

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**20th Day**

**Wednesday, March 13, 1963.**

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

On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City):** — Before the orders of the day, I would like to call the attention of the members of the legislature to a very fine group of students up here in the west gallery. They come from Grade 8, Wascana School, and they have their teacher, Mrs. Howe, with them. I am sure we all wish to welcome them to the house this afternoon and we hope they will enjoy their stay with us very much.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — Today I would like to welcome to the gallery this afternoon a fine group of students from the Sutherland School, which is part of the Saskatoon school system and in Hanley constituency. I want to welcome also, on behalf of the members of the house, the teachers who are here with them, Mr. Tetrow and Mrs. Henderson. I hope they enjoy the afternoon. If they had consulted me before they came I would have advised them to come yesterday, but not having consulted me I hope that they will enjoy their stay here anyway, and have a profitable and pleasant day as I am sure they will.

**AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF SASKATOON AND CNR**

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I should like to direct a question to the Premier. Does the government intend to bring in either a private or public bill this session to authorize the execution of an agreement between the city of Saskatoon and the CNR for the purpose of moving the railway

March 13, 1963

station and yards from the city centre to the outskirts. Before the Premier answers, I would like to say that the opposition, in order to facilitate the passage of this legislation, would be willing to waive any rules . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order. We can't have a speech on the question.

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, to begin with, of course, the government doesn't bring in private bills. These are brought in through the established channels and submitted to the legislature, usually by a private member of the legislature.

There has been discussion with the city of Saskatoon with regard to this matter, which would require a private bill, dating back to about October of last year. We assured the city at that time and have assured them since that the government could see no reason why such a bill should not be submitted. As I understand it, the contents of the bill were finally submitted earlier this week only. My understanding is that the intention has been advertized or will be advertized in this week's Gazette. It will then proceed to the legislature. It will be necessary for the legislature to waive some of the ordinary rules in order that it can be processed during this session.

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. E. Whelan (Regina City):** — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, Mr. Speaker, on your behalf and on behalf of all hon. members, I would like to welcome a group of students and their teacher to this assembly. The group are located in the Speaker's gallery. They are 34 students from Grade 7 and 8 classes from St. James School and they are accompanied by their principal, Bill Yannell. We hope that their stay with us will be pleasant and educational.

### **SASKATCHEWAN SAVINGS BONDS**

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer):** — In regard to Saskatchewan savings bonds, the sales reported up to the end of the sixth day now total almost \$5.5 million. This is going very well. I thought the hon. members would like to hear that.

## **CHARGE OF \$25 TO GERIATRIC CENTRE PATIENTS**

**Mr. J.W. Erb (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Welfare, and it may also involve the Minister of Public Health. Has any consideration been given, since the patients in the geriatric centres are now covered by medical care insurance, has any consideration been given to eliminating this charge that has been made of \$25, or reducing it in view of the situation?

**Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation):** — Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that could be discussed when the estimates are brought forward. It will take some time and I will be very glad to discuss it then.

## **REGINA JAIL**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I too would like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Welfare. Has the minister investigated charges made earlier this week in Regina district court that there are frequent beating of inmates by inmates and occasional knifings at Regina jail, and, if so, are the proper authorities taking any action to prevent a recurrence of these happenings?

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have investigated the matter fully. It appears that the man who was questioned was speaking about some other prisons in Canada because we do not happen to have dining rooms in our provincial establishments, and there is no record of anything ever happening in the Regina jail such as was mentioned in court. We have no responsibility for what is said by people who go to court, but certainly the references to using knives in the prisons certainly cannot be supported during the period I have been Minister of Social Welfare. I will be very glad to discuss this matter further when the estimates are before the house.

## **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

### **William Grayson School, Moose Jaw**

**Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City):** — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to draw to the attention of the legislative assembly the fine group of young youngsters from William Grayson School in Moose Jaw, situated in the Speaker's gallery, and another group,

March 13, 1963

126 in all, in the east gallery. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Olafson, and their teachers Mrs. Mawsen, Mrs. May and Mrs. Bowler. I am sure that all members will want to join with me in extending this welcome to them and express the wish that they will enjoy their stay with us and go away with a firmer understanding of British Parliamentary procedure.

### **BUDGET DEBATE**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

**Mr. W.J. Gardiner (Melville):** — In the few brief minutes I had last evening I was dealing with some of the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture. In opening my remarks this afternoon I want to leave that particular subject for a moment and deal with one or two aspects of the budget that we had presented to us and to which we have the amendment which has been moved.

I think that in the amendment which has been moved the opposition has taken a very wise course because of the appearance before this legislature of supplementary estimates which show the irresponsibility of the government that we have in power in this province at the present time.

In estimating the increase of expenditure for the past year we find that there has been an increase of between eight and nine percent in the total expenditures of the government that were not approved in the original budget that was passed by this legislature last year. I do not believe that we would find a similar occurrence in any budget, not only here but possibly any place in this country, than the increase that has been presented to us in supplementary estimates in this house.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out in no uncertain manner that the majority of this money that is being spent in supplementary estimates has been taken from the people of this province for medical care purposes. And I say here to the government that if they had accepted the suggestions of the opposition in the special session called to provide a medical care plan for the people of this province, had they accepted the suggestions of the opposition, we would now have approximately \$11 million in a medicare fund to provide medical services to the people of this province instead of having it squandered on supplementary estimates and hidden by the government of this province.

And so I say that when the Premier and the Minister of Public Health and others say to the people of this province that they are providing medical care to the people of this province, they should also tell them that they have stolen from the people of this province \$11 million for medical care which is not going to go for that purpose.

I would also like to point out one of the statements made by the Provincial Treasurer at the time he brought in his budget, and it was this. Today it now costs a family of four, with an income of \$3,500 a year, about \$48 for medical care, compared with the \$84 it would have cost them under private schemes. I say if there was ever a more bald-faced, false statement made in a budget in this province, it was this particular statement. When we look to the estimates of what revenues the minister expects to take in in this present year, we find that in education and health tax alone he intends to take in \$37.5 million — and if you take one and one-half percent of that you find more than \$10 million, which is equivalent to \$10 for every man, woman and child in this province; a family of four, you multiply \$10 by 4 you get \$40, and so instead of \$48, the average cost, even if you don't include income tax, and you don't include the corporation tax, the total cost for a family of four would be well over the price that was previously paid for services under Medical Services Incorporation or Group Medical Services in this province. And so I say here, today, that the Provincial Treasurer in presenting his budget has again left this false impression in the minds of the people of this province that they are getting medical care for \$48. They've tried to sell this story about hospitalization for so long that it is hard to believe that the people would swallow this new tale, but for a Provincial Treasurer to make such a statement in presenting the report of the government of this province to the people over the air, I think it is shameful.

I would like to refer to one brief statement that was made by the Minister of Telephones when he indicated in his address yesterday that they were the first ones to pay grants for telephone poles, and other assistance to telephone companies in this province. If he had read a little further back than he probably has, he would find out that in 1911 and 1912 there was \$100,000 paid out in each of those years to provide telephone poles for companies that were being formed in this province at that particular time. So when the minister claims to have inaugurated this plan, he again is not correct.

Now I want to turn just for a few moments again to my friend the Minister of Agriculture, and to the address which he made in this house last evening.

March 13, 1963

I want to refer particularly to his claim of having done something for the farmers of this province, and I want to remind him again that since speaking here last night I have checked with a farmer friend of mine and have found that in the month of February, for the same grade of steer, he sold his steers in the month of December for the amount of \$29.10 a hundred; he sold them in the month of February for \$20.70 a hundred for the same grade of steer. And what was the answer of the Minister of Agriculture of this province? He had no solution, he didn't say that he inquired from the Minister of Agriculture of Canada what action the federal government had taken; he said, No, I think the price is even going to go lower. That was his answer to the farmers of this province as to the solution that he had to their problems at the present time.

It is high time that our Minister of Agriculture, and our federal Minister of Agriculture as well, suggested some remedies to the situation before that price goes lower, as has been stated by my friend across the way. If we look back in history, just the history of this government in this province, we find case after case where this government has refused to assist the cause of the farmers in this province.

I go back first to the case of the British-Canadian wheat agreement, when the then Minister of Municipal Affairs rose up in this house and said that the Canadian government had been paid more than they should have received for the grain that was sold from Canada to Britain during the term of that agreement. That was just before the representative of the Canadian government went overseas to attempt to get a better deal from the British government — that was the assistance the federal government received at that time.

