorious to need recounting.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of asinine statement by the Attorney General in my life, but I have never heard one more asinine than that. Then he goes on to talk about free enterprise. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the former premier of this house on many occasions say that the co-operatives were one of the great champions of free enterprise. The former premier of this province, on many occasions, did try to impress on the minds of the people of this province that the co-operatives were a form of free enterprise. And what does the Attorney General say about the co-operatives. He says, “most of these people will refuse to concede all of their fields of economic life to the buccaneers of private enterprise.” And so now the co-ops are termed by him associated by him as one of the buccaneers of free enterprise.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Nonsense.

**An Hon. Member:** — Sure is nonsense.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — And then he goes on to say, but I think the most coercive and inane statement of the whole article is this, Mr. Speaker, when the Attorney General says, speaking of the co-operatives, or the Western Producer Co-operatives, “they refuse to accept the fact that they live in a political world”. In other words, Mr. Speaker, there is only one political world, and there is only one form of politics and that is the form of politics associated with the Attorney General and those who sit to your right.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — You said that in the last paragraph.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Yes, and then, of course, I don’t have to deal with the reply, because that was dealt with by the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) this afternoon.

I don’t have to give the Liberal record insofar as co-operatives are concerned. Everybody knows this is Saskatchewan. They know now that the CCF have ruined the CCF that started, now the new NDP’s have finished it, they have ruined the true co-operative movement in this province, Mr. Speaker, because of their political infiltration.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — The only reason, Mr. Speaker, there is a co-operative movement left to this province when this party came into power is because in the

formative years, when the co-operatives in this province ran into trouble, and especially the Wheat Pool, which the Attorney General now tried to destroy, it was the Liberal party who lent them some \$25 million, so that they could get back on their feet and become the great marketing organization that they are today. And your Attorney General and the Premier of this province should take little comfort in the actions taken by Federated Co-ops to the independent co-ops, the Saskatoon Co-operative Creameries, during the medicare crisis, as it was pointed out by the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner). So now, we have the record. We have on the record the attitude of this government towards the co-operative movement in Saskatchewan.

I want to point out to the Minister of Agriculture, once again, some of the things people on this side of the house suggested to him, I think it was some two years ago, in regard to crop insurance. I think everyone knows throughout Saskatchewan and the three western provinces that the recent federal government had as one of their main aims to start up a crop insurance scheme. And then, of course, to go along with that and to try and save their political future, the government of this province enacted a sort of crop insurance scheme. Well, at that time we pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that they were treading on dangerous ground if they tried to destroy all the benefits of PFAA and all the benefits of PFRA in this province. And we pointed out to them that an overall scheme of crop insurance in Saskatchewan, in a year such as we had in 1961, could wreck the whole economy of this province. And then I think that the people of Saskatchewan, more so than any other province, were quite convinced that the federal form of crop insurance and the provincial form of crop insurance left much to be desired. And in their best interests they could not see themselves giving up the benefits of PFAA, even if they were costly at that time, to enter into a crop insurance scheme.

We have heard a great deal lately about crop insurance, and the crop insurance in this province. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, whatever political advantage or whatever political mileage the Minister of Agriculture or the Premier of this province has gained by this scheme, it certainly doesn't measure up in terms of results, and it would appear even though they went all out last season to try and see that more farmers would take advantage of it, it would appear that in its present state it is still not acceptable to the farmers of Saskatchewan. Because, in 1961, the year that an overall scheme could have wrecked the economy of Saskatchewan, in 1961 only 194 farmers of this province took advantage of crop insurance as enacted by this government.

In 1962, after an all-out effort to sell crop insurance in every area, we only had 1,300 farmers sign up for crop insurance, and when you realize that the very small figure paid out under the crop insurance plan, measured against the millions and millions paid out under PFRA, I think that we can all realize the ineffective type of insurance we have.

