

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**10th Day**

**Wednesday, February 27, 1963**

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

On the Orders of the Day:

**WELCOME TO OPTIMIST CLUB GROUP**

**Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to welcome the group of young lads in the front row of the Speaker's Gallery under the sponsorship of the Saskatoon Optimist Club, with Mr. Dunlop in charge. I think all members will join with me in saying how pleased we are to have them with us and we hope their stay will be an enjoyable one.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mrs. G. Strum (Saskatoon):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I would like to draw the attention of the house to the students in the West Gallery from Saskatoon, Lorne Haselton school and Victoria school, with their teachers, Mr. Lezecke and Miss Lachelle. I am sure the members of the house join with me in wishing them a happy day and a safe return.

**Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to also introduce a fine group of students from my constituency. They are from the Kinistino High School, grade 12, and they are led here by their teacher, Mr. Dan Wade, accompanied by Mrs. Louis Hogan and the bus drivers are Mr. Liddell and Mr. Rider, and I hope their trip here this afternoon will be both educational and a pleasant one.

**REPORT ON CEMENT DISTRIBUTING PLANT**

**Hon. R. Brown (Minister of Industry and Information):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to draw the attention of the hon. members to the story which appeared in the daily press a couple of days ago — I'm sorry I forgot to bring a copy with me — referring to the intention of Canada Cement Company to construct a million dollar cement distributing plant in the city of Saskatoon.

**February 27, 1963**

Chatting with the company officials the other day, before the announcement, they advised me that it is their intention to set this industry up on some 1400 acres of property which they own out at Floral and their long-term plans call for establishment of full-scale manufacturing operations at Saskatoon with an investment something in the order of \$12 million. I am sure that all members of the house are just as happy as I am to welcome this development by Canada Cement and to wish them well in their new operation in the province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **REQUEST FOR TABLING OF GEORGE S. MAY REPORT**

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse):** — Before the orders of the day I wonder if I might ask the Premier again whether or not it would be possible to table the report of the George S. May Co. of Chicago.

**Premier Lloyd:** — The other day I assured him at the time that I would find the report and we would have a look at it and consider whether or not it was the type of information that could be tabled. 1947 is some considerable length of time ago and the report has now been assembled and arrived in my office today so I am not in a position to tell him further.

### **ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

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

**Mr. J.H. Staveley (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last evening due to the exceedingly late hour I did not take sufficient time I think to properly congratulate and welcome our newest member to this legislature, the hon. member from Prince Albert, (Mr. Steuart). I think I would like to take a moment or two to do this now. It was my privilege to be associated with my new colleague for many years in municipal government and I have as high a regard for his practical ability as I have for his ready wit, both of which will be welcome, I am sure, in this house. The hon. member for Prince Albert will make a very valuable contribution to the cause of the people of this province as a member of this opposition, and I am sure he will make an even greater contribution when he sits to the right of the Speaker as a member of the government after the next election. I think possibly that I might even thank him for singing the fourth verse of a very sweet song. I think possibly I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we could have three or four more by-elections, and if we could have three or four of my hon. friends across the house remove the blinders

from their eyes and see the light, we possibly might change this government without a general election.

Also, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to congratulate the hon. members from Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) and Moose Jaw, (Mr. Snyder) in their presentation, when they moved and seconded the speech from the throne. And I am very pleased to congratulate them on their presentation, for I am afraid that I cannot congratulate them on the content of their remarks. Mr. Speaker, these were typical socialist election speeches, composed only of bitterness, of venom and of abuse towards the Liberal party and its leader, together with, I think, self-applause for the self-styled progressive legislation of the socialists, which the people of this province know to be bureaucracy in its worst form, compulsive, arrogant, restrictive, and which has placed a debt on the shoulders of this generation of such magnitude that many generations will be unable to remove the burden.

And one thing, Mr. Speaker, which has been particularly noticeable in all of the speeches by the government members in this session has been the complete absence of the term NDP. Does this mean that this small, isolated group of Saskatchewan socialists is the unwanted child of this national marriage of labor and CCF? Or has it been made an orphan either unwilling or unable, to accept the name or the parentage of its forebears. This is a very peculiar situation, and I am sure that it is one that will be watched with keen interest, particularly by the farmers of this province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I would be very remiss as the member for the Weyburn constituency if I did not bring to the attention of all members of this legislature the fact that Weyburn, the only city in the constituency which I represent, and my own home, is celebrating its 50th anniversary, the Golden Anniversary of its city status, throughout the entire year of 1963. And I would like to take this opportunity of extending a very sincere welcome to all members of the legislature to visit with us during our celebration of this very important milestone in the life and in the history of our Weyburn community.

We are taking this occasion to pay tribute to those hardy pioneers who settled our district and who planned and built so well for the future of our community. We are doing this in this way.

I would like to tell you that the famous Soo line, the C.P.R. line from Moose Jaw to St. Paul was built through what was to be Weyburn in the year 1892, at which time there were already many homesteaders in our area. Weyburn settlement itself was founded in 1899, and at the end of that year, Mr. Speaker, the total population of Weyburn was 25 persons.

**February 27, 1963**

In 1902, Weyburn was incorporated as a village, on August 5, 1903 as a town, and it received its city charter on September 1st, 1913. Our first policeman in Weyburn was a member of the Royal North West Mounted Police. Larry Lett, who served for several years as the Sergeant-at-Arms in this legislature, Mr. Speaker. The late Dr. R.M. Mitchell, who sat in this legislature from 1908 to 1920, as a Liberal member, arrived in Weyburn on May 13, 1899, to practice medicine and he was joined in 1903 by the late Dr. H.E. Eaglesham, who also sat in this legislature as a Liberal member from 1934 to 1938. To these gentlemen and to hundreds of others like them this province owes a debt of gratitude which it can never repay. The late Hon. C.M. Hamilton, Minister of Agriculture, in the early days of our province, homesteaded at Weyburn in 1900 and the late Rt. Hon. James G. Gardiner taught school at Weyburn in 1904. So, Mr. Speaker, you can see that Weyburn has a great tradition in and has made a great contribution to the life and development of our province — the political life — as well as those other phases of the social and economic life of Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is these people and hundreds like them whom Weyburn is honoring in this our jubilee year. Their faith in the future of our community and of our province was shown in the way they built their churches and their schools, by the way in which they began their businesses, their professional lives and their farming operations. These people built the foundations, Mr. Speaker, and it is up to us in our generation and to those of future generations to build the superstructure as well as the foundations which they built for us. I only hope that we can do it as well.

I would like now to take a few moments to acquaint the members of this house with three or four situations which exist in our Weyburn constituency and which may not be peculiar to our own area.

Approximately one year ago I brought to the attention of the members of this legislature certain inequities existing in the allocation of crown lands, and with particular reference to grazing leases. Now in my inexperience at that time, Mr. Speaker, and in my inherent belief in the fair-mindedness of human nature, I had hoped and expected that the government would have taken steps to correct this deplorable situation. And I pointed out that the basis of these allocations, wherever it was possible, was clearly, very clearly, . . . NDP government. But nothing has been done. And what kind of public administration is this. Surely on the basis of your humanity first program the foremost consideration should be need. Instead of this it appears to be the last, if it is taken into consideration at all. And I am sure that the hon. Minister of Agriculture could never explain to my satisfaction why one single man should be allocated up to 27 quarter sections of crown land, while a married man with a family could not even

lease one badly needed quarter section — needed to retain that family on the farm, Mr. Speaker. The Family Farm? And this is just another example of something to which this government pays lip service and then, by its very policy, destroys, is it any wonder that so many Saskatchewan farmers are leaving the NDP.

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, would the hon . member after he gets through speaking, give me the name of this gentleman if not now.

**Mr. Staveley:** — I would be very pleased to, Sir. I have something else to say along that line too.

Now I know of dozens of allocations which bear the same odor, but I do have one file in my briefcase which I hope to be presenting to the minister in the next few days. And in this case, I am sure, merits his personal and unbiased attention. And I will be very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, if I am unable to thank and congratulate the hon. minister on again reversing a decision which has already been changed twice. Now, the Liberal party policy is very clear with respect to crown lands. And when the Liberal party forms the next government, allocations will no longer be made in the back room by Messrs. Elchuk and Mr. Nye, Mr. Speaker. An independent board will be set up and it will not be composed of a majority of government people as have been so many boards which have been set up by this government. And this board will be composed of a majority of people from farm organizations and from cattle breeder organizations. And then, for the first time in many, many years, a fair and equitable allocation will be made of these crown lands, which should be used for the benefit of the people of this province and not for the benefit of this socialist government. So much for crown lands, Mr. Speaker.

About three weeks ago I had the privilege of attending a public hearing on rail line abandonment held in the town of Radville, a very fine urban community in the Weyburn constituency. This meeting was very well attended by people from Radville, Ceylon, Colgate and Goodwater, as well as from those rural municipalities which would be affected by plans of the, Canadian National Railways to abandon certain lines in that area. Now these good people are very concerned and upset over their inevitable financial loss, inconvenience and the disruption of their social life should these lines be abandoned. And I would like to congratulate the hon. Premier and his colleagues for the action they took in resisting the policies of these railroads with respect to the abandonment programs, and delaying the implementation of these programs. And I am sure that this government is well aware of the hardships which will be caused to those communities which will be affected when the lines are

**February 27, 1963**

torn up. And I would again like to congratulate the Premier for attempting in this case to safeguard the interests of our Saskatchewan people.

Another item which is causing concern in our Weyburn constituency is the proposed and recommended changes in school unit boundaries. And I would assure the hon. Minister of Education and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs that there will be many unhappy and very angry people in our area if these changes are lightly made, and made with no regard for the wishes of those who are going to have to pay the piper. The Stoughton area and the Radville area are both very much concerned over these matters, Mr. Speaker. I would like now to turn for a few moments to social aid — we have certainly heard a great deal about social aid in this session. And much has been said about social aid here in the city of Regina. But I am not going to comment on social aid in Regina because I know nothing about social aid in Regina — except what I have read in the papers and have heard in this house.

However, Mr. Speaker, I have been aware of a growing antagonism toward the policies and the administration of the social aid program as developed by this government. About a month ago I had the privilege of attending a meeting, one of the regional meetings held in Estevan, called by the hon. minister. I sincerely believe that it is the responsibility of an elected member of this legislature to represent the thinking of the people whom he represents and so I was very pleased to attend this meeting as I knew that there would be a very fine cross-section of people present there from my own constituency. And I felt that this would assist me in consolidating my own thinking based on the comments and the questions which I had heard prior to the meeting and based on what I felt I might hear at that meeting. And I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that my thinking was consolidated at that time. And I am sure that the hon. minister must be aware of the antagonism and the dissatisfaction with his program which on the basis it is being administered is becoming a monster which could destroy this province, and if the minister is not aware of this, Mr. Speaker, it is only that he refuses to face the facts.