Then, since that time, came the question of butter. The Canadian government asked the governments of the provinces of Canada and other organizations to purchase some of the surplus supply of butter for their institutions and they would give it to them at a very low and reasonable price. What was the assistance given by our Minister of Agriculture or this government? One pound of butter purchased in the first year; all the rest margarine. That was the assistance given by my friends across the way. And what did the minister say when he was asked in this house why they didn't purchase butter? He said, We don't believe in subsidizing the farmers; and, of course, this is the true story from our NDP and our CCF friends — We don't believe in subsidizing the farmers in Canada!

Then we come down to today. He is asked what he is going to do about the price of beef. I think that the best thing that could be done is have the boat that brought the New Zealand beef into Canada, when it goes back, take the federal Minister of Agriculture and the provincial minister right along with them back to New Zealand, and that would help solve some of the problems of our farmers here in the province of Saskatchewan.

During the course of his remarks, he claimed that the present government of this province had done something for the farmers. And I say to him that if he can show me one thing that he has done since he has been Minister of Agriculture, except, as part of the CCF government, take taxes out of the pockets of the people of this province and the farmers in particular, if he can show me something new that he has done for the farmers of this province since he has been in office, then he would be accomplishing something.

In closing, there is just one other item I want to mention.

Last night the Minister of Agriculture had the gall, in his address, to state that if any member on this side of the house voted against this budget, he was voting against a veterinary college. I'll ask the minister to look in his book that was handed down as to the estimates for the coming year and if he can show me where the veterinary college is mentioned in the budget that was handed down by the Provincial Treasurer for the coming year, then I'll say he might be right, but it isn't even mentioned. The only place that it appears is in the supplementary estimates. And if the million dollars is not paid by the last day of this month, then that money cannot be paid until new estimates are presented to this house for that particular item. I've had that happen before. From the publication of the paper today, it states that the meeting to discuss this matter will not take place until the second day of April. So there is not going to be any money paid out under supplementary estimates for a veterinary college because the discussions have not even taken place and yet the Minister of Agriculture would threaten the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) and say that if he doesn't vote for this budget he is voting against the veterinary college. How can you get any statement that is further from the truth than the one that the minister stated last night when he attempted to threaten the member from Saltcoats.

And so I say here, Mr. Speaker, that standing and speaking for the farm people of this province, I cannot, because of excessive taxation, because of the fact that this government has not provided solutions for the problems of our primary producers in this province, I could not see my way clear to support the budget. I will support the amendment and vote against the budget itself.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear.

March 13, 1963

**Mrs. M.J. Batten (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all on behalf of my constituents and on behalf of your constituents, Mr. Speaker, to thank the minister for the extension of gas services to Muenster, St. Gregor, Englefeld, Watson and Wadena. We appreciate this very much and we think this is something that our constituents will appreciate as well. I can see that in my constituency it is going to be very difficult to choose between the popularity of the minister in charge of this corporation and the Minister of Highways. They have both been exceptionally good to us.

**Hon. R. Brown Minister of Industry and Information):** — We all like you, Mary.

**Mrs. Batten:** — We still have a few places where we need extensions of gas and of course no. 20 needs paving very badly but we trust that this will be done in the very near future, before this government goes out of office because I wouldn't like to have to embarrass the new Minister of Highways by asking him for the same thing when the Liberals are in power.

I wish, too, on behalf of your constituents and mine, Mr. Speaker, to say how proud I am that in the report of vital statistics for last year, the report states as follows:

Saskatchewan's 1961 death rate is identical with the rate of the nation as a whole, and this is 7.7 per thousand. But in the Humboldt-Wadena health region, the percentage there is much lower. It is only 7 per thousand population."

There are only two other areas, Regina City itself and Saskatoon rural, that can equal this fine record. I think we owe a debt and a tribute that should be paid to our municipal men who have provided good health facilities in the past in this region, to our doctors, to our local hospital associations. This part of the province has always been most progressive and in the forefront of looking after its citizens in the matter of health, and the results can be seen from these statistics.

I wish too at this time, while I am distributing bouquets, to pay tribute to the civil service of this province. I want to say that quite often the government members will endeavor to protect the employees of the government as if they were being attacked, when they are not being attacked. The other day in crown corporations, the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) paid a tribute to the bus drivers who work for the Saskatchewan Transportation Company and stated how much the people in Saskatchewan appreciated the fine safety record



that these men have, their courtesy and their efficiency. Now I was very sad that this was not reported in the press because I think these men deserve credit and deserve a tribute. The same is true of many other employees of this government; telephone operators who go out of their way to render service; people in these buildings and in various departments of government who will serve the humbles person, the humbles members, such as a member of the opposition, and will endeavor to answer our enquiries and satisfy us when we ask for something on behalf of our constituents. This is truly appreciated and perhaps our appreciation is not voiced often enough.

I think the people of Saskatchewan can appreciate the fact that these employees have done a tremendous job because, Mr. Speaker, when I look across the way and when I listen and watch the antics of some of the cabinet minister, I can see that this province would have certainly been on the verge of total collapse if it had not been for a very stable civil service.

So that we are governed fairly well, in spite of the cabinet ministers, and we owe a tribute to the employees of the government for this.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank:** — Does that include Willis and Brown too.

**Mrs. Batten:** — This has really been — I can exempt some of the ministers but I am not going to exempt the Hon. Provincial Treasurer. I've got something to say to him since he brought up the subject and drew attention to himself.

I enjoyed reading the budget speech very much and I enjoyed the budget debate. It was one of the funniest things that I have ever heard. I think the funniest remark was when the members kept referring to the Hon. Provincial Treasurer and saying that he was all heart. Now that is quite a description of our Provincial Treasurer — “all heart”. I can picture him as a hard-hitting politician, but to say that he was “all-heart” was truly a new picture.

I imagine from listening to the budget debate, and particularly the ministers, and perhaps the junior ministers who have not learned to cover up their political strategy as well as some of the people who have had more experience, that the strategy that the NDP'ers have planned for the forthcoming year was something like this. They looked around and they could see that NDP was a pretty bad name; they haven't mentioned it themselves — only one person in the entire debate mentioned that name. They don't even refer to them as NDP'ers, and they thought, well this isn't good, we can't very

well call ourselves CCF'ers because that is pretty well dead, we can't call ourselves socialists because, in spite of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, socialism is not as popular as he seems to think it should be, so what are we going to do? They decided, well, the most popular, the most progressive, the party of reform is the Liberal party, but — they said — there are Liberals in the house; well, we can't call them Liberals. They said, we are going call them something else, we are going to call them Thatcherites. Let's get rid of this Liberal picture, because we want to climb on the Liberal bandwagon but we haven't got the courage that one of our cabinet minister had to walk across the floor, to face the electorate, we will simply try to take over Liberal philosophy.

Well, I thought truly, truly this sits ill-at-ease on the shoulders of the members across because socialists can try to change the color of their cloak, and I am reminded very much, especially seeing the children in the galleries, of a little story about Little Red Riding Hood. I never saw so many sweet little woolly lambs as there appeared to be in this budget debate. Everyone was just as good and kind, and it was only once in a while that the guard slipped and the teeth showed, and you saw that grandma wasn't really grandma — she was a wolf.

So these wolves in sheep's clothing have in part taken Liberal platform promises, they have taken Liberal philosophy in part; they haven't been able to digest it but they have spouted some of it and some of the budget sounds quite good because of this. They, for instance, for the first time since I have been in this house, acknowledged the fact that people themselves did something in this province and did progress and did build schools and roads and did make material as well as educational and cultural progress, before the CCF came into power. This is something brand new. This they have copied from our speeches and as long as they believe in it and accept it, that is fine; I don't mind them using it. They have often expressed gratitude to the local government — now isn't this strange. Do you remember what the government said about local governments a few years ago? Local governments weren't any good, they were inefficient, they were everything else — but now they are fine and they expressed a debt of gratitude to them, as well they should.

In addition to that, members are starting to look upon private enterprise as being something that isn't immoral, that isn't a bad word; they are starting to encourage private enterprise. Now it is hard to say when you hear some of them — if you thought they were sincere — whether they belong on this side of the house or the other side. But, of course, you can tell because sooner or later during their speeches, especially when they get off their written speech, they start talking about the thirties and you see that in spite of the nice caps that they are wearing, the wolf is still there in grandma's clothing and it is quite an old wolf. These men, Mr. Speaker, are old men with old ideas. Even the young men

have old ideas. And this is obvious because they are still tied down to the emotional ties that they had with the socialist party, and even though they are trying to change their color, although they are trying to make the NDP party something new, that old emotional tie that they had with socialism, and still have perhaps in their basic thinking, exists and shows up.