I was quite surprised that the minister has never got up in the meetings with the cabinet at Ottawa to point out the weakness of the act — the minister has been noted for always howling at the federal government — but I suggest the farmers were quite disappointed in him, and I was amazed too that he has never taken the opportunity, as has the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba, to stress in no uncertain terms to the federal government that this is not an effective plan of insurance so far as the farmers of Saskatchewan are concerned. In no uncertain words, the Tory Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba told the Tory Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa, it just wasn't satisfactory. And I would hope tonight that the minister, after perusing some of the facts that were pointed out to him, will see to it in the future that a better type and a more satisfactory, more practical type of crop insurance is brought into effect in this province.

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — I am sure the hon. member doesn't want to leave the impression . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — All I want to say is this . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Nobody heard you anyway.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Mr. Speaker, regardless of what members on the right have tried to tell the people of this province now for some 18 years, regardless of what you have heard in the house this session, as far as I am concerned, and as far as the people who sit on this side of the house are concerned, the major industry in Saskatchewan is still agriculture. The basic way of life in this province is still the agricultural and the farming way of life, and I would point out this to you, Mr. Speaker, that member after member on the other side of the house, has got up and tried to convince the people of Saskatchewan that agriculture now has been supplanted by industrial development. This, Mr. Speaker, is just a boast, and this was a trend that started way back in the days of the late lamented provincial treasurer, who is now down in warmer climates. And the first action he took, if you remember, was to take the two words "Wheat Province" off the licence plates of the automobiles in this province.

And there was a very good reason why he did that, Mr. Speaker, because at that time they were trying to convince the people of Saskatchewan that now we had a real booming industrial province. I was very interested this afternoon when I heard a remark, the member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) was reading out the

per capita personal income in the province of Canada in 1960 and 1961. The significant thing about that personal income was this, Mr. Speaker, that in 1960, Saskatchewan was fifth in per capita personal income. British Columbia first, Ontario second, Alberta third, Manitoba fourth, and Saskatchewan fifth. But in 1961, Saskatchewan had gone down to seventh, and only surpassed the Maritime provinces of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland. And then what remark did we hear from the other side of the house. We heard that there was a crop failure in 1961. Well, Mr. Speaker, that has destroyed every argument that those members on that side of the house put up in regard to industrial development. Because, if one crop failure in one year, has sent the per capita income of this province down from fourth to almost last place, it proves then that this province has not developed a sufficient standard of industrial development to buoy up and hold the economy.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — So they had a crop failure in Saskatchewan. All right, what happened to Alberta. Didn't Alberta have rough times as far as agriculture was concerned in 1961 too? Did she go down? No, her per capita income went up by \$30 per capita, and she still stayed in third place. What happened in Manitoba? Manitoba had a rough time as far as agriculture was concerned in 1961 too. Did she go way down to the bottom of the ladder? No. She stayed in her fourth place behind Alberta and her per capita income remained constant. So here, Mr. Speaker, I want every member on the government side of the house to go to the publication sent out by the civil servants of this province, "The Dome", issue of February 8, 1963, and look and see the facts as far as industrial development as far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned. It certainly belies every statement made by members to your right for the last eighteen years that industrial development has surpassed the agricultural industry in the province.

And it is about time that the members to your right, Mr. Speaker, had given to the farmers of Saskatchewan some of the concessions that the farmers in Manitoba have received and when you had a crop failure, maybe if some of these high taxes were taken off, some of these taxes these boys have put on the statute books of this province at the expense of the farmers, if they were wiped out, as they should be, it would mean that maybe the farming income at least could stand the blow of a crop failure such as we had in that year.

Then, the Minister of Public Works cried about inflated dollars. The member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) the other day said it takes two dollars now to do what a dollar used to do in 1930, but every time they get up in their place, Mr. Speaker, to compare some of the money spent now, as to what was spent in the 1930's, to justify their case, they don't tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it costs more to run the government of this province today than it cost to run the government

**February 26, 1963**

of the province of Manitoba, even though the population is somewhat the same. They don't tell you that it cost a million dollars a month more to run the government of Saskatchewan than it does the province of Manitoba. They don't tell you that because of the conditions in the administration of social aid in this province, it cost more to administer social aid in Saskatchewan than it does in Manitoba.