There is no criticism, there is no condemnation of these good people who through no fault of their own require assistance for the maintenance of themselves and their families, no more so than if they were to become physically or mentally ill, or if they were to suffer from an accident. And I am just as conscious of this as anybody in this house, or outside of the house, but I am also thinking about those able-bodied people who can work and who want to work but for whom there are no jobs. And this government, by its system of social aid, makes it impossible for them to work. I am sorry the minister is not in the house this afternoon because I would like to remind him of

the suggestion which was made to him by the social aid officer of Weyburn at that Estevan meeting, that this government pay its share of social aid in wages, in a works program, that this government make the necessary arrangements with the federal government to pay its share of social aid in a works program. And I know very well that his department will receive complete co-operation from municipal government. And while the minister ridiculed this suggestion at the Estevan meeting and suggested that the city of Weyburn merely wanted the provincial government to remove the snow from the streets, I know that since that time this recommendation has also been recommended by the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association. There is a terrific field in this respect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting for one minute that one deserving person be curtailed one cent in what is needed, but I am suggesting that insofar as able bodied persons are concerned both this province and its social aid program would be on a much healthier basis with this change of policy. And this change would not be meant to eliminate social aid in any way, but it would make the program constructive rather than defeatist as it is at the present time.

Now, the only other point that I wish to raise with respect to social aid is to commend a policy to the minister which will do away with certain abuses with respect to social aid payments, because there are abuses, Mr. Speaker. And if the minister closes his eyes to these abuses today, I am sure that they will haunt his dreams tomorrow. And I am referring to the diversion of social aid payments by some recipients to purposes other than those for which the payments were made and, Mr. Speaker, it is not under conditions such as this that this province was built, but it is under such conditions that this province could be destroyed and unable to retain its respected and equal partnership in this great confederation of Canadian provinces. And so I would commend to the minister a new and a complete review of his social aid programs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have I believe tried to be more than fair to the government this afternoon. I believe in giving credit where credit is due and I have done that. I believe in hitting hard where criticism is justified and I have tried to do that this afternoon. I also believe in making recommendations for the improvement of government in Saskatchewan and I have done that on one or two occasions this afternoon. But I do not think that this government will accept any recommendation, Mr. Speaker. Do you remember, some time ago, when the Leader of the Opposition suggested that a commission similar to the Glassco commission possibly, be appointed to inquire into ways and means of eliminating waste and extravagance in this government and in this province, and also inquiring into ways and means of increasing the efficiency of government in Saskatchewan? Now, I have here

**February 27, 1963**

a clipping from the Regina Leader Post of December, dated December 31, last, which I think expresses the hon. Premier's reaction to this suggestion, and I would like to quote a portion of this:

Premier Woodrow Lloyd said Saturday the Saskatchewan government would have instigated an outside study into the organization and operation of government departments and agencies if it had been convinced of the need of such a move.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the government is so self-satisfied, so smug and thinks that everything it does is right, and any suggestion by the opposition is wrong, then I think that we can expect the kind of political mess in which we find ourselves today in the province of Saskatchewan. I am glad that the Minister of Industry is here today because I would like to comment for a moment or two on his speech last Friday afternoon. And I noted he said that he remembered on many occasions coming back into the house after an election when it was stated by members of the opposition that this government was living on borrowed time. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am rather new in this house but I feel that I should let him know that I too am one of those Liberals who believes that this government is living on borrowed time. But I would go a little further than that and I would also suggest that they are living not only on borrowed time, they are also living on borrowed money.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Staveley:** — I believe that the public debt of this province proves this and that the supporters of the government know it.

The hon. minister on Friday afternoon, painted a rosy picture of Saskatchewan as a mecca in the realm of industrial development. But instead of this, Mr. Speaker, to anyone not blinded by the propaganda dispensed by this NDP government, it resembles much more closely a desert, with only an occasional oasis to sustain the parched and weary residents of this province, until they can leave the province or until a responsible government can put the Saskatchewan economy back on a stable basis.

I believe that the hon. minister talked for something over an hour, and I enjoyed his talk, I might say. He talked for something over an hour last Friday afternoon, but did you notice, Mr. Speaker, that he indulged only in generalities, and he did not give us anything with which we could compare. It has been suggested in this house that the present plight of this province in the field of industry is the result of previous free enterprise administrations, the depressions of the thirties



and World War II.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Alberta and Manitoba had the depression. They had and they still have free enterprise governments, and they suffered the same effects from World War II as Saskatchewan. But these other provinces recovered, and this in itself has proved to me that socialism cannot do the job as well as free enterprise.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Staveley:** — This session, Mr. Speaker, has been characterized by charges and counter charges, by personal attacks on various members of the legislature, and by other members. We bring our school children into this house to watch the processes of government, and what do they see? For much of the time, adults acting like children, and we expect the children to act like adults. And this is not government to me, Mr. Speaker, — to me, government is a business a big business. It's the people's business. And I would like to compare for just a moment or two the results of the efforts of the Saskatchewan government in the field of industrial development, with those of the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba. Because I like facts and not fantasies.

Now, I could quote a lot of figures, but I think that figures are rather boring, and I thought possibly that I would just take the last year, which has the completed records, that is the year 1960. And I would like to deal with the private and public investment capital, because I think, after all, this is about the best yardstick one could find for industrial development.

As we are aware this field covers principally the primary and construction industry, manufacturing, utilities, trade, finance and commercial services, housing, institutional services, and government departments. And when we have all the figures and the comparison of these figures, then I believe that we can compare the advance made in the field of industrial development in this province. I think that this should give us then a true story.

I would like to take these figures, as I say for the year 1960, for Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta. In the field of primary construction and construction industry, Saskatchewan \$206 million, which is very good; Manitoba \$118.6 million; Alberta \$393.4 million.

In manufacturing, Saskatchewan \$19 million; Manitoba \$59.5 million; Alberta \$84.3 million.

**February 27, 1963**

Take the field of utilities. Saskatchewan \$154 million; Manitoba \$181.8 million; Alberta \$219.4 million.

Trade, finance and commercial service. Saskatchewan \$43 million; Manitoba \$61.5 million; Alberta \$91.2 million.

Housing. Saskatchewan \$76 million; Manitoba \$107 million; Alberta \$177.4 million.

Institutional services and government departments. Saskatchewan \$128 million; Manitoba \$152.6 million; Alberta \$254.9 million.

Now comparing these totals, Mr. Speaker, we find that in 1960 the total for Saskatchewan was \$626 million; for Manitoba \$681 million; for Alberta \$1,220.6 million.

And this, Mr. Speaker, is your answer.

As the hon. minister has told us that it was difficult to get industry into this province and I appreciate this and we do realize this but excuses are no substitute for results, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Staveley:** — Do you think, too, that all of those industries, which have established in Alberta and Manitoba in the past ten years, are going to pull up stakes and come now to Saskatchewan? Of course they are not. They are lost to this province forever.

And while this government was bleating about pulp mills and petrochemical plants for political purposes, the other provinces got them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Staveley:** — Socialism compared to free enterprise. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment and refer once again to the speech of the hon. minister, when he dealt with a statement made by a gentleman, Mr. D.L. Campbell, I think it was, Vice-President of the British American Oil Company, when he was speaking to a Chamber of Commerce, or a Board of Trade meeting at Moose Jaw recently, an annual meeting — and I would like to quote Mr. Campbell's statement: as reported by the hon. minister when he said this:

Great strides toward balance and stability and resiliency made by the Saskatchewan economy in recent years, can be attributed to diversification.

I believe that this is quite right, Mr. Speaker, but you know there is another side to the story and I think it is a very important side of the story. It is this — this is the usual system of telling half truths, which this government has done so well for the past many years. Because the implication here, Mr. Speaker, is that this man, who is recognized as a free enterpriser, is lauding and congratulating and approving of socialist policies in the development of industry. And I don't believe that this is the case. I believe that the hon. minister also suggested to the Leader of the Opposition, when asked the source of this information, I believe he said that the quotations might be found in any one of several papers; the one he had at the moment I believe was the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix issue of February 1st. Now this meeting took place in the city of Moose Jaw, and I have here the Moose Jaw Times Herald of February 1, and I would like to refer to a couple of other statements made by Mr. Campbell, which I think will possibly show the other side of the picture. Here is one:

The so-called benefits government distribute in our present mixed free enterprise economy, are for the most part made out of tax earning of free enterprise.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that possibly the socialist philosophy is being carried on the shoulders of free enterprise.

Another statement:

Governments have no business running competitive business enterprises, because they have no right to engage in risk ventures with the public money.

Does this sound as though he approves of socialist policies? Here is another one, Mr. Speaker:

Economic planning by both government and industry will be necessary, but this does not suggest a planned economy.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Staveley:** — Mr. Speaker, one of the great tragedies in this province today, is that our people have lost all faith and trust in government, and respect and confidence for government, and it is acts such as I have just mentioned in not telling the whole story, — and I don't think I would have even mentioned this if the whole story had been told, — but it is acts such as this that are responsible for the loss of that faith, trust, respect and confidence.

I noticed in the throne speech reference to assistance this government is going to give to private business, and the

**February 27, 1963**

hon. minister commented on this in his speech last Friday afternoon. Now I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. government members, went to school, but I wonder how many of them remember in their readers this story of the "Boy Who Cried Wolf", because this same situation exists today — because regardless of what you people say, you will no longer be believed. Private business does not trust you and will not trust you. Do you believe that the doctors trust you? Do you believe that the petroleum industry trusts you? Do you believe that the dentists, lawyers, merchants and machine dealers and farmers trust you? Are these not the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Confidence in government in this province will not be restored until this socialist government party is defeated.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Staveley:** — Then the people of Saskatchewan will see the difference between socialism and free enterprise; between bureaucracy and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, since I can see nothing in the speech from the throne, to make me think that this government has changed any of its policies, which have brought us to the position, the deplorable position in which we find ourselves today, I will not vote for the motion.

**Hon. Mr. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — In rising to take part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the address-in-reply. They did an outstanding job. The citizens of their constituency can really be proud of them.

The Leader of the Opposition followed, with the same irresponsible, self-fabricated exaggerations that he has done ever since he was first elected to this legislature.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kuziak:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I intend this afternoon, to analyze His Honour's speech, to see how governmental programs enunciated in that speech will fulfill or implement the 1960 CCF, NDP program for more abundant living, as was presented to us and to the people of Saskatchewan in 1960.

But, Mr. Speaker, before I go into that, I want to touch to some extent on some of the charges and exaggerations levelled against the Department of Social Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity for some seventeen years of being a secretary-treasurer of a municipality in this province. I have had the responsibility during these seventeen years of administering social welfare, both under Liberal and under CCF administrations. I want to make this very clear that all the way down through the history of the province of Saskatchewan, the administration of social aid was always administered by the municipalities of our province, and not by the Department of Social Welfare. I am going to tell you that if you go back into Liberal times, the municipalities were responsible for the administration of social aid as well as the complete and total payment or cost of the social aid within the municipality.