For instance, in listening to them speak about the thirties, comparing the state of roads, and the state of electricity, in the thirties with today, I could hear the translator, of Mr. Khrushchev speech in the United Nations a few years ago. I don't know, I think most of you heard it when Mr. Khrushchev got up and said that "when the communists took over in Russia, there were barren plains and now you can fly over Russia, and you see electric lights all over the place", and I could have sworn I was back in Regina listening to the CCF on the other side of the house.

In this thinking, this implication that is left with the people is that the party did this, when this is simply progress and there would have been the same type of progress under any type of government. This fuzzy kind of thinking is the kind of thinking that our people are sick and tired of, and it is shocking to hear a comparatively young man, a man in a responsible position, such as the Minister of Education, try to leave the picture that because one Liberal refused to cook a turkey for somebody, all Liberals are bad and you won't have turkeys if you have Liberals in power. Now, this is truly a strange thing for a man who is pictured as a reformer of the educational system. If this is the kind of thinking that our children are subjected to, heaven help the future.

There is another way that their socialist tendencies and background, in spite of their attempt to gain Liberal respectability, still show, and this is in the fact that they still believe that economic factors are everything. This is why they have attacked, over and over again, this article, this speech that Dean Lang apparently gave to a farm organization. How can you fight for a family farm if you don't recognize what a family farm is? If you don't recognize the fact that there are non-economic factors about a family farm that are worth while? I am willing to fight and sacrifice in taxes and otherwise to keep families on farms, to keep family farms, not because these farms are economically desirable but because they do something towards enriching our life as Canadians; because they produce the kind of young people that are worthwhile in Canada; because they give people added incentive towards progress that perhaps a city life stifles.

You can look in the background of many of our leaders in all types of endeavor, be it the church, be it education, be it politics, and in so many of them, in the majority of them, there is that farm background. There is a richness of family life, the security, and, last, there is

the fresh air and sunshine. It shows up in their thinking; they weren't crowded; they weren't brought up with a chip on their shoulder; they weren't pushed around. They had freedom and light; they had close family associations with their parents because they all worked together; they lived in a community that depended on each other and these are valuable factors, and you shouldn't make fun of somebody who has the courage to say that they are valuable factors. We must recognize that they are valuable.

I find that it is valuable for my children to be brought up in a small town. I like Humboldt, and I like the people there, I think my children are getting a better break than they would in a large city, and I am willing to make a financial sacrifice because I earn less money there than I would if I were practising in a large city. This is a choice that I could make. Surely this is a choice that farmers make. And Dean Lang didn't suggest, and neither does anyone in any political party suggest, that farmers should be deprived of necessities or of the good things of life or of even the luxuries of life. All he said was that these other things have to be considered, that economic factors aren't the whole of your being.

As the Hon. Minister of Agriculture said last night "man does not live by bread alone". If the minister could only understand what he says, he could be quite a great man instead of a fuzzy lamb.

There is another way that this socialist tendency shows, and it shows throughout the budget, it shows throughout the budget debate. There is no real respect in the people on your right for individual freedom, Mr. Speaker, and this has been demonstrated over and over again. It was demonstrated very well last night, and I hate to say this, when the hon. member's constituents are present, but when the Hon. Attorney General spoke last night, he spoke with great scorn about the nerve of this little woman — I love that expression "little woman", it makes us a different category, we are not quite human, we are just "little people" — this "little woman" who had the colossal gall to come to Regina with the Keep Our Doctors committee, and protest to this government. And why was this nerve-racking and gallish on her part? Because, he said, "she lived in subsidized housing"; because, he said, "she couldn't educate her children if it wasn't for state schools". Now, Mr. Speaker, since when have we lost the right to come up and speak to the Premier of this province, and to protest to this government merely because we live in "subsidized houses" or because we send our children to state schools?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mrs. Batten:** — Is this “little woman” any less than anybody else in this province? Not in the eyes of Liberals, Mr. Speaker. We believe that whether you are receiving social aid, or whether you are receiving deserted wives’ allowance, or any other kind of an allowance, whether you are living in a subsidized house, or whether you can own a palace of your own and have private tutors, you have the same right and the same freedom and the same responsibility to speak for the rights of others in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mrs. Batten:** — And we believe, Mr. Speaker, that in a good society, the majority does not force it’s will on any minority, and this is the battle that these so called “little people” were fighting.

This business of “little man” and “the common people” irks me tremendously because if ever you saw “little men” you should us, that is all we are, we are just “little common people” and yet because the people have elected us, because a farmer from Kelsey can suddenly become the Provincial Treasurer, and start spending millions of dollars, he suddenly becomes a different category of person and then he can look down and condescendingly say that he is protecting the “little people”. What “little people”? Surely we, in this country, and in this province, where a small town lawyer can rise to the position of Prime Minister, where a farmer can become a Provincial Treasurer, surely there is no such thing as “little people”. Surely in a democracy, such as Canada is, we are all equal. This is Liberal policy. We don’t have to go around pretending that we alone, are moral, we alone, are sanctified, that we rule by divine right, in order to protect “little people”.

This unwillingness of the socialists on your right to renounce their old beliefs, makes most of the money that is being spent in this budget absolutely useless, because only after 19 years they realize that they have to attract industry, that they have to have prosperity through private enterprise, because this is where the money is coming — out of the pockets of people who believe in private enterprise. It is not coming from crown corporations; it is not coming from the things that you promised the people of Saskatchewan it would come from. But now you haven’t got the courage I’m sorry, Mr. Speaker, they haven’t got the courage to get up and say “We are through with socialism, we no longer believe that the state should own and plan all, we believe in a co-operative society, where private enterprise can function, where the state will only pick up the slack, and do that which people cannot do for themselves”, and because they haven’t got the courage to renounce their socialist principles, they cannot succeed, even though they try to bribe the people with their own money.

March 13, 1963

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mrs. Batten:** — This budget and the actions of this government remind me very much of the fact that a good wife, or a wife who is at all efficient at being a wife, doesn't have to push her husband into situations. She tries to know ahead of time what he wants and lead him gently down the direction he wants to go. This, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what I think a government should do, but this government has not shown its leadership. This government has endeavored to push where it should lead, and it has had to be pulled, where it should have lead, and this is why it is impossible to support this budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have many pages of notes, I have many suggestions for almost every department, where the money that they so conveniently found in the taxpayers' pocket, and put in their own could be spent to the advantage of the taxpayer. It could be spent to the advantage of those people who need it. Unfortunately my time is up and I, as a good Liberal, don't intend to steal any of the other fellows.

I will not support the budget. I will support the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I first want to express a word of commendation to my colleague, the Provincial Treasurer, for what I consider to be a very fine budget address, and to the other members of the house, members on both sides of the house, who have contributed to this debate. I think it has been, in many ways, a good debate, and I think we have had a not unsatisfactory airing of many of the problems which face the province.

I wanted, Mr. Speaker, to spend most of my time this afternoon on matters concerning agencies of the government for which it is my honor to have some responsibility: the medical care insurance commission and the Department of Public Health. But there were some matters which I wanted to deal with before turning to these departments.

I think, I might, first, Mr. Speaker, deal with some remarks of the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner). He has indicated to this house this afternoon that somehow the money which is represented by the supplementary estimates was taken from the people for medical care.

He has somehow suggested that some money which was intended for medical care has been diverted to some other purpose. Now I want to make perfectly clear to the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner), I won't be able to take all the time that would be necessary for that, but I will make clear to the other members of the house, Mr. Speaker, that all of the money which was appropriated by this legislature last year will be paid over to the medical care insurance fund.

I want to say this again, Mr. Speaker, because I think the member from Melville does not have clearly in his mind the nature of the legislation, the provisions of the Medical Care Insurance Act. The Medical Care Insurance Act provided that the per capita tax or the family tax will be paid directly to the medical care insurance fund. It provides also that all sums appropriated by this legislature shall be paid to the medical care insurance commission. And the sum of some \$15.3 million appropriated by this legislature at its last regular session shall be and will be paid over in its entirety to the medical care insurance commission. Now, Mr. Speaker, almost all of that sum has been paid over to the medical care insurance commission now, and any small remaining balance will be paid over before the end of this fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about my constituency, and I think in my first remarks all members of the house will be able to join with me. I think the citizens of Regina are pleased and proud of the spectacular victory of our own Richardson Rink in the McDonald Brier competition, and I know all would want to wish Skip Ernie and his rink every success in the Scotch Cup, emblematic of world supremacy. He has brought distinction and honor four times to our city and to this province.