They don't tell you we have, time after time, year after year, got up on the floor of this house and pointed out the waste and extravagance and said that if they would cut out the waste and extravagance that is going on in this province, it wouldn't take two dollars now to do what a dollar did before.

And this is the type of defence the minister to your right, the cabinet ministers and the Premier have when, just as the Minister for Mineral Resources — that cabinet has been shunted around and changed so much lately we don't even know which minister is what — the premier has been playing political ping pong and tiddlywinks with his cabinet appointments ever since he became premier, and so after many cabinet adjustments it is hard to define the minister.

This is why they get up to speak every time you bring these facts before them; you are accused of either misquoting or misconstruing the facts, and so tonight I hope that they will at least take some of these suggestions and see to it that in the next three weeks they will get down to something constructive assume the dignity and the responsibilities of their cabinet positions, and they will see to it that when the budget is brought into this house and the remaining ministers, who haven't spoken in this house, will get up in their place and tell the people of Saskatchewan what they are going to do in their departments, to see to it that the people will at least get some satisfaction and some degree of benefits from these huge expenditures of \$200-\$300 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, each cabinet minister in turn was a bitter disappointment, but I think the biggest disappointment to me, so far this session, was the performance of the Minister of Health just a few minutes ago.

Here was a chance, here was a time if there ever was a time in this province when confusion reigned supreme, when the whole way of life of the people of this province has been changed, when the people of this province were expecting some leadership and some clarification to come from a new cabinet minister, who has the responsibility of straightening out one of the most critical messes ever forced upon the people of this province; here was a time — you had better stay around instead of going upstairs and looking out the window . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You'd better lock the door.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Here was a time when the Minister of Public Health should have given some concrete information to the people of Saskatchewan, when he could have explained some of the difficulties now facing the doctors in receiving the amounts of salaries owed to them.

Here was a time when he could have explained to the people what has happened to their accounts, or how they could process their accounts if they went down to the United States for a holiday and something happened that they had to seek hospitalization or medical advice there. Here was a chance when he had the whole afternoon and the whole evening, to explain, to explain this to the people, for the press, radio and television coverage could have picked it up and relayed back to the people what went on here. He followed the example of the rest of his cabinet ministers and just set up a cheap comedy act. Apparently he was more interested in trying to read back to the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) some of the things he had said in previous years when he was to explain what goes on in his department. And here again we were disappointed with the performance of a \$16,000 cabinet minister and a \$20,000 Premier, who will be retiring when the people have the chance to vote and to censure this government for what has been going on, for what has taken place during this last year and the type of performance that the people are getting for this huge expenditure of public money.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident at this time that I will be supporting the amendment and, of course, not supporting the motion. And I would leave this parting suggestion to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Premier, that in two or three days time we will be going into the budget, and I would suggest to the people of Saskatchewan that if they think that they have been taxed and have had money extracted from them in a high and loose fashion in the years past, that this will probably be one of the largest tax budgets ever imposed on the people of this province. I would hope when the time comes for the Premier of Saskatchewan, and the time comes for each member on the other side of the house, each cabinet minister, I hope that they will for once in the long history of their 18 years in Saskatchewan, they will get up one after another and explain to the people what services they are going to get for this terrific cost.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment and not support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, I will at this late hour of the debate of the throne speech like to express congratulations to my desk mate, the hon. member for the constituency of Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) the

mover of the address-in-reply, and to the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder), the seconder of the address.

Also, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Premier for the wise choice and judgment in elevating the hon. member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) to the position in the cabinet to head the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development, and also in elevating the hon. member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) to the very important portfolio, the Minister of Natural Resources.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time in the history of the province that the constituency of The Battlefords has had a representative on the executive council. His appointment to head this vital and important portfolio was received with gratitude by the people of The Battlefords and may I assure you, by all the people of north-western Saskatchewan.