This cost we have taken off the shoulders of the municipalities over the past eighteen years. You know as the Leader of the Opposition emphatically stated the other day, "there is increasing evidence that hundreds of people are drawing social aid that are not entitled to it". Mr. Speaker this is a charge on the integrity and honesty of every municipal official in this province, including the ex-mayor of the city of Prince Albert, the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) as well as the ex-mayor of the city of Weyburn and the sitting member at the present time for the Weyburn constituency, (Mr. Staveley). And I am going to deal with some of these boys.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kuziak** — Mr. Speaker, if hundreds of people are drawing social aid when they are not entitled to it, it is because municipal officials are lax and incompetent and that is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition is charging the officials of the municipalities of this province with.

I know that he has become known throughout Canada and Saskatchewan for his irresponsible utterances and false charges. The Leader of the Opposition could have checked. The hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) talked about generalities. I wish that the opposition would go a little more into statistics and facts. They could get facts and statistical evidence from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I am going to take some of their statistics on social aid advances in all the provinces of Canada.

I know that the opposition isn't going to like it. I am going to ask them to check the year 1961. If, as the Leader of the Opposition stated, "there is evidence that social aid is being given to chisellers, dead-beats, drunks and even to persons who are not citizens of this province".

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to give you statistical evidence from the federal government for the year 1961, of how social aid was administered and paid out in each of the provinces of Canada.

**February 27, 1963**

Do you know who is at the lead? I am going to give you the percentages of the people on social aid, of the total population of the provinces.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — In the lead is Newfoundland with 11.4 percent of all people of Newfoundland on social aid in 1961. If you want other years; in 1960 Liberal Newfoundland had 12.42 percent of its population on social aid; in 1959 it had 11.97 or 12 percent on social aid. The first province in the Dominion of Canada. If there are chisellers and drunks on social aid here in Saskatchewan there are a lot more drunks in the other Liberal provinces on social aid.

The leading province that dishes out social aid the way the Leader of the Opposition says is Liberal Newfoundland.

The second one, Mr. Speaker, in the dominion statistics showed New Brunswick, another Liberal province, the second highest in Canada with 4 percent of the people on social aid. The third province is British Columbia with 3.8 or almost 4 percent. here may be a reason for British Columbia because the old age people all go down to B.C. I could overlook that. Next is Nova Scotia with 2.84 percent, the next is Manitoba, that some of them praise, 2.4 percent of the population on social aid. The sixth is Quebec, another Liberal province, finally comes the CCF-NDP province of Saskatchewan, the seventh in Canada down the list in handing out social aid.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to say this, that if we have deadbeats, and drunks on social aid roles in this province, Liberal Newfoundland has five to twelve times as many. Mr. Speaker, this reminds me of the branding and name calling of social aid recipients back in the hungry thirties. I can never forget when my predecessor, Mr. Myron Feeley, who sat in this legislature in 1938 or 1939, appealing to the then Liberal government within this very legislature to increase assistance for the unemployed who roamed Canada, rode the freight rods, and so forth, was answered by the Liberals: "Where do you think we will get the money?" or "Do you think money grows on gooseberry bushes?" That was the answer Mr. Feeley received in 1938. But I am going to tell you, a couple of years after the war broke out they found the mulberry bush or the gooseberry bush with millions or billions of dollars.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I'm going to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, in those days they called the unemployed and those on social aid, bums,

chisellers, and drunkards. I'm going to tell you that when the war broke out . . .

**Mr. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — Where were you?

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Never mind where I was. When the war broke out, these bums as they used to call them, joined the forces of Canada, they fought, they bled and they died for the country who didn't know them only a few years before. And here again, we are getting the same kind of name calling.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Oh! Oh!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — The hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) is being critical. In fact in his speech he endorsed the Liberal stand on social aid, and here is what he stated "Social aid is a public scandal". He charged the government with allowing abuses to go unchecked. Mr. Speaker, you know I did some checking. I called up the Department of Social Welfare. I wanted to know how social welfare was administered in the city of Prince Albert when the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) was mayor of that city for four years. Here is the way it was administered: Social aid recipients in Prince Albert for 1955 to 1958, when the hon. member was mayor of that city, rose from 767 to 1335, an increase of 75 percent.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — How about that?

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Now, social aid costs in Prince Albert jumped from \$142,800 in 1955 to \$340 thousand in 1958, an increase of 138 percent. More than double over a four year period.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, we took over all your cases.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Yes, public scandal. All right, fine. Mr. Speaker, he made his speech in this house, I'm making mine now.

I am going to now compare . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — He can't take it.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I am going to now compare it to the provincial average for the same time. At the same time the province took over all the other cases in all the other cities, and in all the other towns, in this province, and you know what the provincial increase for those same four years was, it was only 67 percent in the number of recipients that went on to the roles.

**February 27, 1963**

Inasfar as the expenditure of money was concerned, the total social aid costs for the province as a whole, rose from \$1.5 million to \$2.5, an increase of 64.1 percent. His was 136 percent. He was putting them on twice as fast as all the other towns and cities of the province.

Mr. Speaker, when the member . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, will the minister permit a question?

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — No, not now.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Will the minister permit a question?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Will the hon. member take his seat?

**An Hon. Member:** — He is afraid to answer your question.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I knew I would get the opposition up. Mr. Speaker, if social aid was scandalous, he saw to it that in Prince Albert it was twice as scandalous.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, let's use some common sense. Social aid is difficult to administer. Social aid is a problem at any time, but let's not speak in silly stupid generalities.

Mr. Speaker, when I got up I stated that I intended to analyse the speech from the throne to see how it is fulfilling or implementing the CCF-NDP program placed before our people. That is our blueprint. I want to say that we are the only government in Canada that has the courage to remind the people of the promises that we made in an election. In 1960 we promised to fulfill some 17 points . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — I thought forty.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — . . . which we believed at that time would bring about a more abundant life for the people of Saskatchewan. I'm going to touch on now, Mr. Speaker, on as many of these points as time will permit. I ask you to check the degree of implementation since 1960 and refer every time to His Honour's speech in connection with these points to see whether it is mentioned in the speech from the throne.



The first point that I am going to talk about here, is our promise to continue the development of mineral resources in Saskatchewan. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very proud of having been appointed Minister of Mineral Resources. I am proud to follow in the footsteps of a man who today is recognized in the mining and petroleum industry of every province in the dominion of Canada. The resource ministers of Canada recognize him as the most outstanding mineral resource minister that Canada has had in the last decade.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — The hon. Mr. Brockelbank piloted the development of mineral resources of this province, I am going to say, so well and effectively that the growth in mining in Saskatchewan has been most spectacular. The net value of mineral wealth has increased tenfold since 1944. The revenue to the government or people of Saskatchewan, in royalties, lease fees, has gone up over a hundredfold from \$233,000 in 1944 to over \$24 million in 1962.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — This, the ridiculous Thatcherites call stagnation. The hon. member for P.A. in his speech stated, “government’s greatest failure was in industry and business development.”

Mr. Speaker, a hundred times greater income or revenues the hon. member for P.A. says “is the greatest failure”.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Prince Albert is a business man, and let’s take for example in 1944 he was in the business that he is in today and he made a net income of \$1,000 — I imagine he would do good if he did that under the Liberals. But with our mineral resources increase, up until 1962, our mineral resources increased the net revenue by 100-fold, 100 times. Supposing his net income increased 100 times, in other words a net of \$100,000 yet he calls it “stagnation”.

I am going to say this, Mr. Speaker, that the only time the hon. member for P.A. or Weyburn made his money was under a CCF government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Here is a statement I am going to make, Mr. Speaker, on mineral resources and it’s not going to be a generality. I am going to back it up. Saskatchewan has led all the provinces of Canada in the rate of increase of the net value of mineral wealth produced during the years 1944 to 1960. I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition. Their undue and silly criticisms had made us stand back and take a look at our record, and our record is fantastic.

**February 27, 1963**

In mineral resources since 1944 'til 1960 we led every province of Canada in the increase in net value of mineral production, even Alberta, and I am going to back it up by quoting the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Survey of production on page 24, it shows the net value of mineral wealth production increase since 1944, and Saskatchewan leads the group with an increase of 916 percent, almost ten fold. Alberta is next with 779 percent, and then comes the Canadian average of 374. Where are the Liberal provinces. They are of course in the gutter, down there . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — That's where the Liberals always were.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Quebec only had an increase of 320 percent, Newfoundland, a Liberal province, only 182 percent; New Brunswick, a Liberal province, only 150 . . .

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner:** — Stagnation.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Yes, Liberal stagnation. In 1914, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan ranked as the 6th greatest mining province in Canada. Even then it wasn't too bad. But we've had a tenfold increase — the greatest increase of any province in the Dominion of Canada. Today we are fourth in Canada. Yet the Leader of the Opposition screams out and he says industry is stagnating in the province, this government has driven oil and mining companies out of Saskatchewan. Where did we drive them to when we have the greatest increase in Canada? Did we drive them to New Brunswick, the Liberal province? Mr. Speaker, how silly can we get!

**An Hon. Member:** — It is easy for them.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Now I am going to make this statement. Mr. Speaker, either the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures are misleading Canada, or the Leader of the Opposition is misleading Canada — either one or the other.

**An Hon. Member:** — Fantastic. We know the answer to that, Alex. He's getting redder by the minute.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I've given you some statistics. Now I am going to give you more facts to prove my statement, that Saskatchewan is the fastest mineral resource expanding industry of all the provinces of Canada. And I am going to read from a new report on our mineral growth. This is taken from the Star-Phoenix dated January 11, 1962, and here is what a Liberal paper has to say about mineral growth in Saskatchewan — and I'm going to quote it:

Saskatchewan has made a phenomenal increase in its mineral products in the past ten years. In 1952, provincial production amounted to \$49,506,094. Thus, it has quadrupled its output in a decade.

This is better than the national average because in 1952 Canada's total production was valued at \$1,285,342,353, and doubled by 1962 to \$2,573,782,838.

Here a Liberal newspaper commends mineral growth while the Thatcherites opposite would tell you that we are stagnating.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say the following, we have provided every encouragement to the mining industry, and the mining industry has shown their confidence and satisfaction in Saskatchewan mining laws, its regulations by actually developing the mineral resources of this province at an unprecedented rate. They've shown the confidence by the rate of increase that we are developing in oil and mineral resources. We have, Mr. Speaker, been providing incentives and services to our mining industry and we are meeting with industry fairly regularly to understand their problems and to give them any further assistance whenever, Mr. Speaker, that assistance is warranted. At the present time in His Honour's speech, he forecast that we are meeting with the petroleum industry to devise incentives that would encourage deeper drilling to deeper formations in Saskatchewan.