Mr. Speaker, we, in Regina, are proud of our city. It is one of the four fastest growing cities in Canada; it is growing in population, in industry, in national and in international influence. And, Mr. Speaker, Regina is growing as an industrial centre. I know that the carefully selected statistics of the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) were designed to prove the reverse. But, Mr. Speaker, the citizens of this city know that Regina is, in fact, growing and prospering.

The hon. member from Moosomin was talking about some of the industries which we have in Regina. He talked about the cement plant, and he talked about the steel mill, and he told us that the Liberal party were very happy that there was a cement plant, and very happy that there was a steel mill, that they were the friends of industry, and that they would be the friends of new industry which came to this province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are glad to hear that the member from Moosomin and his colleagues are the friends of these industries. We are glad to hear this change of heart on the

March 13, 1963

part of the members opposite, particularly the member from Moosomin, and the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) because, Mr. Speaker, they certainly weren't always friends of the cement plant.

What did the members opposite have to say when the bill to guarantee the bonds of that cement plant were before this house? Well, Mr. Speaker, here is what they said: "Why are you guaranteeing these bonds? If this thing is a sound venture, why can't it be built without government assistance, and if it isn't a sound venture, why are you helping it? It was a very constructive approach, I am sure. Mr. Speaker, the former member for Saltcoats was particularly bitter in his attacks on the sponsors of this project and the present members for Moosomin and Arm River were right behind him.

Here is what the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) had to say: "Well, I for one am not prepared to spend \$5.5 million of the people's money of this province unless we are given the opportunity to investigate every angle as far as this company or any other company is concerned." Well, I overlook the fact that no one was spending \$5.5 million, or any dollars; the project was one to guarantee bonds, but one can see in this quotation just how cheerfully and how openhandedly he welcomed the cement plant.

And here is the member for Arm River. After referring to Mr. Woodsworth as a socialist, he went on to say "and here his followers are trying to take the poor people of the province's money, it is their money, and guarantee some capitalistic promoters the sum of \$5.5 million so they can set up a cement plant here outside the city of Regina".

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — That's right.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — He went on to say, "Don't throw away to help promoters from British Columbia, Alberta and other places," and he kept on and he said "The Premier was pleading, but after all he could not get away from the fact that the government was taking \$5.5 million and giving it to the promoters". Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the friendly welcome from the member from Arm River. Now, I need hardly say that the members opposite voted against the bill to guarantee the bonds of this cement plant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's turn to the other industry the hon. member from Moosomin mentioned, the steel mill. By the time the steel mill was established, the Liberals had changed their leader, but, regrettably, Mr. Speaker, not their attitude to new industry or to industrial promotion. Now, the



steel mill was enabled to establish in this province and in this city by reason of the fact that the government guaranteed some \$10 million of its bonds, and provided other financial assistance. The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) asks, “How much?” — the amount has been reported in this legislature each session in a reply to an order for return of the legislature — the precise amount of assistance rendered to the steel plant by way of guarantees, loans, advances and the rest.

Now, this plant ran into early difficulties. The construction contractor who was building the plant went bankrupt. The company had to move in and complete the job at additional expense to itself, thereby depleting its working capital. In addition, the plant ran into some initial technical difficulties. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are common enough in new plants, you might say it was almost routine, but in these circumstances, what position did the Liberal party take — these professed friends of industry. The Liberal leader, Ross Thatcher, had to say, as quoted from the Star-Phoenix on June 6, 1961:

Liberal leader Ross Thatcher charged today in Regina that the government’s financial dealings with Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation are approaching proportions of a scandal. For all practical purposes, the company would appear to be bankrupt.

This, Mr. Speaker, about a company which is experiencing start-up difficulties. A sort of statement clearly designed, or certainly having the clear effect of impairing the credit of this company just at the time when they would be needing credit. At the time when they were having difficulties with construction contractors and technical start-up difficulties, they had the additional burden of a credit-squeeze, engendered and engineered by the hon. member for Morse, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thatcher). Mr. Speaker, a nice, friendly gesture — Liberal style.

Mr. Speaker, these are the friends, the so called, professed friends of industry in this province, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the industrialists of this province are saying to themselves, “With friends like these, who needs enemies”.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney;** — Mr. Speaker, I could give you statements of other people who were prominent in the party. I have one here by Mr. Fred Johnson. Mr. Fred Johnson was the candidate for the Liberal party in 1960 and in 1962, and he is quoted in the Leader-Post of June 16, 1962:

March 13, 1963

The Liberal candidate said Thursday he has learned on good authority that Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation is in such hopeless financial position that it is selling its own scrap; accounts receivable have been attached by the bank.

Well, Mr. Speaker, again, statements such as these can only have one effect, and that is to impair the credit of this company at a time when it admittedly needed credit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough for Liberal members opposite to lack the foresight and the confidence to support the establishment of the cement plant. It is far worse, Mr. Speaker, to lash out at an industry which is experiencing start-up difficulties, making statements which couldn't help but impair the credit of this company, and accordingly, its ability to survive.

Far worse, Mr. Speaker, to peddle the company's private affairs in the press for partisan political advantage.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. Many people in the city of Regina will not soon forget that the Leader of the Opposition was willing to destroy this company, and with it their investment and their jobs, in order that he could get some petty political advantage by so doing.

Mr. Speaker, there may, indeed, be friends of industry in this house, but they don't sit on the front benches opposite me.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want now to turn to some remarks from the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) and I want at the outset to say how much I enjoyed the contribution, to this debate of the hon. member from Maple Creek. There is no doubt that his remarks were well considered and, of course, as always, well delivered. With some of them I could agree; with some of them I could agree in a qualified way, and I propose to comment on those at a later time in my remarks. With some of them I feel I cannot agree.

The member from Maple Creek, suggested that there was something improper in the presentation to this house of the supplementary estimates which were laid on the table by the Provincial Treasurer. He seemed to suggest that supplementary estimates should only cover money which has been spent. Now, Mr. Speaker, supplementary estimates are just what they say they are — estimates. There is no requirement in law or in practice that the money be spent before the estimates are

presented to this house. And surely no member can quarrel because estimates are introduced in the house before the money is spent. I would have thought that members opposite would welcome this, rather than deplore it, as apparently did the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron).

Now, he had some harsh things to say about a good number of the things which were included in those estimates, and he seemed to call the whole process a fraud — filching money from the people of Saskatchewan — picking the pockets of the taxpayers.

Well, let's look at some of the larger items of fraud, and of filching, and of pickpocketing.

Let's take one or two of them: an extra \$170,000 for a provincial community pasture program — a fraud. Well, Mr. Speaker, not a fraud, a fact; and a fact that people will be proud and pleased about. How about another — \$800,000, approximately, for highway construction, largely because of the long construction season last fall. Now, clearly the Minister of Highways could have pulled the highway crews, stopped construction, and laid off the men. This, presumably, the procedure recommended by the members opposite. Instead he carried on, carried on with the construction program right into December. As we know, there was a long open fall. Now, Mr. Speaker, is this fraud? Is this a scandal? I suggest it is nothing more than good common sense. An extra million and a quarter dollars for grants to municipalities so that they could get on with the grid road program — an investment in rural Saskatchewan.

And mind you, this was for money which had already been spent. These were grants to municipalities to reimburse them for money which they had spent. And yet he asks the house to believe that this sort of action is somehow picking the pocket of the taxpayers, somehow filching money from taxpayers, because the Minister of Municipal Affairs pays to the municipalities money which they have expended on the grid road program.

And there was the grant to the university for a veterinary college. One million dollars. Now, some member earlier in this debate said a grant for a veterinary college of one million dollars — how can that be, there isn't any veterinary college? And we heard this echoed by the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) today. Well, Mr. Speaker, the estimates don't say there is a grant to the veterinary college. They say there is a grant to the University of Saskatchewan, and I ought to advise hon. members opposite that there is a University of Saskatchewan.