Most of us on this side of the house, Mr. Speaker, that have known the hon. gentleman, politically and otherwise, concur wholeheartedly in his appointment. The natural resources, of the province, Mr. Speaker, their conservation and wise use, will no doubt receive meticulous care and scrutiny as has been the case since the election in 1944.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend congratulations to the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart). I do know that as time goes on he will have to adapt himself to accept the reality of true economics, to base his judgment on facts, and to learn that by obscuring, camouflaging or misrepresenting facts does not increase the stature of any individual in the eyes of the public, who in public life is entrusted with the responsibility for the vital decisions of this magnitude, that affect the well-being and the welfare of all segments of our people and economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering who is responsible for the seating arrangement of the hon. members on the opposite side of the house. Whoever made the arrangements must have erred. I would have suggested that had the hon. member's seat been moved two down and one to the right, then the old saying of "birds of a feather flock together" could have been justifiably applied.

Now, it is hard, particularly for me, to distinguish who is the leader of the Liberal party — whether the member that is sitting in the front seat or the member that is sitting in the back seat. I know that the \$50,000 worth of Liberal leadership is not producing the goods, and had the hon. gentleman been elevated to the front seat, they could have taken turns and put in another \$50,000 worth of leadership. And may I add, Mr. Speaker, that an article in the Regina Leader-Post of Friday, February 22, further illustrates my point when a writer from the city of Moose Jaw refers to the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) as "the Ross Thatcher from Prince Albert".



**Mr. Steuart:** — That's a great compliment.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — While on the subject of leadership . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! At this time, under standing order 30, sub-paragraph 3, at half an hour before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, I must interrupt the proceedings and put the question on the amendment. The amendment is moved by Mr. Gardiner, seconded by Mr. McFarlane:

that the following words be added to the address: 'We respectfully submit that your Honour's advisers do not possess the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan'.

The amendment was negated on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 19**

**Messieurs**

Klein	Gardiner	Coderre
McCarthy	Staveley	MacDougall
Barrie	Foley	Snedker
McDonald	Guy	Gallagher
Danielson	Boldt	Erb
Cameron	Horseman	Steuart
McFarlane		

**NAYS — 28**

**Messieurs**

Lloyd	Meakes	Michayluk
Johnson	Thurston	Semchuk
Williams	Wood	Perkins
Brockelbank	Davies	Thiessen
Walker	Turnbull	Snyder
Nollet	Stone	Stevens
Kuziak	Whelan	Dahlman
Strum (Mrs.)	Thibault	Kluzak
Kramer	Berezowsky	Peterson
Willis		

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Mr. Speaker, before the vote was taken, I stopped on the subject of leadership. While I am on this subject of leadership, it would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentlemen opposite are somewhat uneasy about the fact that the Hon. Woodrow S. Lloyd has assumed responsibility of premiership in inter-election years. May I assure them, Sir, that the hon. Premier was chosen leader

by a most democratic convention in a most democratic manner by delegates most democratically selected by the people throughout the length and breadth of the province of Saskatchewan by a most democratic political party to be found anywhere on the face of the earth.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — That the choice of a leader and a Premier was necessary was due to the fact that a similar national convention, with the same fundamental democratic principles, chose, in a most democratic election, the Hon. T.C. Douglas, the then premier of Saskatchewan, to lead the New Democratic Party.

However, Mr. Speaker, one of the aspirants for the enviable position has since, in an undemocratic manner, retreated to the fold where personal ambition and positional rewards may be the only hope for his future. Must I remind hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that a similar incident almost 20 centuries ago, found in the oft-read good book where, by virtue of his birth, he became the greatest leader of Christianity, said to his followers “Before the cock crows thrice, one of you will betray me”. I would remind the hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker, that judgments on people in public life are ultimately given recognition on the basis of integrity, sincerity, sensitivity to the needs of the people, and, above all, honesty, rather than mere phraseology or hollow words, used to mislead and misinform solely for political ambition. Mr. Speaker, sitting in the present house we have a representative group of one of the noblest professions in the province that I am aware of, namely the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation. Incidentally, Sir, to become a member of this organization, each individual member, to what my hon. friends opposite often refer to as compulsion, has deducted each month on assuming employment from every monthly pay cheque, organization or union dues, commonly referred to as Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation fees.