I was going to read to you another portion entitled "More Heartening Oil Picture" from the Leader Post but one of my hon. friends read it last night so I am going to drop it, but here's another headline, "More Encouraging Oil Picture of Saskatchewan". Now this man who reported that encouraging picture is an oil executive of the British American Oil Company and here is something I am going to say, Mr. Speaker. Here is an oil executive, foreign to Saskatchewan, talking in glowing terms of Saskatchewan's development while the Saskatchewan-born Thatcherites are smearing, undermining, maligning, fouling their province and its development. The more Saskatchewan prospers, Mr. Speaker, the madder the Liberals are. I know that when the steel mill and pipe plant got a \$4½ million order for pipe lately it was reported in the press that the Leader of the Opposition became ill and he had to see a medical doctor. His forecast of the steel mill failing has proven as incorrect as most of the utterances that he has made within this province.

The Leader of the Opposition talks about industrial and mineral incentives and stated "too little and too late". I could quote you from this oil executive, and I will, and here is what the oil executive had to state with regards to our incentives. And I quote, Mr. Speaker. "Some further incentives" further incentives, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't say it's the start

**February 27, 1963**

of incentives, he says there were incentives but thinks

some further incentives to exploration might be coming from the change in regulations promised in the speech from the throne at the current sitting of the Saskatchewan legislature.

Here the oil executive, Mr. Campbell, admitted that they have had incentives and that more are being considered.

Although the opposition claimed that his Honour's speech is devoid, is empty, lacks program to benefit Saskatchewan people. Here is what the speech has to forecast with regard to mineral development, and I am going to enumerate these forecasts.

1. It says there will be certain changes in regulations to foster greater petroleum exploration, particularly in deeper formations.
2. Present incentives and services to the mining industry will be continued both with regards to the sedimentary area of the south as well as the pre-Cambrian hard rock area of the north.
3. Additional incentives are forecast for the pre-Cambrian area to encourage exploration and development of hard rock mining.
4. The speech from the throne, in connection with mineral development, states a drill core and sample storage building for the metallic minerals of the north is forecast for Lac la Ronge.

This, Mr. Speaker, is going to be an invaluable service to the hard rock mining of northern Saskatchewan. It's just another incentive to increased hard rock exploration.

We have, in the last few years, built a petroleum core lab. in this city and I am going to say that this petroleum core lab. has proved to be a very valuable service to the oil industry of the province. In fact I am going to tell you this petroleum core lab. is a first for Saskatchewan and has now been copied by Alberta and British Columbia.

5. His Honour's speech forecast further assistance to oil fields' roads; further resource road building will be carried out into mineral resource areas, and yet the opposition say that the speech from the throne hasn't got a thing.

6. The speech from the throne mentions new helium gas reserves and a possible helium industry within Saskatchewan.

7. His honour's speech reports the opening of the world's largest potash mine in Esterhazy. The speech further reports that another shaft at the site, and additional plant facilities will be constructed in this coming year and this further expansion at the potash mine is estimated to cost at least \$10 million.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned 7 very important forecasts on the mineral industry in Saskatchewan in the speech from the throne. These the Thatcherites brush off and they say His Honour's speech is empty, its got nothing.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kind of programs that have assisted the mining industry of Saskatchewan to grow in the past ten years at twice as fast as the Canadian average and in the last 18 years the fastest growing provincial mineral industry of Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, the opening in 1962 of this potash mine by the International Minerals and Chemical Corporation of Canada has been heralded as the outstanding mining news development for the whole of Canada. Mining magazines throughout Canada are still loaded with news of the world's largest and most modern potash plant in the industry. Have you ever heard the Thatcherites mention a decent word. Oh, yes, the other day off the air the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) finally mentioned the potash industry. But he attacked the government for collecting too much revenue from this industry and not spending enough money in this area. But take a look at the record. The mine was only opened up lately. We have only received \$46,000 in royalties. Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of years while the industry was establishing within the province we spent \$1,250,000 to help the area because of the industry establishing there. Give us a chance. But I do want to say this, that the potash industry appreciates what has been done by the province. In the amount of \$1,250,000 this was in the form of capital investment, in loans, in grants, in the building of highways and roads within the area that were necessary because of the Esterhazy potash mine.

Saskatchewan's mineral development in the past ten years has certainly given our people of Saskatchewan a more abundant living. I therefore say, Mr. Speaker, that the pledge given the people in 1960 of further expanding mineral resources, that we have implemented that pledge even beyond our fondest hopes.

**February 27, 1963**

I am going to touch on another pledge. A vigorous program to attract additional industries into the province. Mr. Speaker, every one with common sense knows that any nation or province that hopes to attract industry must first plan to acquire and provide large quantities of reasonably priced electrical energy and fuel or natural gas. The Liberals of this province, Mr. Speaker, prior to 1944 did not show any common sense. They did not believe in planning, they had no vision, they were completely stagnant, and all the province depended on was the agricultural economy. Prior to 1944 Saskatchewan did not have enough electrical energy in any one area to run a good blacksmith shop. In the first years of the CCF commencing with 1944, the CCF administration highlighted the rapid expansion of power, the exploration and development of gas and petroleum to provide potential industry large quantities of power and fuel or natural gas. The moment industry was assured of ample electrical and fuel energy, industry started to come into the province. Saskatchewan since 1944 to 1960 has had a most rapid diversification of its economy. In fact it has had a more rapid diversification of its economy than any other province of Canada except Alberta. And I mean by diversification, Mr. Speaker, that our non-farm sector of our economy, that is mining, manufacturing, construction, electrical power, have been growing faster than any other province in Canada except Alberta.

And again I am going to back this up with facts. If you check the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in their survey of production, it shows that in 1944 only 18 percent of the new value of commodities production came from the non-farm or industrial sector of economy. By 1960 the Dominion Bureau of Statistics show that 50 percent of our net wealth came from non-farm, or the industrial sector, although the farm production increased considerably too. In fact the D.B.S. show the following percentage increases in the net value of commodity production for all the province of Canada, and I am going to give it to you. Alberta had the greatest increase in the industrial sector of its economy, an increase of 522 percent; Saskatchewan came second with 430; British Columbia came next with 236; Manitoba came fourth with 232; Canadian average was 413 — where do you suppose the Liberal provinces of Canada are, New Brunswick, Quebec and Newfound are at the bottom as usual. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe too that the main reason why Alberta has progressed more than even we have in Saskatchewan is because Alberta threw the stagnant Liberal party out a lot earlier than we did.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but they did not allow any of their members to come back into the legislature to even sit in the opposition to undermine, to belittle, to underrate Alberta.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — Weed them out good, that's what we needed.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics shows that Saskatchewan has increased in general industrial development since 1944 by 430 percent, or the fastest industrial boom of all the provinces of Canada, except Alberta, which has had a greater boom. Mr. Speaker, again I am going to repeat that either the D.B.S. or the Liberals are not reporting the truth. I will leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and the people of the province of Saskatchewan, to decide who is truthful.

Mr. Speaker, a moment ago I had mentioned that the non-farm sector of our economy consisted of the following industries — mining, manufacturing, construction and electrical power. I have already proven by quoting the D.B.S. that in these industries combined we in Saskatchewan have had the greatest increase of all the provinces of Canada since 1944, except Alberta. I have talked on mining and I have shown you that in mining we have led all the provinces of Canada. Now I am going to go to manufacturing, and let us take a look at manufacturing, not only speaking in generalities but I am going to give you statistical evidence from the D.B.S. which is not CCF statistics, but Liberal-Conservative statistics.

Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I stated that any country or province must first develop and provide economically large blocks of electrical power and fuel before you could expect any industry or any increase in manufacturing. This was done, and it is only in the last few years that the manufacturing industry could establish itself anywhere in the province and be guaranteed sufficient power and fuel at reasonable rates. I cannot hope to take time out to name all the manufacturing industries that have come in but I am going to name a few of them.

One, a \$10 million cement industry that the Liberals did everything possible to undermine. They refused to provide a guaranteed loan, they forecast its bankruptcy and failure. Mr. Speaker, the plant has had a tremendous success. The loan has been paid off years ago. This plant was made possible due to Saskatchewan's booming oil and construction industry. And now it is reported that we have another cement plant going up on the outskirts of the city of Saskatoon too.

A \$20 million steel and pipe manufacturing industry the one that made the Leader of the Opposition sick the other day. And there again they did everything possible to destroy and discredit this industry. Again they foretold its failure. I want to say that the rapid development of oil and gas in the province made possible the steel and pipe industry in Saskatchewan. Other steel fabricating plants came into this province and located in Saskatchewan including the Dominion Bridge.

**February 27, 1963**

Transformer manufacturing industry — power made this possible in the province. A wire and cable industry, power and telephone expansion made this industry possible. A 500,000 paper bag industry, the common salt industry made it possible, sodium sulphate products. The boom in the construction industry in the province created a number of light aggregate and cement products manufacturing industry. Two multi-million dollar forest industries came into the province. Hardply at Saskatoon and the \$3 million wafer board industry in the town of Hudson Bay.

Mr. Speaker, the sewer and water program created a clay pipe and sewer tank industry, a plastic pipe industry in the province. A multimillion dollar co-op chemical plant was established in the province. This, Mr. Speaker, is only part of the industries that came into Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, while the Thatcherites belittle Saskatchewan's manufacturing industry I want to say that we have had a substantial share of manufacturing industries establish in this province.

Again let us check the D.B.S. The D.B.S. reports the following increased percentages in the net value of manufacturing, again in the period 1944 to 1960. It shows Alberta leading the provinces of the Dominion of Canada again with an increase of 356 percent; Saskatchewan came second with 194 percent; Ontario, the citadel of private enterprise, came third with 175 percent; the Canadian average was 162 percent. Do you, Mr. Speaker, wonder where the Liberal provinces are. New Brunswick's increase was only 154 percent. Quebec 135 percent; no wonder Quebec is socializing power.

**An Hon. Member:** — Too little and too late.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — And Newfoundland, you know the great Liberal province, 96 percent. Mr. Speaker, how can they think they are going to do better than their Liberal colleagues in other provinces of Canada?

Mr. Speaker, the D.B.S. showed that Saskatchewan had had the greatest increase in manufacturing in the period 1944 to 1960 of all the provinces of Canada, except Alberta. The Thatcherites, again I am going to say, continue to smear and belittle the province, and they call this stagnation. If it is stagnation, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has had the least stagnation of all the provinces, while the Liberal provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Newfoundland had the most stagnation.



Now let us look at the growth of the construction industry in Saskatchewan. Next to mining, construction has increased most rapidly in Saskatchewan. Increasing almost six-fold in terms of net value of production from 1944-1960.

Let us check the D.B.S. survey of production, page 27.

The figures show the following increases in the period 1944-1960.

Manitoba led with an increase of 669 percent. Alberta next with 643 percent. Saskatchewan third with 609 percent. Quebec and New Brunswick, two Liberal provinces were at the bottom.

**Mr. J.H. Staveley:** — Last year we did better . . .

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Well, I am giving you Liberal-Conservative statistics. If you have no faith in it, we have. I'm going to go on, I'm doing the speaking now.