March 13, 1963

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has been conducting and I may say very skilfully conducting negotiations to have the veterinary college established in Saskatchewan, with federal and other assistance. And a substantial grant, as evidence of our good faith in this project, was the next logical move. It is proposed to do this; it is provided in the supplementary estimates.

Now, on this matter, the members opposite will take their usual pose. They will, as they all have, demanded that a veterinary college be established. The hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) is particularly vocal in this regard. And they have demanded that the government do not less, but more, but when the time comes to pay, Mr. Speaker, then somehow the money to pay has been filched from the taxpayers; to pay this money we are short-changing the citizens of Saskatchewan. And the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) gets up and moves that the expenditures are excessive, or unwarranted, or unnecessary. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter for regret that he did not advise us whether expenses for a veterinary college or for the University of Saskatchewan next year were excessive or unwarranted, or unnecessary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to let time decide. I don't believe that if money is given to the University for a veterinary college, that people are being defrauded or short-changed. I am willing to take that stand that it is a good expenditure and good government, and I am willing to argue this, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to argue it without the aid of Perry Mason.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could deal with other expenditures included in the supplementary estimates. For example, there is a grant of \$250,000 to the Saskatchewan Diamond Jubilee and Canada Centennial Committee. I am one who believes that expenditures on Centennial celebrations and centennial projects to remind us of the great traditions of which we are heirs, that such expenditure is neither fraud nor folly, but is rather a manifestation of patriotism in its highest sense.

And in this regard, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to report that I have been advised by the Minister of Education that the Saskatchewan Arts Board has agreed to share with civic groups in Regina and Saskatoon the cost of a comprehensive survey to determine the need of each of these cities for an auditorium such as will enable them to attract to Saskatchewan the best artistic and dramatic performances which Canada has to offer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with one or two other points raised by members in their remarks. There were some points raised by the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) when he referred to Dr. Steinson's resignation from the Teachers' College, and he made some reference to Claude Ellis.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron:** — On a point of privilege. I made no reference to a resignation from any college in my speech I delivered.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, if I have indicated the wrong hon. member; I am sorry for having done so. Some member opposite, and I believe the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) referred to the appointment of Mr. Claude Ellis to the position at the Teachers' College. And I simply want to say this, Mr. Speaker. This appointment was made during my tenure as Minister of Education and I want to say that Mr. Ellis' application was considered in the usual way. He was certified by the public service commission as a suitable and proper person to appoint to the position. There was full consultation on my part with the Deputy Minister of Education and with the director of teacher training. I have no way of knowing whether the principal of the Teachers' College was consulted. I would be very much surprised if he were not, but it may well be that he was not. At least I can assure hon. members that this appointment was made in all respects in the way prescribed by the public service commission, and after full consultation on my part with the Deputy Minister of Education and with the director of teacher training. These have been the established ways of making appointments and there is nothing at all unusual in this appointment, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) made some remarks about foreign borrowings and indicated that because money has been borrowed in the United States that this meant that the people of Saskatchewan were losing substantial sums because of the devaluation of the Canadian dollar. Superficially, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. Obviously, they are losing money which they would not have lost had the Canadian dollar not been devalued. But, Mr. Speaker, they are not losing money which they would not have lost had the money not been borrowed in the United States. Because the money which was borrowed in the United States was borrowed at substantially more favorable rates of interest and calculations have been made which indicate that the Canadian dollar would have had to be devalued by more than ten per cent, and stay in this devalued state over the entire life of loan, before there would be any net loss to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan by borrowing in the United States rather than borrowing in Canada.

This was certainly the situation when I was Provincial Treasurer. I reviewed some of the older borrowings and ascertained that this was the position. So, in fact, it is not at all accurate to suggest that these foreign borrowings represented the implementation of a policy which was unwise or which was costly to the people of Saskatchewan.

March 13, 1963

Now, the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) was talking about the surplus funds in the medical care insurance fund, and obviously his remarks were wholly inconsistent with those of the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) because the one was accusing us of having too much money in the fund and the other was saying we have taken all the money out of the fund and diverted it into other expenditures. But I simply want to point out to members opposite that there was no per capita tax levied in the fall of 1961 and, accordingly, it would be expected that the other taxes would yield enough to enable us to have in the fund the sort of surplus which would have been there had the per capita tax been levied last fall — that is in the fall of 1961, and there is no suggestion whatever, Mr. Speaker, that the surplus funds from January 1, 1962 to December 31, 1962 will be used for any other purpose but for the purposes of the medical care insurance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have some remarks which I want to address to the house, commenting on the hon. member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart). I will defer making these until a later occasion but I particularly wanted to deal with some of his remarks on compulsory marketing boards. He evidently, as I take it the member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) is, is a sturdy opponent of compulsory marketing boards and a sturdy opponent of any provision whereby all of the producers in any given area must be required to market their produce through a centrally designated board. Perhaps I have misconstrued his remarks but I think this is the fair interpretation, and I venture to think the only fair interpretation, which could have been taken from his remarks. I will be illustrating with some degree of force, Mr. Speaker, that while this may be the view of some Liberals opposite, it is not the view of Liberals in other parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about Wascana Centre. I believe we know, all members will recall that at last spring session we passed a Wascana Centre Act providing for the establishing of an authority to develop the lands around these buildings as a centre for government, education, the arts and recreation. And since then the authority has had a busy year. The members have been appointed; the city of Regina appointed His Worship the Mayor, and Aldermen Peart and MacPherson; the University of Saskatchewan appointed President Spinks, Vice-President McEown and Vice-President Riddell; and the government of Saskatchewan appointed Alderman Braaten of Moose Jaw, Mrs. James Struthers of Regina, Dr. Brownstone, the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Hon. Mr. Davies and myself.

The removal of the dominion experimental farm has been arranged and the university is proceeding apace with plans to build the first complex of buildings on the new campus. The major block of land between these buildings, these government

grounds and the university campus, has been acquired. Two other smaller parcels of land on the other side, the north side, of the creek have been acquired. Planning is proceeding for the deepening of the lake and the shaping of the basic landscaping contemplated by the master plan. We are in the process, Mr. Speaker, of establishing a nursery to grow from seedlings the hundreds of thousands of trees which will be needed to proceed with the park development once the basic landscaping is completed.

The project has received national and international recognition, particularly in architectural circles, but also in popular magazines as well. We have had stories in MacLeans, Financial Post, Weekend Magazine, Christian Science Monitor in the United States, and a good number of other technical journals.

The authority has set up an architectural committee to advise on major architectural questions and I am pleased to be able to say that in addition to Mr. Minoru Yamasaki, our planner, and Mr. Church, our landscape planner, two other persons have agreed to serve on this committee. They are Dean Pietro Belluschi of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology at Boston, Massachusetts, and Dean Russell of the School of Architecture of Manitoba. Now, Mr. Speaker, the three participating parties, the city, the university and the government, have, I believe, a rare opportunity to develop an area which will be a source of pride not only to you, Mr. Speaker, and to us in this house, but to Saskatchewan people of generations yet unborn. We are stewards, Mr. Speaker, of nature's bounty and nature's beauty, and we too often overlook this, just forgetting our obligations and leaving them unfulfilled. But, Mr. Speaker, Wascana Centre will be a part of our payment to posterity.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I want now to turn to some comments on the medical care insurance plan. I do this with a good deal of pride, because certainly the major accomplishment of this government during 1962 has been the introduction into Saskatchewan of the medical care insurance plan — North America's first large-scale, government-sponsored medical care plan. In no other province or state, Mr. Speaker, is there a plan which provides prepaid medical care available to all residents, a comprehensive range of benefits, and financed from taxes related to ability to pay. Mr. Speaker, this fact has raised the hopes of people all across Canada and in province after province public planning for medical care is one of the very live issues of the day. And there can, Mr. Speaker, be no doubt — no doubt that the reason that this is so is because we in Saskatchewan have introduced the plan, that we in Saskatchewan have established the plan which is working, and working successfully.

March 13, 1963

This has led, Mr. Speaker, to political leaders of all hues talking about medical care plans, introducing into their platforms proposals for medical care plans. The New Democrats in most provinces — and I will say that again for members opposite — the New Democrats in most provinces, the Liberals in Ontario and Quebec, the Conservatives in Ontario and British Columbia, the Socreds in Alberta. Now we know, Mr. Speaker, that for the Thatcherite branch of the Liberal party this creates a very considerable dilemma. How does one go about opposing the medical care plan when Liberals in Ontario are advocating an almost precisely similar plan, and a plan, Mr. Speaker, which is opposed in that province by the Ontario Medical Association? Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure this provide some very considerable difficulties for the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Not at all.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, maybe not at all for him, Mr. Speaker. But . . .