**Mr. Klein:** — They are not used for political purposes, I can tell you that.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — No new recruit entering this profession on receiving the necessary qualifications is at any time approached, whether he or she is willing to contribute to the welfare of this organization. It is true that the executive, its executive assistants work on behalf of the teachers of the organization generally, and also contribute in an advisory capacity to the welfare of education and to its members. I can recall, Mr. Speaker, when I entered the teaching profession some 30 years ago, under a Liberal government, 1933 to be exact, and I can remember up to 1944 the conditions that existed in the province of Saskatchewan under which some of the teachers had to work.

Grants from a Liberal government to rural schools, \$200 or \$300 in some instances — this paid the total teacher's salary plus that of the secretary-treasurer and sometimes that of the janitor.

**An Hon. Member:** — Liberal prosperity.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — No teachers' organization until some years later, except for small organized groups known as teachers' alliance, groups of city teachers working tirelessly to improve the lot of their fellow teachers. Add this, no security of tenure, no collective bargaining rights. Often your employment hinged on the fact that you underbid your next highest bidder. It wasn't until 1940, Mr. Speaker, that an inactive Liberal government introduced compulsory \$700 minimum salary for teachers holding permanent certificates in the province of Saskatchewan. Yes, compulsory . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — \$700 a month?

**Mr. Michayluk:** — \$700 a year. \$2.50 per day. And out of this was deducted a certain percentage for superannuation. As a result of this act, Mr. Speaker, I must admit that one school district that same year offered me \$850. Those in the teaching profession, Mr. Speaker, who remember the pre-1944 and the post-1944 era are best able to gauge or appraise the position of teachers, together with education opportunities, opportunities for the young boys and girls of Saskatchewan. It was during the period, 1944 to 1961, that the now Premier, the Hon. Woodrow Lloyd, was Minister of Education. The Saskatchewan Bulletin, journal of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation of November, 1961, in an editorial under title of "Congratulations, Woodrow Lloyd" had this to say, and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

All our readers will no doubt wish to join us in congratulating Woodrow Lloyd, our new Premier. His new post is a fitting reward for his many years of dedicated public service.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** —

He has proved himself capable of high responsibility and we are certain he will discharge his new duties with his usual sincerity, integrity and ability.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**February 26, 1963**

**Mr. Michayluk: —**

These qualities that helped Woodrow Lloyd build an enviable reputation and has made his influence felt far beyond the boundaries of the province he served well for so long.

I am going to omit one paragraph and go on to the next, Mr. Speaker. I quote:

During the 16 years that he was Minister of Education, Woodrow helped to bring about legislation that has been good for education in Saskatchewan. The Teacher Tenure Act was enacted. The Salary Negotiation Act became law and helped produce orderly and dignified bargaining. The Larger Unit Act made centralization and vastly improved facilities feasible. The Federation Act was extended so that it now includes disciplinary power; the Superannuation Act was improved; Group Insurance for teachers became a reality. There were other improvements, of course, in addition to those milestones of teacher welfare. He brought wisdom and vision to the task of developing improved educational opportunities for Saskatchewan boys and girls. And many boys and girls grown to maturity since Woodrow first was named minister of Education have lived fuller, better lives because of his influence. Higher levels of education have been accompanied by higher achievements and higher standards of living.

May I omit the next paragraph and go on with the one following:

Fittingly the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation presented him with an honorary life membership and fittingly too he has been awarded for his years of dedication to an honorable task. Last year Woodrow was named Provincial Treasurer, now he is Premier.

Mr. Speaker, these are the words, the editorial words from what I consider to be one of the largest professional groups in the province of Saskatchewan. This editorial no doubt expresses the feeling of every teacher in the province of Saskatchewan, along with every boy and girl, except the Liberal party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, industrial stagnation has been bandied around this house for the last week. Regardless of what figures are given, what statistics quoted, or what references to remarks

of people in financial and industrial positions are used. It is difficult to penetrate the minds of the members of the opposition. Well, I'm going to make an attempt. I'm a school teacher and I know, of course, that all my students are not of the same ability, some have higher intellectual levels and some lower. For this reason, recently programmed learning was introduced — those that can learn faster advance according to their ability, but these gentlemen opposite are at the end, it takes them a long time to learn.