Now, I'm leaving the construction industry and I'm now going to talk about the electrical power industry. Let's take a look at the growth of electrical energy in the province of Saskatchewan. The sinews or muscles of industry. The energy that turns all the wheels of industry. Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat again you can gauge your estimates on nations or provinces, the peak of stagnation or boom, on the rate of increase or decrease in the amount of electrical energy it purchases or uses.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I want to say again you can estimate its stagnation, also its boom, on whether or not, this energy is so integrated as to be available to the industry in any portion of the nation or the province. Under the Liberals, prior to 1944 we had no integration of power and we had no surplus power to integrate. I want to point out in Saskatchewan the rate of increase in power since 1944, has been double that of the national average. Our rate of increase in power has been the greatest of all the provinces of Canada, again, except Alberta. Taking in the period 1944 to 1960 again, Mr. Speaker, to prove this statement I am going to refer you to the D.B.S. survey of production, p. 25. The D.B.S. again shows the increase, percentage increase, for each province in the net value of electrical power, and these are the figures:

**February 27, 1963**

Alberta leads the provinces of Canada with 508 percent; Saskatchewan is next with 477 percent; British Columbia is third with 448 percent; Prince Edward Island is fourth with 425 percent; Newfoundland is fifth, a Liberal province up above the Canadian average finally. Ontario 336 percent. The Canadian average is 271 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to sum it up now. The non-farm sector of our economy is mining, manufacturing, construction, and electricity. In mining we lead every province in Canada. In manufacturing we are the second in Canada as far as increase is concerned. In construction we are third, in electrical expansion we are second.

Now the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) talked about investment of capital as one gauge and I want to agree with him. That investment of capital in a nation or province is another very important barometer, of general industrial expansion. I know that the opposition have tried to misinform the public, and this house, and tried to show that investment had lagged in Saskatchewan. The truth, Mr. Speaker, is just the opposite, and again, I am going to go to the D.B.S. to prove my statement.

I want to point out that in 1948 — 1948 is the first year the federal government has statistical information. In terms of private and public investment per capita, Saskatchewan at that time, ranked sixth among the provinces of Canada. Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, Liberal Manitoba at that time, Liberal Quebec, were ahead of Saskatchewan in 1948. By 1962, the D.B.S. shows that our per capita investment had risen to be the third province in the dominion of Canada . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — only surpassed by Alberta and British Columbia and we were 11 percent above the Canadian average, we were ahead of Manitoba that the Liberals talked about.

**Mr. Staveley:** — Are those not estimated figures?

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — But they are always correct. Again, Mr. Speaker, every Liberal province in Canada in 1962, was below the Canadian average. In fact I am going to tell you Liberal New Brunswick was on the lowest cross-bar of the investment ladders of Canada — way down there.

Now I want to turn here (I see he is not in his seat) to the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) speaking on

industrial stagnation. You know he talked about principles. I am going to show the record of the hon. member only two years ago, he was reported making this statement in the house, and I am going to read it; I quote the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) who yesterday again, parroted the stagnation story of the Thatcherites. But only two years ago he had this to say:

Of course, we have listened to the prophets of doom in the Liberal party for a great number of years. In 1948 their duly chosen leader shed many a crocodile tear because industry would not come to this province under a CCF government.

Between 1948 and 1949, and they have had three new leaders in the interim, they haven't varied one bit on this theme. It is customary for one who becomes adroit at using a musical instrument that he is able to make some variation on the theme, but we haven't seen any variation on the part of them at all. Still the same nonsense of stagnation. He has always been on the same theme. And then he goes on and he says

But by their actions one can only conclude that the Liberal party leaders would rather see no development in Saskatchewan at all, than see development take place under a CCF government. If the Liberal party did nothing to encourage industry coming into this province, it would be pardonable. But to try to discourage industry from coming into Saskatchewan, which has been done over the years, particularly by the Leader of the Liberal party, it is unpardonable indeed.

A man with high principles who over a period of a few months somersaulted right over to repeat, as he stated himself, nonsense on stagnation.

**An Hon. Member:** — Things sure change fast in Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — That will be his anniversary to the Liberal party, when the Prince Albert by-election was on, we will remember it.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Now I'm going to repeat another

**Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Now, I'm going to refer to another supposed to be great Liberal leader on industry, and some of his forecasting on elections.

February 27, 1963

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — All Liberal Leaders are great.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Walter Tucker.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who's that? He was big anyway.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — And I am going to read an excerpt from a speech he made in this legislature back on February 15th, 1949, and here is what he had to say and I quote:

As a result of their policies, (meaning the CCF policies) we are enduring stagnation in this province, whereas other provinces are going ahead by leaps and bounds.

**An Hon. Member:** — What year?

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — That was 1949. And then he goes on further and says:

We believe in all the things that I have mentioned, but the government opposite has lost the confidence of the people and were the people given an opportunity today this government would be turned and swept out of office.

**An Hon. Member:** — What year was that again?

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — That was in 1949 — this statement was made in 1949, we have heard the same thing now. You will remember that when we went to the elections in 1952, there were 22 Liberals on that side of the house, and when the clouds of battle cleared only 11 returned. I am going to say this, Mr. Speaker, when the election is called by this government and it will be called in good time, we are not going to go six years like they did when they were in power. I'll assure you of that. I'm confident that we will come back with a greater majority than we have sitting on this side of the house right now.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — Suckers, that sure should bring them on.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I know, I have given them facts to prove it, that the industrial picture of the Saskatchewan economy has been blooming over the past ten years, but the Thatcherites reply and they say "Ah, well, if there has been so much industrial expansion, why has the population of Saskatchewan grown so slowly?" This is the only theme they sing now. Well, I'm going to give them

an answer to that one. The answer is that they are not looking at the right figures. The Thatcherites are looking at total population figures, which include the rural areas, (the farming population) they should be looking at urban population figures. Mr. Speaker, it is this population that feeds the industry of this province or of any nation. The people that live in the towns and the cities. It is known to all the people of Canada that farm populations throughout the whole of Canada and the United States, have been declining for years. And Mr. Speaker, the rural areas are declining even today in most of the provinces of Canada. Rural or agricultural populations, Mr. Speaker, have been rapidly declining, mainly due to mechanization on the land, and also to the cost-price squeeze the Liberal federal government commenced in 1946.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — And to a lesser extent continued under the present Conservative government. It is only natural, Mr. Speaker, since Saskatchewan has the largest proportion of rural population of any province in Canada; the impact of this decline on the total population in Saskatchewan is, of course, going to be greater than in any other province of Canada. But let us take a look at the rural areas.

The other day when the hon. member from Melville, (Mr. Gardiner) was speaking, he gave some figures on Saskatchewan population since 1946, and you will remember, Mr. Speaker I asked him a question, I asked him to give me the figures for 1936 to 1946, when the Liberals were in power in this province; he jumped to his feet quickly and he said “I was hoping someone would ask that” but he continued on with his speech . . .

**Hon. Mr. Willis (Minister of Highways):** — He didn't answer it

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — And now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to give it to him. In 1936 the population of Saskatchewan had reached the record, 931 thousand people in this province. From 1936 to 1946, Mr. Speaker, we had a Liberal government in Ottawa all that time, and for eight of those ten years we had a Liberal government in the province of Saskatchewan. This was the period when the federal Liberal government was spending billions to build industries to assist manufacturing, to build new plants, and extend manufacturing, to manufacture the sinews of war. Why didn't we get some industry in Saskatchewan? We had the Liberals in Canada, we had the Liberals in Saskatchewan, but nothing came to the province. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker,

**February 27, 1963**

that these were the ten black years of Saskatchewan's history. The population of Saskatchewan during this ten year period, dropped from 931,000 to 830,000, almost a 100,000 people left the province of Saskatchewan, including the natural increase that we should have had. All gone.

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — They were fighting wars.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — The Liberal party was fighting a war in Saskatchewan for thirty-five years. We took over the province in 1944 and by 1946 two years later we stemmed the population loss.

By July, 1962, and again I am going to refer to the D.B.S. we regained the record population of 931,000 people.

Our highest population that we have had in the history of the province. Mr. Speaker, all our losses of population have been in the rural areas. The urban areas, therefore, must have absorbed in the towns and the cities, all the population that was lost in the rural areas. And it must have been absorbed into the industrial sector of the economy of the population.

Mr. Speaker, now I want to take a look at the D.B.S. to again prove my point. D.B.S. for example, gives for the years 1951 to 1956, the increase of population in the towns and the cities of every province in Canada and again, who had the greatest increase in population in the towns and cities of Canada except Alberta. Alberta increased 41 percent; the next province is Saskatchewan with 27.5 percent increase, the second highest; British Columbia was third with 24.5 per cent; Prince Edward Island was fourth with 23.4 percent; Ontario was 21.5 percent. The Canadian average is 21.5 percent. Where are the Liberal provinces of Canada. Down again.

Now, if you further check the D.B.S. for the population increase of the cities of Canada. Here is the information that you will get . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — We are talking about Saskatchewan, not just the cities . . .

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — We've got cities in Saskatchewan . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — They were here before you were born.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — The rate of growth of the city population, and this time the D.B.S. shows the figures from 1956 to 1961. Therefore, I am going to take the most recent figures. It shows

that the greatest increase in cities was Alberta, again it leads the field by 26.2 percent; Saskatchewan second with 21.2 percent; Ontario is third with 20.5 percent. The Canadian average is 16 and where are the Liberal provinces, down below as usual.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I should refer, but here is a headline that says "Regina's growth rates third spot". Well, I am going to read from this article and this comes from the Leader Post. They don't like us too well. The Leader Post reports on January 5, 1962, and I am going to quote:

Dealing with percentage growth of all cities in Canada, including metropolitan areas, Calgary is placed first. The records say Calgary's population was 96.5 percent greater in 1961 than it was 10 years earlier. Edmonton was second with 90.8 percent. Saskatoon was third with 79.3 percent. Regina was fourth with 57.3 percent. Toronto is fifth; Sudbury is sixth; Ottawa is seventh; Kitchener is eight; Montreal is ninth.

Where are the Liberals? Where is Manitoba? If you want facts, we will give it to you, and don't talk in terms of generalities. Back your statements up.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — They were up before you were born . . .

**Mr. Kuziak:** — You sure need to study. The hon. member for Melville, (Mr. Gardiner) talked the other day very highly of Manitoba. No cities in Manitoba are in this list, they are not even in this class. Now, I am going to refer back, Mr. Speaker, to the speech from the throne. Out of 45 paragraphs in His Honour's speech, 18 paragraphs are devoted to reporting and forecasting developments in the general industrial sector of our economy. The programs he enumerated in his speech shows the people of Saskatchewan that we intend to continue our rate of growth of general industrial productivity, with the hopes of surpassing even Alberta and becoming tops in all of Canada.

Our pledge, Mr. Speaker, made in 1960, a vigorous program to attract international industry is being implemented at a very, very rapid rate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**February 27, 1963**

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I want to say that this increase in industrial development is truly giving our people of Saskatchewan a far more abundant living than we have ever had. The speech from the throne devotes 18 paragraphs to this pledge and I am going to enumerate them.