**Mr. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — . . . 19 years.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . I just suspect Mr. Speaker, that with all his skill at riding two horses, he is going to strain something more than our credulity in this performance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been told times without number that over a period of 40 years that the Liberals approve of a medical care plan in principle. But, Mr. Speaker, I want you to note and I want hon. members to note, and I want the people of Saskatchewan to note that the Thatcherite branch of the Liberal party has conspicuously and carefully avoided expressing support for a plan which was comprehensive in benefits, publicly administered, financed from taxes, and with benefits available to all.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . bureaucratic.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, Liberals in other provinces, Mr. Speaker, have approved these principles, but not the Thatcherite splinter. The only reasonable interpretation Mr. Speaker, why these people have not approved these principles, have not stated their approval of these principles, is that, in fact, they do not approve of them, and, in fact, that they would jettison them, and with them the plan as presently operating in Saskatchewan, if they were elected to power.

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris- Estevan):** — Is it operating?



**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that again. An hon. member asks ‘Is it operating?’. And my answer is an emphatic ‘Yes’, it is operating. I want to say that the Liberals opposite again, and I will challenge them, if they believe in these principles, let them stand up and say they believe in these principles. But they have, as I say, very carefully avoided expressing support for a plan which had comprehensive benefits, which was publicly administered, which was financed from taxes, and with benefits available for all.

Yes, we will certainly welcome their conversion if they do stand up and say that they, like Liberals in Ontario, support these principles.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — You’ll have to run the platform here.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a little more about the opposition tactics in opposing the medical care plan, but prior to so doing I want to address a few of my remarks to the activities of the Department of Public Health.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a very active year in the Department of Public Health. I realize that activity is something abhorrent to members opposite but, Mr. Speaker, we have a great number of accomplishments to show for it. We have, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the introduction of the medical care plan, received the final report of the Thompson committee, a careful study of health needs of Saskatchewan, and containing comprehensive recommendations which will provide a blueprint for the development of health services in this province for many years. And I want, Mr. Speaker, to pay a tribute to each and every member of the advisory planning committee on medical care and particularly, Mr. Speaker, to the chairman, a man to whom this province owes a great deal, Dr. Walter P. Thompson.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, we have also received the hospital survey report which reports on general hospitals in the province, and I will refer to that a little later.

We expect to receive in the next few months a report of the committee on aging and long-term illness, a report which will contain exhaustive comments on the difficult and perplexing problems in this field of health care.

I don’t know whether there will be solutions, Mr. Chairman, it is perhaps easier to propound solutions when one isn’t faced with the problems, and we will see what the committee, consisting of a great number of

well-informed people in this field, have to say with respect to solutions. It will certainly not be possible, Mr. Speaker, to implement the many recommendations contained in these reports in the immediate future but the three reports together will provide invaluable source material and an outline for future progress.

And I think it is an indication of the value which the citizens of Saskatchewan place upon health care that we should receive, in the space of a few short months, not only a hospital survey report dealing with our hospital plant and facilities, not only a report dealing with the perplexing problems of aged and long-term illness, but also a report from a distinguished committee headed by Dr. Thompson dealing with the general health problems to the day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the psychiatric services program of the Department of Public Health. Saskatchewan continues to be in the forefront in the treatment of mental disorders. Now it would have been possible to have been misled about this. Some friends of mental health, and, some of them very recent converts I may say to the cause of mental health, suggest that expenditures on other health programs have or will in the future restrict expenditures on mental health treatment, and one would have thought that in provinces where these additional health programs are not offered the expenditures on mental health would be much greater than they are in Saskatchewan. This is surely the logic of this argument. But, Mr. Speaker, such is not the case. We, in Saskatchewan, continue to spend more per capita on the treatment of mental disorders than does any other province. We continue to offer Canada's best-developed program for the mentally retarded. And we continue to spend on research into mental illness more than all other provincial governments combined.

Members opposite may look pained; I wish they would suggest to their colleagues in provinces which have the misfortune to have a Liberal government that there is a good deal of merit in expenditures on mental health. We, Mr. Speaker, have continued to experiment and innovate, and we believe that the results appear to justify the efforts.

The mental health program has gradually changed over the last 10 or 15 years from one oriented to two large mental hospitals, from this type of a program, to one which is based upon clinics in most of the major centres in Saskatchewan. The number of people seen as out-patients at mental health clinics, even between 1957 and 1962, has more than doubled, from 2,200 to 4,900. And the number of patients treated in psychiatric wards of general hospitals has similarly increased. Our admissions at the mental hospitals continue to rise. In 1962, the admissions were greater than those in 1951 by some five per cent, but, notwithstanding these greater admissions, the

number of patients in mental hospitals at the end of 1962 was two or three percent less than it was in 1961. What is clearly indicated, Mr. Speaker, is that the incidence of mental disorders, or at least the incidence of detected mental disorders is not declining at all, but that the treatment procedures are quicker and more effective than they were only a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we are looking forward in this budget to making provision for the opening of the regional psychiatric centre at Yorkton. And I see that the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker), on behalf of the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher), has applauded that. It's the first time in Canada — once again another first, Mr. Speaker — that a mental hospital has been built as part of a complex which will provide both general hospital care and mental care for all the people of a given region. Now, the basic concept here is that all the people from an area requiring treatment for mental illness will be treated at a facility, at a hospital, which is operated in conjunction with a general hospital. And they will enjoy the advantages of being treated by a staff which operates in association with their colleagues at a general hospital. In addition, there are obvious advantages, obvious economies in operating laundries, food service and these sorts of things as common facilities.

The budget, in addition to providing for this expanded area of psychiatric service at Yorkton, provides for a continuation and broadening of our program for the mentally retarded. Members, I think, will be interested to know that at the two training schools at Moose Jaw and Prince Albert there is space for 1400 persons. Now this is a ratio of 156 places per 100,000 population. And once again, Mr. Speaker, this is the largest amount of facilities for the mentally retarded provided by any province in Canada.

The Prince Albert school provides facilities for the middle range of the mentally disordered persons, mentally retarded people, persons of 30, 40, 50 I.Q., and the nature of the institution is such that the objective is to provide at the institution a life which is as nearly normal as possible for these people. We operate a recreational program and we have put very considerable emphasis on camping and similar activities which will break the institutional routine. We have also provided, we believe, some worthwhile occupation for these people. We are, at the present time, developing programs for the fabrication of snow fences, lawn furniture, and the like. We believe that this will enable these people to enjoy as normal a life as is possible in an institution of that nature.

I should, I think, before turning other matters say something about hospital care in Saskatchewan. The year has again seen an increase in the cost of hospital care in the

province. These increases continue for a number of reasons. Some of them are due to increases in medical science. As our knowledge of medical science increases, clearly the hospitals need more equipment and, more importantly, they need more and better trained staff. And all this adds significantly to costs. And then there is increases in costs due to the shift in the use of hospitals. An increasing number of persons are using hospitals in the larger centres, and a decreasing number using their local community hospitals. And this I think will continue and will very possibly accelerate because of the introduction of the medical care plan. Prior to the introduction of the medical care plan, a fairly substantial number of people in the province had medical care available to them on a municipal doctor scheme, which made care available to them if they stayed home, but not if they went to the nearest city. Now, with the introduction of the medical care plan, many people will be free to seek their medical care wherever they like and I think we can assume that an increasing number will seek medical care in the larger centres, and will seek admittance to hospitals in larger centres.

Now, these increased costs, Mr. Speaker, are by no means confined to Saskatchewan. Indeed, while we still spend a large amount of our provincial wealth on hospital care, our rate of increase in costs during the last five years is the lowest in Canada. Other provinces are very clearly experiencing an increase in demand for hospital care and the expenses of hospital care, that we experienced ten years ago. We had increased costs then, I suppose this is one of the penalties of being a pioneer, but we introduced our hospital plan in 1947 and suffered, and suffered is the word, increases in costs shortly thereafter — other provinces are only now experiencing the same phenomenon.