I want to read an article from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, dated February 1, 1962, under title "Mineral Development said Cushion for Economy". May I quote:

Great strides toward balance, stability and resiliency made by the Saskatchewan economy in recent years can be attributed to the diversification — D.L. Campbell, executive vice president of British American Oil told the 75th anniversary meeting of the Moose Jaw Chamber of Commerce.

Further, he stated — and would my hon. friends opposite make note of this. I quote:

That as a result of increased mineral production, manufacturing and other non-agricultural activities, the provincial economy has come a long way since the years when Saskatchewan province-wise had all its eggs in the wheat basket.

And he goes on further, and I quote:

From an 80 percent dependency on one crop in depression days, Mr. Campbell says that the provincial economy has progressed to the point that even in a good crop year, such as 1962 (that's the year that my friends opposite don't want to refer to — they only refer to 1961 because it was a drought year) non-agricultural production accounted for about half of the total commodity output. In the poor crop year 1961, non-agricultural production accounted for over 65 percent and contributed stability by limiting the effects of a 62 percent drop in agricultural output to declines of only 27 percent in the total output and only 15 percent in the total personal income.

**February 26, 1963**

May I quote further, Mr. Speaker.

The B.A. official said that by far (and I want my hon. friends opposite to take note of this) the fastest growing segment of the Saskatchewan economy in post-war years has been the mineral production.

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Why did B.A. move out of the province?

**Mr. Michayluk:** — I will give you more figures. Twenty-five percent of Canadian crude oil production in 1962 accounted for the Saskatchewan record, 175,000 barrels per day, totalling 64 million barrels a year, with a value of approximately \$145 million, the B.A. vice-president said. He estimated 1963 production of 180 barrels per day, or very close to the province's present maximum producing capacity. And he said further, and I want my hon. friends to note this. I quote:

Mr. Campbell said that the petroleum industry has spent approximately \$750 million exploring for oil and natural gas in Saskatchewan, with refinery and pipeline expenditures bringing the total investment to around \$1 billion. At the present time total royalty payments in the province are on the order of \$18 million per year.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — If this is stagnation, give us more of it.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Is this stagnation? Now, may I refer you to another article. This is from the Leader-Post, Monday, February 25 — only yesterday.

Building starts on cement plant. One million dollar cement plant to be built eight miles east of Saskatoon at Floral, on the 1,400 acres of land, and when completed will cost \$1 million and will provide employment for 100 people.

Another item in the Star-Phoenix of January 9, 1963.

Mining and building boom in Saskatchewan. Esterhazy potash capital, producing 100 carloads of potash a day.

One other item in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, December 26, 1962. Mr. Fawcett, the industrial development officer of the city of Saskatoon — same story — potash — interprovincial co-operatives — and so on and so on down the line — future looks good for the city. Stewart G. Fawcett says prospects never looked better. City industrial prospects never looked better, said Mr. Fawcett, of the future. Now is this the stagnation that my hon. friends opposite refer to?

**An Hon. Member:** — The only thing that's stagnant is the Liberals.

**Hon. F. Meakes (Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development):** — It looks that way.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Now stack this up, Mr. Chairman. I'm not reading, don't worry, I get along without reading.

**An Hon. Member:** — P.A. were negotiating with your own minister in Regina at the time.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Stack this evidence, Mr. Speaker, against those views held by the hon. members to your left and particularly the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I want to refer to an editorial note in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of June 21, 1961. I quote:

If Ross Thatcher, provincial Liberal leader would temper the vigor he has shown and is showing with a little more common sense, he would do even better than he is doing. His statement at a recent rally near North Battleford that the potash area east of Saskatoon would never be developed under a socialist government strikes us as nonsense. The company working this tract has sunk millions upon millions to get potash mines and has been facing great difficulty as has every company attempting to mine potash in this province. Does Mr. Thatcher believe that these difficulties would not have been met if his own party had been in control of this province? Nonsense.