His Honour's speech forecasts legislative and budgetary programs to further this economic growth.

It reports good progress and forecasts continued and rapid development of the South Saskatchewan River Dam development. The one that we wouldn't have had, had a federal Liberal government been re-elected in 1957.

The speech from the throne reports on the great potash industry and forecasts a multimillion dollar expansion.

The Liberals call this, of course, nothing, empty, stagnation.

The speech from the throne forecasts a possible helium industry in Saskatchewan.

The speech from the throne forecasts another gas pipe line, and here, of course, I should mention the multimillion dollar steel and pipe order for the steel mill and the pipe line. This, the Saskatchewan Thatcherites call nothing.

The speech from the throne forecasts multimillion dollar power and gas expansion to reach more customers. The Liberals call this nothing.

The speech from the throne forecasts a multimillion dollar co-op chemical plant. The Liberals all this nothing.

Changes in regulations and incentives to petroleum industry to drill deeper horizons.

Continued services and provide further incentives to hard rock mineral explorations.

To provide further research services to industry generally and to promote further extension of the research lab. at the Saskatchewan University Campus, and here again, the Thatcherites say, this is nothing, it is stagnation.

Forecasts programs to encourage and assist industry to establish in Saskatchewan.

The hon. member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) better listen to this one. The speech from the throne



forecasts the expenditure, or completion of the expenditure of some \$7 million on technical and vocational schools to be completed in 1963 in Saskatoon, in Moose Jaw, in Regina, in Prince Albert and the Thatcherites, including the hon. member from Prince Albert, say this is nothing.

I sometimes wonder where the nothing is.

I would now like to take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Just table it, Alex, so we can all go home.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I would like to put the Leader of the Opposition straight on the charge of too many civil servants in this government.

**Mr. Boldt:** — That ought to be quite a trick.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Okay, listen to it. The truth is that Saskatchewan has one of the smallest civil servant rolls in Canada, and I'm going to back it up. I am going to say this, Mr. Speaker, that there is no use trying to compare the number of civil servants in Saskatchewan to 1944 when they were in office. In my own department, Mr. Speaker, we now have five thousand oil wells to supervise; they had nothing.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — What did they need civil servants for? We have now some 200 gas wells, yes they had a few that petered out on them a few days after, in my area, up around Kamsack.

**Hon. Mr. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources):** — That was Gardiner gas . . .

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — We have now some 1600 miles of gas pipe line. They had some 10 miles. All revenue to the government from mineral resources, royalties, and of these I gave you the mineral resources, royalties, and of these I gave you the figures a while ago, but I am going to repeat them again. 1944 it was 233 thousand. You know the other day, the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) my goodness, he was going to give them credit, all kinds of credit — he said the revenue from mineral resources, and he said I'll take a pot shot and guess \$600 thousand, and I said \$200 thousand, and even I was wrong.

**February 27, 1963**

I checked and I find out the total revenue of the mineral resources in 1944 was only \$233 thousand and from the mine at Flin Flon it was only \$187 thousand. Well, anyway, the revenues then were less than a quarter of a million dollars; today our revenues are over \$25 million dollars, one hundred times greater.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I am going to refer the Leader of the Opposition to the D.B.S. on provincial government employment. As of December 31st, 1961, the D.B.S. reports on the number of civil servants for every ten thousand population in eight of the provinces of Canada, and why eight of the provinces of Canada, because two refused to submit their information. One is a Liberal province.

**An Hon. Member:** — That figures . . .

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — This should be a pretty good gauge to see whether we have too many civil servants. Saskatchewan, out of the eight provinces, ranks fifth in terms of the number of civil servants per 10 thousand population, and this Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that we have got programs that don't exist in the other provinces of Canada. Now I am going to give you the standing of these provinces. Prince Edward Island, the little island, leads all of Canada with 137 civil servants for 10 thousand population. Well, they could be forgiven, it's a small population. Take a look at the next one, a Liberal province, Newfoundland. Newfoundland is second with the greatest number of civil servants in Canada, 111 civil servants for 10 thousand population.

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — Liberal progress

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Alberta is third with 85 per 10 thousand; Nova Scotia is next, fourth, with 78; then comes Saskatchewan with 77; Ontario with 67; New Brunswick, a Liberal province, 60 — pretty well down, credit to them; Manitoba with 55 — I should say credit and maybe not, it all depends what programs they have.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — They haven't got any.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — We are, if you count the provinces from the bottom, we are the third lowest with the number of civil servants per 10 thousand population in spite of the fact that we've got programs in Saskatchewan that no other government in Canada has.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — And good ones too.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Now I know I can go on for another hour. I don't think it's going to help them anyway.

**An Hon. Member:** — Give it to them anyway. I think it will help them. Give them a chance, Alex.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have proven that the speech from the throne is loaded with programs and forecasts designed to implement our sacred obligation and undertaking given to our people in 1960. Yes, implementing this blueprint for more abundant living for the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to say that we on this side of the house are humbly grateful to our great people of the province of Saskatchewan in all walks of life who have helped us lay the plans and blueprints so well since 1944 and who have entrusted us to lead them straight on and upward to obtain greater records for a more abundant living for our people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — I think I am going to deliver the shortest address to this assembly. I just want to take about two minutes as my contribution to this debate, and then this gentleman can have the floor.

**Hon. Frank Meakes (Minister of Co-operation and co-operative development):** — Who has the floor, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I will have to say that you both rose at about the same time, so I shall recognize the member of the opposition so it will be back and forth.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Thank you, I won't keep you long. I was interested in the reams and reams of statistics read off by the minister who just sat down. I wondered how many people in this house who were listening to him, or even he, could repeat any of it right now. And while he was going on extolling the virtues of this government and the great increases in everything in Saskatchewan, he said we have the most flourishing growth of population and that is the ultimate end by which you might judge growth. It struck me rather strangely because I was just reading the Saskatchewan vital statistics for 1961, and if you will pardon me for reading a speech, Mr. Speaker, I am going to read a speech, not prepared by myself but prepared by dedicated civil

**February 27, 1963**

servants in the interests of putting facts, not political propaganda. Speaking of population, on page 8 of the report just tabled in the legislature about half an hour ago, it says the population of Saskatchewan at June 1st, 1961 was 925,181, an increase of 10,181 over June, 1960. The report goes on to say this actual population increase is lower than the natural increase, that is extent of live births over deaths. It is lower during that year by 6,706. The minister said the people left the farms and went into the cities because there is no place else to go; according to this report somebody, 6706 people disappeared — they were born and they didn't die — but we lost 6,706 people. The report says since the 1956 census year Saskatchewan's population increased by 5.1 percent while the total Canadian population increased by 13.4 percent. Hence, Saskatchewan's population growth is 2½ times smaller than the national growth. So says the vital statistics for the province of Saskatchewan speaking of population in Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — About as good as the rest of the figures.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that I am prepared to accept this research at accuracy done by these dedicated civil servants rather than to the political ballyhoo we heard this afternoon and it is on these conditions that the people will judge the speech submitted by the minister. These are the facts as laid out by a verified report of the government department of vital statistics for Saskatchewan, and if we are to take anything at face value, it must be this. And Saskatchewan's growth in population is 2½ times smaller than the national growth.

I couldn't lose the opportunity to place before the legislature this statistic as given by the Department of Vital Statistics concerning the tremendous loss in population that was suffered in the province of Saskatchewan.

That is all I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker. The shortest speech delivered in the house, but I think one of the most potent ones.

**An Hon. Member:** — You didn't even answer the question.

**Hon. Frank Meakes (Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development):** — Mr. Speaker, one thing I do like is the modesty of the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron).

Mr. Speaker, in rising in the dying moments of the debate, the traditional debate in reply to the speech from the throne, I would first like to say to you, and I know that

all members of this house appreciate the fact that when you went on your trip to Nigeria representing this legislature that we all know and feel that you brought honor to this legislature.

I would like also to congratulate the mover and the seconder. I am sure their constituents are proud of them as we on this side of the house are. They certainly brought a great honor to our political party.

I also would like to congratulate the hon. member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) on his election. I am sorry I was not in this house the day that he gave his speech, it wasn't that I didn't want to hear him, it was that I couldn't be here. I hope that his stay is pleasant and I also hope that it is short.

**Mr. D.G. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Lost a buck on the election.

**Hon. Mr. Meakes:** — Oh, that's nothing. I listened with interest to the Leader of the Opposition give his traditional speech, and I think it is so because there was practically nothing different from last year's, I don't think it was even quite as loud as last year. There was one thing that he mentioned that set my memory into motion, Mr. Speaker, and this was when he talked about when the Liberal government was elected in this province that they would form an opportunity state instead of a welfare state.

Well, my memory went back, Mr. Speaker, to that opportunity state under a Liberal government. It was an opportunity state all right. At the time when I was a young man growing up, and when the young men were looking for opportunities, what opportunity was there? There was the opportunity to go and work for my neighbor all winter at \$5 a month — of course the government paid my neighbor \$5 to feed me and I still think my neighbor lost money. There was the opportunity for people to go without medical care, and this happened many times. There was the opportunity for people to go without hospital care, and this happened many times. I said to this house before, and I say it again, my memory goes back to those days when my father, as municipal secretary, had to make the decision as to whether one of the rate payers of that municipality when he entered the hospital, whether the municipality could guarantee payment. Of course the hospitals, I want to say, were not to blame, they were bankrupt under a Liberal government . . .

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — So was everybody else . . .

February 27, 1963

**Hon. Mr. Meakes:** — Mr. Speaker, there was the opportunity . . .

**Hon. Mr. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — It's a late conversion . . .

**Hon. Mr. Meakes:** — . . . there was an opportunity for a farmer to grow beef at two cents a pound, and then pay the freight on that beef to Winnipeg. There was the opportunity to raise, keep chickens and raise eggs for six cents a dozen, and I well remember my sister-in-law saying, when she took twelve dozen eggs to town and got six cents a dozen — 72¢ — I'll tramp them in the ground before anybody eats them at that price again. Of course, it has often been said there was the opportunity to be evicted off your land, and this was done in many cases. There was the opportunity for mortgage companies and investment companies to buy land for taxes, for two years taxes. And there was quite a number of companies got hold of land very cheaply that they turned round and sold when the war started and they made big money out of it.

Yes, my friends, this was the opportunity state of the Liberal government and I want to suggest to you that this could be well the opportunity state if by some freak of chance, maybe 1 million to 1, that a Liberal government was returned to the province under the leadership they now have.

I am sorry the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) is not in his seat. All I want to say with regard to what he said, when he attacked the president of the co-op union for making a statement last summer, I want to say that the co-operative movement, not only in Saskatchewan but the co-operative movement in western Canada showed the faith in his ability and his integrity and his sincerity and his belief in the co-operative movement when that man just recently was made president of Federated Co-operatives which reaches across the three prairie provinces.