Members will know, I think, that some provinces, the Liberal province of Quebec, didn't introduce compulsory, or comprehensive hospital care until 1961. Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) was reading to us from the green book proposals of 1944-45, in which the Liberal government in Ottawa was urging the provinces to get on with the job of introducing medical care plans and a hospital plan, and if this were done, the federal government would share 60 percent of the costs. This government, I suppose naively, took the federal government at it's word, and introduced the hospital plan in 1947, and for ten years pleaded with the federal government to honor it's pledge to pay 60 percent, or 50 percent, or 40 per cent, or any percent of the costs, and for ten years were rebuffed, and, Mr. Speaker, as we well know, not one cent was paid to honor that pledge while a Liberal government was in Ottawa.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Machinery . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Machinery is not what pays expenses — as they say, machinery to pay money doesn't buy the baby any new shoes, and there was no reason why the federal government in Ottawa could not have honored their pledges contained in the green book, except that they simply did not wish to promote a national hospital care plan.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You're just telling half the story.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Ah, yes, of course, they did introduce a national hospital plan bill in the election year, but they didn't get it in fast enough to pay any money out under the plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the trends which I have noted, use the city hospitals together with the phenomenal growth of Saskatchewan's urban centres, has put pressure on available hospital beds, particularly in the larger urban areas. The projects of hospital construction last year have gone a long way to relieve these pressures. Besides the completion of new hospitals at Grenfell, Loon Lake, Maple Creek and Moosomin, a start has been made on one at Rosetown, and major projects of construction or renovations were proceeded with at the Prince Albert Holy Family, Saskatoon City, University Hospital at Saskatoon, St. Paul's Hospital at Saskatoon, and the Yorkton Union Hospital at Yorkton.

Mr. Speaker, the budget presented by my colleague provides over \$3 million so that we may continue this major hospital building program — a program which has made hospital care more readily available to the citizens of Saskatchewan than to any other province in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier I have recently received a report from the hospital survey committee, a comprehensive report dealing with general hospital needs and facilities in the province. Now, major portions of this report were never intended for publication, and in fact contain some rather frank comments on some of the particular aspects of hospital care at some hospitals and very clearly the committee never intended that these be made public. However, a summary of the report is under preparation with a view to publication, and I hope to be in a position to make this public in the near future.

Well, Mr. Speaker, sometimes we get a little bit discouraged, when we consider the health needs of our citizens and we talk about the additional money which will be necessary

for hospital care or for geriatric care, or for care for specially handicapped groups, or when we consider the fight against cancer, or arthritis, or some of these other diseases which are far from conquered. But there have been some very spectacular successes which we have achieved. The budget presented to this house contains a reduced vote for T.B. control. The amount, as you know, is calculated on a standard rate of \$4 per day and on this basis it is assumed that we will need to put out next year less than we did this year, \$140,000 less, 30 percent less.

And in the annual report by the medical superintendent of the Anti-Tuberculosis League, last year, 1962, there was an improvement over 1961, a drop in patient days by almost 30 percent. As we can see, if we are having a drop in patient days of 30 percent in 1962, we anticipate a similar drop of 30 percent in 1963. These figures tell their own story about our dealing with that disease which used to be known as the White Plaque.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Who? Who started that one?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — No, I'm not taking any particular credit for this, on the part of this government. Health programs are not the prerogative of any particular government — many people contribute, and, Mr. Speaker, while the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) has interjected, I want to express a particular tribute to the Anti-Tuberculosis League. The Department of Public Health has worked very closely with them. The league carries on a very substantial preventive program, a program which is even more necessary now than it was before, and the Department of Public Health will continue to give financial support to the league, not only for its treatment program but also for its prevention program.

Now, just a word about paralytic polio. Perhaps the most spectacular medical advance in the last few years has been the campaign against paralytic polio. In 1955, Saskatchewan was the first province in Canada to organize free mass immunization for all the people — we were using Salk vaccine at that time. And then the Sabin oral vaccine — the little cup — came along and again we operated the first immunization with the use of that vaccine in Canada. We operated in Prince Albert in 1960, and in 1962 we were able to launch a province-wide immunization program, and we reached more than 80 percent of the people of this province. Now, this, Mr. Speaker, is a very remarkable achievement. If you have been listening to your radio you will know the department is now giving booster shots to younger children.

The conquest of this killing and crippling disease can be illustrated by simply stating a few figures. In 1952 there were 1,200 cases of polio resulting in 90 deaths. In

1962 there were 3 reported cases of polio. Now province-wide programs of this nature demand the highest level of planning and co-ordination. And let me pay a tribute to many voluntary organizations which have assisted the department and the health regions in carrying out this immunization program.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we sometimes now assume that if a vaccine is found that will prevent a disease, that the job is done. Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. A vaccine was found for diphtheria some time in the mid-twenties and for decades thereafter very substantial numbers of people suffered and died from diphtheria, simply because the vaccine was not disseminated to all the people. And it is our job, when Sabin, or some other vaccine such as that, is available, to see that this is distributed and it is a very substantial project to reach 80 or 90 percent of the people of any area with any program.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that I have been known to have been critical of the press from time to time, and I had a few words to say down in Ontario last month, when I expressed some mild criticism of certain portions of the press, but I want to say that with most of the established programs we have enjoyed generous support from all of the news media.

Such a program as the mass immunization for polio could not work, could not be effectively accomplished, unless we had the support not only of the press, but of radio, and T.V.; and not only news support, but editorials; not only paid ads, but the very great number of public service announcements and advertisements which they make available to us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am particularly glad to be able to announce that the budget this year contains a provision for grants to the municipal health departments of Regina and Saskatoon. I note that my colleague over on my far right also sees the merit of that very worthwhile expenditure. The cities of Regina and Saskatoon have, for many years, carried on their own health departments. For reasons which appeared good and sufficient to them, they haven't wanted to join health regions. Recently the Regina city council has come forward with a proposal for examining the possibility of a health region. This is being looked into by a joint committee of the department and the city, and while it is being looked into, provision is made for grants of 50¢ per capita to the two cities — a total of over \$100,000.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to remind members of the house that there have been a number of changes in the program operated by the medical services division of the Department of Public Health. And I think this will be of particular interest to members. They may recall that the medical services division

March 13, 1963

is the one which provides health care to a number of people who are not able, out of their own resources, to provide health care for themselves. There is a group of elderly people and then another large group of persons who are wards of the provincial government, for one reason or another. They are wards, or they receive mothers' allowances, or aid to dependent families, or they are in a provincial custodial institution of some kind.

Now, the changes which have been made are changes which have been brought about largely because of the introduction of the medical care insurance plan. There has been a limitation on the hospital visits which would be paid to a medical practitioner who served these people, a limit of 14 days. This limit has been removed and they will have available to them care on an unlimited basis. We have had an arrangement whereby when someone becomes no longer entitled to this service, by reason largely of having come into some income, we have had an arrangement whereby we gave them a hospital card for the balance of the year for which they became disentitled. It will now be provided that they will receive, not only a hospital card, but a joint card, so that they can look forward to receiving both hospital and medical care for the balance of the year in which they become disentitled to programs I and II service.

Similarly with people who are on old age assistance. Members will recall that this is the program which provides allowances for people between 65 and 70 who are in financial difficulties. These people will be given a joint card, entitling them not only to hospital care but also to medical care. Now, this program has been carried on under an agreement with the College of Physicians and Surgeons for a substantial number of years. It had been, I think, originally assumed that it would be integrated with the medical care insurance program proper, but the College of Physicians and Surgeons has expressed desire to have the program continued under administration by the Department of Public Health, and the arrangements to bring this about are presently under discussion with the College.

A good number of other parts of the program of the Department of Public Health are well worth commenting on, Mr. Speaker, but I just want to make one or two quick comments.

The provincial laboratory is carrying on, under very exceptional pressures brought about by a good number of changes, one of the new programs, or expanded programs, which is being carried on; is maintaining a close watch on the purity of Saskatchewan dairy products so that the wholesomeness of these foods can be maintained at their present very high level. Every effort is being made to test and prevent the marketing of milk which may contain any traces of pesticides or antibiotics. I think members will know that there has been some



misgivings about this over the past couple of years. We are presently expanding our facilities to carry out this work and the budget will provide extra money for this, so that we may continue and the people may have even greater confidence in the safety of these products.