While on the topic of nonsense, Mr. Speaker, I might as well deal with more nonsense. Hon. members will remember the fearful, scary phrases used by my Liberal friends opposite in their election propaganda prior to 1944-45. They said "You will lose your farms if you vote for the CCF. There will be no elections if you elect the CCF. Those that oppose the party will be put into jail and they'll build scaffolds. People would be sent into the northern parts of Canada." This is what the Liberal party propaganda said. Yes, that is what they said. I can recall that during the last session the Hon.

Minister of Natural Resources had to withdraw a statement in which he charged the Liberal party with using this type of misleading propaganda. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a Liberal pamphlet written in Ukrainian. I'll read it to the house. It is in the Ukrainian language but I'll translate it literally into English. I am sorry that the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) is not in her seat — she would be able to translate it to some of the hon. members to your left. Note this, I quote: "You will lose your farms if you will vote for the CCF". That's not all, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Foley:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. On a point of privilege. I think we should have a neutral interpreter.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is not a point of privilege.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Printed by The Redeemer's Voice, Yorkton, Saskatchewan. The hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) should know this printing press. And issued by the Saskatchewan Liberal Association. Here is another publication in the Ukrainian language. "Where do we go" and in this pamphlet they are threatening there will be no elections, only revolution and bloodshed would remove the CCF. People that will not conform to legislation passed by duly elected provincial or federal government would be sent north — as is done to Russian prisoners.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Why didn't they send you to Prince Albert. That's where you should have been.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — I'll go there when the occasion arises, don't worry. The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) was critical of social aid. I was just wondering, how many meetings did he have in his constituency to criticize social aid? He was all over the province. I don't think that he would hold meetings on social aid abuses in his constituency. Mr. Speaker, I checked the public accounts and I found that every municipality and every town and village in the constituency of Rosthern has given social aid to needy people, and rightly so. I want to ask the hon. member for Rosthern a few questions. Does he know the men and women in his constituency who are elected to local government? Does he consider these, people of integrity and capable of administering public funds? Has he at any time discussed problems of social aid in any of the municipalities, either rural or urban, in his constituency? Has he ever drawn attention of local governments to misuses of social aid funds in his constituency, or to the Minister of Social Welfare? What has he done to point out that misuse of public funds were made in his constituency? These are some of the questions I would like to ask this hon. gentleman. Does he realize that



his accusations reflect on the integrity of men and women in his constituency that are duly elected to assume responsibility for administering public funds?

The hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) is at variance with the manner in which liquor licensing commission issues licenses for liquor outlets. Mr. Speaker, may I go into the past and point out how hotel operators got their licences from a Liberal government. I have a report of the Elwood royal commission. May I read one section how the Liberal were granting licences.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Is it in English:

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Yes, it is in English. I'll just read part, and this is a royal commission report I quote:

We find that prior to the granting of a licence Shepherd gave the interested parties to understand that it would be necessary to contribute \$1,000 to the Liberal campaign funds in order to get a licence. And upon this understanding, the interested parties undertook to contribute the said sum and that subsequent to the granting of a licence the \$700 was paid to Shepherd pursuant to such an undertaking.

Royal commission report, Mr. Speaker. Liberal government. Another report of the Witmore royal commission on misuse of government funds in highway construction. I will read one paragraph, Mr. Speaker and I'll sit down. I quote:

The treasury was defrauded by means of fraudulent transactions herein reported to the extent on the whole of \$64,394.

This is the highways department.

Mr. Speaker, it is 10 o'clock and I think I have said enough — it should be evident from what I have said that I am going to support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.H. Staveley (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, I understand that the lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) holds the record for closing off the debate in this

**February 26, 1963**

house in the shortest space of time. Now certainly I have no desire to contest that honor, but my hon. friend from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) has almost made me a contestant. There must be about 30 seconds to go and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was complaining yesterday that . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — He got carried away.

**Mr. Staveley:** — . . . Mr. Speaker, at this time I would just like to add my voice to those which have already spoken during this session in extending a very warm and sincere welcome to our newest member of the legislature.

And at this time I would also like to beg your leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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