I am quite willing to admit what the hon. member said when he said that most of the legislation, co-operative legislation was brought into this house by a Liberal government. This I don't deny. And he went and he said that co-operatives should be politically neutral, and with this I agree. But if the Liberal party continues as they did last year, during the throne speech, and defending operation freedom and Canadian Chambers of Commerce which were attacking the co-operative movement, the co-operative movement could well be forgiven if they are wondering if the Liberal party as a party had adopted a policy of being anti-co-operative. The Liberals of the twenties and thirties did. I agree, support the co-operative movement and men like the hon. member for Arm River, (Mr. Danielson) deserve a great deal of credit for their unqualified support of the co-operative, and I want to here give

tribute to the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and I believe that if you check the records you will find that he had helped guide as much if not more co-operative legislation through the committees of this house as any other member and I give him this credit. The trouble is today that the Liberals, like the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) apparently haven't the vision of a co-operative society such as their leaders of another day had.

The hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) went on and he said that the Family Farm Credit Act had not been successful — he said it had been of no use. But I want to point out to this house that some 450 young men have taken advantage of that legislation. Under that legislation over \$4.8 millions have been lent out. And I think the most important thing that that legislation has done is that it hurried a Conservative government in Ottawa to do something about the credit Act that they had on the books, a Liberal government for 22 years in Ottawa had done nothing about it, and certainly the amendments to the federal Act have been good, since we brought in our legislation.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition said — I am now going to quote from a radio broadcast that he made on February 7, 1962:

In regard to co-operatives, Liberal Leader Ross Thatcher today said that the co-operative movement stands in danger of losing its traditional policy of political neutrality. He added that there is strong evidence to suspect that many employees of the Department of Co-operatives, as he put it, are doing nothing except propaganda work for the CCF government.

Now, I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that if this is so, I wish he would put on the record of this house, or if he doesn't want to do that, or might like to give it to me, if he can prove that employees of the Department of Co-operation have been doing political work, I'll do something about it, but he can't do it, and I say this that until he proves it he had better shut up.

**An Hon. Member:** — Tell him if you like.

**Hon. Mr. Meakes:** — Of course he never was too accurate or too truthful in his accuracy. He was wrong as usual. He went on and he quoted, and I now quote again:

M.L.A.s will examine departmental expenditures in detail during the forthcoming legislative session. They will question why the number of employees in the Department of Co-operation was changed from 7 in 1944 to 60 in 1961.

**February 27, 1963**

But he was wrong again, as usual. In 1944 there weren't 7, Mr. Speaker there were 26. In 1962 there weren't 60 but 56. This I suggest, was just another one of his broad sweeping statements.

**An Hon. Member:** — Poppycock. Wrong again.

**Hon. Mr. Meakes:** — And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Liberal party, and I believe there are many of them in the Liberal party who believe in the co-operative movement, they had better start showing that they believe in it, by giving more than mouth service, by giving it more than lip service, by giving it a bit of the other type of service.

**An Hon. Member:** — A little more than political service.

**Hon. Mr. Meakes:** — I am sorry the member for Maple Creed (Mr. Cameron) left his seat. He got up and he quoted from, yes his Herculean effort, in a long speech when he quoted from vital statistics. I just want to say this, that the hon. member, the Minister of Mineral Resources, didn't deny these statistics. All he was doing was relating the urban growth, what had happened to the people who had left the farms, they had gone into the cities and he was relating this to the industrial growth of the province.

I am sorry also that my hon. friend the member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) isn't in his seat. I was amused. He went on and he talked about how the government had lost four by-elections. Of course it was only three, one was a deferred election — he said we should resign and go to the people. Well, I suggest one way, if he really believes this, if he really thinks that by-elections will defeat this government and my hon. friend, the member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) talked about this same thing — that the hon. member from Milestone might well resign his seat. If he thought this would be another victory for the Liberal party, why didn't he resign his seat, clear his conscience, create a by-election to prove this point of his and to vindicate his actions of last May. He might, while he has done this, he might have satisfied those people who in 1960 worked so hard to elect him.

My friend, I will be speaking on the budget debate and at this time I am dealing with my department. Today I am just dealing with some of the false statements or wrong statements that have been made from across the way. One other thing I would just like to deal for a minute with is medicare.

I think we should just take a look to see — let us look back as to why this government brought in a medicare act. They brought it in because of the request and the support of many organizations across this province. I have here a clipping



of March 16, 1962, Leader Post, "Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities went on record Friday favoring prepaid medical care for the whole province". Farmers union in their brief to the government said — I quote in part on page 3,

In conclusion we reiterate our support for a compulsory prepaid medical care program in Saskatchewan as a positive step toward providing the humanitarian aids for all the people and raising the general health standards of our province.

Saskatchewan Federation of Labor, Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Associations in their brief to the government on page 2:

Assuming that municipalities can insure their indigent people, it is quite evident that a medical insurance plan would help solve the dilemma that many municipal councils find themselves in from time to time. Such a plan would insure councils that the responsibility towards their indigents could be properly carried out and at the same time would minimize the possibility of budget deficiency due to uncontrollable expenditure.

Let us look for a moment, Mr. Speaker, at the people who oppose medicare. Well, first of all, I ought to be correct, who opposed the legislation as passed in this house. Well, first of all there was the Liberal party. And then of course, I believe the Leader of the Tory party, provincial Tory party, Mr. Pederson opposed it. Mr. Kelln of the Social Credit opposed it. Of course, then we come down to the College of Physicians and Surgeons, they opposed it, and then we have this group, my Hon. Leader referred to as the Kick on Door group, I have another name for it; have been using it for months; it is the Kill our Democracy group. This was the group who were actually the stooges of the doctors and the Liberal party. And my hon. friend, he is not in his seat, the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) I know spoke at a K.O.D. rally in Yorkton, and I am sure there were other members who did the same.

It is interesting to note that after it was all over that the K.O.D. they weren't going to release their financial statement; they didn't want to make public who had supplied their money. I have here a clipping of October 16, 1962 of the Leader Post, headed K.O.D. silent on finances. "The provincial Keep Our Doctors Association probably won't issue a financial statement until its work is finished." Well, when is its work going to be finished? I have here a clipping and I think this really shows what they are. The clipping here from the Star Phoenix September 13, 1962.

**February 27, 1963**

K.O.D. will expand activities to other political fields. Saskatchewan Keep Our Doctors committee will expand its activities to investigate fields of provincial legislation outside of medicare. Its president Rodney Thompson said Wednesday night. High on the list he said, in an interview, are the Departments of Education and Social Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, just before I sit down I just want to say this, that after July 1st, as far as I was concerned medicare was not the important dispute, as far as I was concerned. The important thing after July 1st, as far as I was concerned was the upholding of the law, the fulfilment of democracy.

Now I am just going to quote from, it is certainly no CCF paper — I'll admit I don't think it is a Liberal paper either, the Globe and Mail — in their report on business of October 30, 1962:

The battle of medicare will be fought in the Canadian area which is a democratic area. Medicare will be opposed by some people on the grounds of principle and supported by some other people on the same grounds. It will be attacked by some as the wrong thing to do at any time and by some others as the wrong thing to do at this particular time. It will be attacked and supported in total, and attacked and supported in part.

They will be entitled to argue, to denounce, to proclaim, and in the end to use their provincial and federal votes in an effort to enforce their wishes. Out of all this tumult, shouting and balloting, a democratic solution will eventually arise.

This is the point on which the rules may hurt but must still apply. Canadians have the right to disagree with the law, but once a law has been duly passed by a duly elected government, then you do not have the right to disobey that law.

President John Kennedy, recently spoke on the same matter, in another context. He was addressing himself to the students of the University of Mississippi, and what he says has validity for the citizens of any democracy. In a government of laws, and not of men, no man, however prominent or powerful, and no mobs, however unruly or boisterous, is entitled to defy a court of law.

If this country should ever reach the point where any man, or group of men, by force, or threat of force, could long defy the commands of our court, in constitution, then no law would be sure of its writ and no citizen would be safe from his neighbor.

Mr. Speaker, this was why I worried more, last July 1st, about keeping our democracy than I did about medicare. I think that this was the important issue. Mr. Speaker, I see it is five o'clock or one minute to, and I understand that this is the time of voting.

There are many more things I would like to say, many more things that I would like to give a report on, but I will do this in the next address.

I must say I am happy to say that I will support the motion.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 32**

**Messieurs**

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

**NAYS — 19**

Thatcher	McFarlane	Horsman
Klein	Gardiner	Coderre
Batten (Mrs.)	Staveley	MacDougall
McCarthy	Foley	Snedker
Barrie	Guy	Gallagher
Danielson	Boldt	Steuart
Cameron		

February 27, 1963

## COMMITTEE TO AMEND STANDING ORDERS

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Lloyd.

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

**Mr. Thatcher (Morse):** — While we are debating this particular motion, I have one or two questions that I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am afraid you have lost your right. You spoke on this debate before it was adjourned. Members that spoke were the Premier, Mr. Thatcher, Mr. Brockelbank, and Mr. Snedker adjourned it.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, Sir, very respectfully I would say that I have not spoken, I might have asked a question, but certainly I have not spoken on this motion, and this is a fairly important motion, and . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I can't help it, I have to follow the rules of the house which are laid down for me to guide the house, and I have to say that you spoke on this question, the same as the Provincial Treasurer. He spoke very briefly, but he has also lost his right to speak any further on this debate.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — But, Mr. Speaker, I think that the record will show you that I most emphatically have not spoken on this motion. I would like my privilege of speaking now, not at length, but it is my right as a member . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! You exercised your right the other day.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — At that time you would have been in order to speak further, but you did not . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I am telling you as a MLA that I have not spoken on this motion. Now are you calling me a liar, Sir. You did not hear me, because I have not spoken, Mr. Speaker.

**Premier Lloyd:** — The Leader of the Opposition rose in his place, and did speak when the motion was under consideration. He pointed out, as I recall it, that he had really no objection and very little to say about it, but some of the other members on his side did wish to have something to say about it, and at that point took his seat and the hon. member from Saltcoats, (Mr. Snedker) adjourned it.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — May I say a further word. All I said, Mr. Speaker, was that the hon. member from Melville, (Mr. Gardiner) was unavoidably out of the city and asked that this matter be held over. You permitted the debate to be adjourned. Now I think the record will show this, and I think it would be unfair, Sir, if you do not let me speak at this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have to rule, according to the rules of this house. You pretty well repeated what you said at that time, the Provincial Treasurer rose after you and said equally about as much and then the member from Saltcoats adjourned the debate. So I must rule that you have already spoken . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You are unfair, and prejudiced and you have been making such rulings all session . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . and you have no right. You are the most prejudiced Speaker that we have had for a long time. You are not being fair, because I did not speak in this debate . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I order you to withdraw . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, I will not withdraw . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Then I have no alternative other than to name you.

**Mr. Snedker:** — I move this house has no confidence in the Speaker, seconded by the hon. member . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Sit down. Order! You have spoken now.

**February 27, 1963**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I have not . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am well aware of the facts, that the Leader of the Opposition spoke very briefly at that time . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I didn't speak on that debate, Mr. Speaker. It was adjourned. You are being most unfair and prejudiced . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have ruled that you have spoken, and I have ordered you to withdraw that statement or else I have no alternative but to name you . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, you can do what you like? I'm not withdrawing it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Then I have no alternative but to name you.

**Mr. Danielson:** — As an older member of the house, for God's sake, this sort of thing is ridiculous. It is the member's right to hear and ask, and because of a member being absent the debate was held over and he has asked to speak on the subject. This is the most ridiculous thing I have ever seen in my life. And I hope that for the future peace and welfare of parliament and controlling this house that something be done to rectify these rules. This is absolutely ridiculous . . .

**Hon. Mr. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would refer Your Honor to Beauchesne's rules of debate no. 134,

In case a member persists in using unparliamentary language, the Speaker will be compelled to name him, which is equivalent to submitting his conduct to the judgment of the house. The member should then explain and withdraw and it will be for the house . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I have a right to speak . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — On the point of order, further —

it will be for the house to consider what course to follow in reference to him. If

the explanation is deemed sufficient, some member will move that it be accepted, in case the offending member does not explain and persists in remaining in the house, the motion shall forthwith be made, preferably by the leader of the house, that the member for so and so, be suspended for so many days from service of the house. If the offender does not then obey the order to retire, the sergeant-at-arms will come up to him and touch him on the shoulder. If he still resists, the sergeant-at-arms shall send for his constables and several of them will appear to help him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention to the very serious situation that this house is in, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a way out of this difficulty.

If the hon. member for Morse, (Mr. Thatcher) will withdraw the imputations which he made against the Speaker, and if the house will accept that withdrawal, then I think it is probably a fair statement to say that the Speaker need not enforce the rule against his speaking twice, so long as no hon. member objects, but I suggest that the rules of the house are often waived, by unanimous consent, and if my hon. friend complies with the discipline of the rules and then wishes to speak, I know I for one will not object to him speaking twice. It seems to me that that is a way out.

**Premier Lloyd:** — If I may comment further. I think that everybody in the house would prefer to believe that the Leader of the Opposition made his remarks in a moment of some tension and anger, and everybody would hope that he might withdraw the remarks which he has made in regard to the Speaker of the legislature. If that were done, Mr. Speaker, and I would be prepared to concur with the line of suggestion which the Attorney General has been following, as it is correct that in a technical sense, the Leader of the Opposition did speak. He spoke in part by way of a question, in part by way of a request, and the debate was adjourned by another member on his side of the house before he had a chance to comment on it. I would like to hope, Mr. Speaker, that we could so manage our affairs here that the Leader of the Opposition would admit that a statement made in error and not in keeping with the propriety of this legislature, and that at that point, again, if we could agree that if the point on which his right to speak on this motion was rather a technical one, then perhaps start from there.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I was only asking for what I believe was my right. The right to speak. I think the Premier was fair in coming half way, so I will go the other half way. I may say, Mr. Speaker,

**February 27, 1963**

that I have always believed that you tried to do your job, and if I said you were prejudiced, then I would apologize at this time; I would feel that if I were not allowed to speak that you were being prejudiced, but . . .

**Mr. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — On a point of order. Just for a matter of clarification and I know that there are rules, and that sometimes there is some leeway given, but on different occasions in this house the Leader of the Opposition may have been up and asked a request by virtue of the fact that he is the Leader of the Opposition, and there are times when the Premier does the same sort of thing for the government on the other side. And I would think in a case such as has just come forward here this afternoon, I would think that there may be times, when this could be considered a part of the debate, because after all on behalf of the members on this side, he was requesting something of this legislature.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I will accept the Leader of the Opposition's withdrawal, but I cannot change the rules of the house myself, but if the Leader of the Opposition wishes to rise and ask the house if they would consider permission for him to speak again, because he felt he hadn't said before what he wished and if the house wants to grant that privilege, that is up to the house; they control their own destiny, but I can only enforce the rules as they are now, and it must be the Leader of the Opposition's request of the house, and not me that asks the house to change the ruling.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, then I would like to ask permission now to speak on this motion Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Leader of the Opposition has requested permission to speak on this motion, believing that he hadn't spoken before and said he wished to. Is it the pleasure of the house to grant the request?

**Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I only wanted a minute or two anyway. This motion has to do with radio broadcasting and the time that we allow or allocate for members to speak.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is on the wrong motion.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, I don't think I am on the wrong motion at all. Am I on the wrong motion here? What! Where is the radio



motion, I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

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

Motion agreed to.

### CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF RADIO BROADCASTING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Thurston (Lumsden)** moved:

That the first report of the select standing committee on radio broadcasting of selected proceedings be now concurred in.

**Mr. Gardiner (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak for a few moment on this motion, I might say that I happen to be a member of the committee that dealt with the report. I think with regard to the division of time as such, the opposition was prepared to accept the division as far as the allocation of the actual time was concerned, as between the government and the official opposition.

However, at that time there were certain requests made of the government by our members on the committee, asking that they give fair, and I believe, just, consideration to the request of the opposition for permission to have one of the final radio times of one of the major debates in this house.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the official opposition in so doing, had made a reasonable request to the government in this matter. I am quite certain that any one will realize that the radio time in this house is paid for by all the taxpayers in this province. I am quite certain also that for that reason, that both sides of the argument in this house, the position of the government and the position of the opposition should have equal representation in this house and particularly on radio time, when the radio time is being paid for by the taxpayers of this province.

In being prepared to go along with the division on time, we are not satisfied and have never been satisfied, with the division but in a house which, of course, is controlled by the government majority, it doesn't leave the opposition very much choice. Eventually, they have to battle this thing out every year, but to accept the position that is placed before them by the government side of the house. However, I think it is only fair to suggest that once in a while the government should at least give some consideration to the requests of the opposition in matters of this type, where the expenditure is being made by all the taxpayers of this province.

**February 27, 1963**

At the time this request was made in committee, we were told that it would be given consideration, then we were told also that the Premier had agreed to the request of the last speaking time in one of the debates, but that it had to be considered by the members themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after that was done, then there was the members on the other side of the house who did not agree to the request, and they came back with the offer that they would give a few minutes on the last day of the debate, in each particular debate.

This was not the request of the opposition. All this is, is a further division of the present radio time in this house. It was not giving equal rights to the opposition in any way, shape, or form, over and above what they had had before. What was requested in the radio committee was that the opposition be given the final speaking time, which is not the final speaking time on the debate, it is only the final speaking time on the debate that goes over the air to the people in this province. We were asking that right on one of these debates, and we felt that it was a just and fair and reasonable request for us to make.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the government has refused this request, and I think for that reason it leaves the opposition no alternative but to again bring this matter of radio broadcasting squarely before the public in this province. The government has the right to present every motion on the air, and then demand the right of having the final say on all the major motions on the air, and I don't think there is anyone in this province who would consider that that is a fair attitude for the government to take in this particular matter.

As I said before, there is probably not much the opposition can do, because the majority happens to be on the other side, and they can push anything that they so desire, but I think the people of this province realize that they are paying for this broadcast, as taxpayers, they will feel that the opposition should have just treatment on the part of the government in relationship to these broadcasts and to the debates as such.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks I want to move, seconded by Mr. McFarlane, the member for Qu'Appelle, the following amendment that all the words after the word "that" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

The first report of the select standing committee on radio broadcasting of special proceedings be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the committee, with instructions that it be amended to provide for the allocation to the official opposition, of the final radio time on one of the major debates.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it might be appropriate now to talk about another matter, as far as this radio broadcasting is concerned. I rise to ask the Premier, or the chairman of the radio committee, whichever the case may be, why radio station CKRM was cut off the broadcast . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member is out of order. We are now dealing with the amendment, and I think if you would reserve your comments until after we have dealt with the amendment, one way or the other, you would maybe get yourself better in order, so that we could proceed with the main motion, rather than just on the amendment. The amendment deals with one specific thing.

The amendment was negatived.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may just take a moment, I would like to know why radio station CKRM was cut off these provincial broadcasts. After all, this was the station which originated these broadcasts; it carried these broadcasts for many years, and then two weeks before the session it was suddenly told by Mr. Bothwell, the government's publicity man, that they would have no programs this year.

I have a letter in my hand from one of the former officials of this company. "On my arrival back, I was informed of something that particularly galled me."

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It was the fact that the government cut off CKRM . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I'm afraid that the member is to some extent out of order on this motion. This is just a division of radio time.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, very respectfully, this has to do with the radio committee. Now, I am only going to be two minutes and I hope we are not going through this hassle again. Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the radio broadcasts; I have a legitimate grievance to raise.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have no doubt you have, but at the same time they should be raised on the estimates where the minister is responsible, and not the division of times.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Very respectfully, Sir, this is the radio committee. I

think I can talk about this matter at this time and be in perfect order. I would like to proceed . . .

**Premier Lloyd:** — On a point of order. I think if one examines the terms of reference for the radio committee, it has to do with allocation, it has nothing, as I understand it, to do with the selection of the station which may originate the broadcasts.

The motion was that the matter of division of radio time, arranged for the current session, be referred to the select standing committee on radio broadcasting, the said committee to report their recommendations with all convenient speed.

The question which the hon. member (Mr. Thatcher) is raising now is clearly outside of the terms of reference of this committee. This is not to say that the hon. member does not, and shall not, have a chance to raise it. He can raise it in one of two ways, either by means of questions when the estimates are before the house, or by the means of some motion specifically with regard to his point, but he is out of order at this point.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am afraid that I must agree with the Premier as he expressed the sentiments that I was trying to convey to the member who was speaking. It is not a matter of wanting to curtail the debate or cut it off, but this is not the committee which engaged the radio time, it was just a committee considering a division of it, and I, therefore, will say, with all due respect to the Leader of the Opposition, that his remarks at this time are not on this motion.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — May I ask you one question, Mr. Speaker? What committee is it that decides which stations will carry these broadcasts? Is it not the radio committee? All right, I will raise it at the appropriate time.

The question being put on the motion, it was agreed to on the following recorded division;

**YEAS — 27**  
**Messieurs**

Lloyd	Kramer	Semchuk
Johnson	Willis	Perkins
Brown	Thurston	Thiessen
Blakeney	Davies	Snyder
Brockelbank	Turnbull	Stevens
Walker	Stone	Dahlman
Nollet	Whelan	Kluzak
Kuziak	Thibault	Peterson
Cooper (Mrs.)	Michayluk	Brotten

**NAYS — 17**  
**Messieurs**

Thatcher  
McCarthy  
Barrie  
Danielson  
Cameron  
McFarlane

Gardiner  
Staveley  
Foley  
Guy  
Boldt  
Horsman

Coderre  
MacDougall  
Snedker  
Gallagher  
Steuart

The assembly adjourned at 5:45 o'clock p.m.