Programs carried on by the physical restoration division and the occupational health division of the department will be expanded. Occupational health is necessarily expanding to meet complex health problems brought about by new mines, such as potash mines, the increasing use of radiation, and the treatment of various conditions. And here, Mr. Speaker, I might report to the house that in 1962 there was a comprehensive survey of the machines which are used for radiation purposes in the province. This was carried on in very close co-operation with the College of Physicians and Surgeons. We have a committee, half of them appointed by the College and half not, and they go around and check these installations, finding out which are unsafe. We turned up a good number which were unsafe and the necessary corrections for the safety of the staff will be made.

The health and safety education branch of the department continues to carry on its program. It is a real shame, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great regret, that no one has come up with a vaccine which would make people cautious and prudent, but none has yet been found. I don't know, we might inject them with Liberal vaccine and make them immobile, and thereby prevent accidents, but short of that, Mr. Speaker, we will have to content ourselves with safety programs; with prevention programs carried on through the public news media, through schools and through other avenues, and this is being vigorously pursued by the department.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer has already outlined in some detail the medical and dental bursaries which we are offering, and we are very hopeful that these bursaries will go a long way to alleviating shortages of staff, both medical and dental, from which the province may have been suffering.

For the past several years we have offered bursaries of \$1000 to dental students in their final year of training, on condition that they return to practice their profession in the province. We are coming to realize that the effectiveness of this program is limited by the fact that this is only directed to the final year of training and, accordingly, the new program, announced by the Provincial Treasurer, will provide 35 dental bursaries and they will be available to students in all their years at the dental colleges.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have enjoyed a close consultation with the College of Dental Surgeons on this project, and I think I can say that the council of the College endorses the program enthusiastically, and I am confident that the program will make a substantial contribution to meeting the needs for qualified dentists in the province.

It proposes a similar extensive program of medical bursaries and also a program of medical scholarships. Scholarships will be provided from amounts of \$250 to \$750, and I might here correct a report which appeared in the paper recently that the top scholarship would be \$1,000. The report is incorrect, Mr. Speaker, because I gave the reporter incorrect information and I correct it now.

The proposal is that there be some 40 scholarships and some 95 bursaries available to students in all of their years of medicine, and this should materially assist students in pursuing a medical career. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the costs of university education are high, and it must be part of the policy of government to see that there are opportunities open to any student who can benefit from university education. Now, this has been the policy of this government. We early launched a student loan fund, the most comprehensive one in Canada when it was introduced, and it still may well be. Then there were scholarships for students in Grade 12; scholarships for teachers. This is now an natural extension of this, scholarships for persons who wish to pursue medical and dental careers.

We believe that it is right that persons who can benefit from a university education receive assistance of the state, and we are accordingly providing this as another portion of a comprehensive program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said that I wanted to say a few words about Liberal policies and tactics in dealing with the medical care plan.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we can look back on 1962 and make one or two remarks which ought to be made.

We saw not only the introduction of the medical care plan, we saw a parliamentary opposition performing in a way that did them or the parliamentary system no credit. We have already heard, Mr. Speaker, of the Leader of the Opposition's private "Kick on Door" committees. Well, those were days of stress, and evidently the stress took its toll on some more than others.

**Mr. D.G. Stuart (Prince Albert):** — Some hid in rooms.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — But, Mr. Speaker, there can be no excuse, there can be no excuse for a continuation of these destructive tactics, and yet they appear to be continuing.

The Thatcherite formula appears to be one simply of this — keep the pot boiling until the next election; keep the medical care pot boiling — and, of course, leave as much stirring as possible to the independent groups, the K.O.D. committees, the Free Citizens Associations.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Fascists.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney** — Every criticism of the plan, real or imaginary, is carefully stirred into the pot, and these critics with a firm purpose, are bent on one thing, and one thing only, and this is to keep the pot boiling until the next election. Now, Mr. Speaker, occasionally they get caught out in admitting just this, and I want to quote what appeared in a Fargo, North Dakota, paper, a statement of one Ralph J. Purdy, and he is quoted as saying this:

Members of the K.O.D. (he was speaking for the K.O.D. on this occasion — that non-political organization) are determined to keep the medical care issue before the public until the next provincial election. The objective is to unseat the New Democratic Party by capturing a majority of the 55 seats in the Saskatchewan legislature.

Mr. Speaker, who is going to do the capturing? The non-political K.O.D. or the political arm of the K.O.D.?

**Mr. Steuart:** — We are.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Purdy, wears a couple of hats; sometimes he is Free Citizens Association, sometimes he is public relations expert of the K.O.D. But I think we can expect more of the same kind of thing.

We can expect people to exaggerate, and to distort the facts. We can expect the people to suggest that the plan isn't working. We can expect people to suggest that doctors aren't being paid, or the patients aren't receiving service. Anything to keep the pot boiling. Now, I think the majority of the people don't want this. I think they are fed up with this complaining, this constant harping on things which have passed, the constant harping on imaginary ills. I don't think the people want this; I don't think the doctors want this. I think the only people who do want it are the opposition and their alleged non-political arm, the K.O.D., and the Free Citizens Association.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — Let's have an election.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — And, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, all the members of this house, and the people of Saskatchewan to cast a critical eye at the stories they hear about the medical care plan. To check the sources and decide for themselves whether the story has any merit, or whether it is just another pot-boiler.

We all remember the frequent demands for investigations by the Leader of the Opposition just before the house started, respecting the payment to the approved health agencies. We haven't heard much about those at this session.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Turned out he was right.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I just want to say this, Mr. Speaker, if he demands an investigation, he shall have one. If he demands an investigation, he shall have one. Not a partial one, dealing only with the medical care insurance commission, but one dealing with the commission and the approved health agencies so that everyone may know, and may know precisely, who is at fault, if any, for any delay in the payments of physicians.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, if members opposite want this investigation, they may have it and we will find out where the facts are.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — All right, we'll have one right after the next election.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I didn't recall the Leader of the Opposition saying that he was going to have his investigation after the next election. It seemed to me that he was demanding immediate action when I last read his outburst from the press.

**Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City):** — Why don't you have it . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — We don't need an investigation. We know that wherever the fault may lie, it does not lie with the medical care insurance commission.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — How many days . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — We have no wish to inquire, Mr. Speaker, into the dealings between the approved health agencies and their member physicians, but,

Mr. Speaker, if accusations are made and continued to be made that the medical care insurance commission is at fault, and if investigations are demanded, we will have to seek out where the facts are.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are right here. I want to say this. I want to just read into the record a few statements as to payments. I have here an estimated value of all claims received by the medical care insurance commission and a total of the payments and advances made in each case to approved health agencies. And I will take three figures, four, all right — December 10, January 10, February 10, March 10. At December 10: value of claims \$2,300,000; total payments \$2,000,000. January 10: value of claims \$3,500,000; payments \$3,100,000. February 10: value of claims \$4,600,000; payments \$4,600,000. March 10: estimated value of claims \$5,700,000; payments \$6,000,000.

This clearly indicates, Mr. Speaker, that, far from there being delays on the part of the medical care insurance commission, the medical care insurance commission has paid over to the approved health agencies sums in excess of the total value of claims received from those agencies. This is brought about by the fact, Mr. Speaker, that initial advances were made to these agencies — some \$6 or \$700,000 — which were to be deducted from future payments; they have not yet been deducted, so that the situation obtains that the agencies have received more money to distribute to doctors than they have submitted claims to the medical care insurance commission.

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister answer a question?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I will reserve to see what the question is. If it is germane I will.

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, this is a question I ask in all sincerity of the minister. I had a case brought to my attention yesterday where a gentleman had extensive medical treatment over the past couple of months, which involved going to Rochester, and a bill of some \$900. He received a cheque yesterday, which can be verified, Mr. Minister, from the medical care commission for \$3.40. Can the minister explain how this could come about.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to explain this because this occurrence happens quite frequently. A number of the accounts of the medical care insurance are segregated in the sense that they are assessed in different ways. Surgical accounts will

frequently be assessed in a different way, by a different procedure, than a straight medical account, and it is quite possible for a bill to come in containing several items and one of the items be put on a separate card because it is going to be assessed differently; it go through the mill and be paid at 85 percent, and the other items not be dealt with until later. I am reminded of a particular example because the person who received it was quite incensed. He submitted an account for \$25 which contained two items, one for \$24 and one for \$1. These became separated in the assessing process — we are hopeful that we can reunite some of these — these became separated in the assessing process; the \$1 account was cleared and he received a cheque for 85¢, and he was considerable aggrieved that he received a cheque for 85¢ in consideration of an account of \$25. He subsequently received for 85 per cent of \$24, but this came later and, accordingly, it was only later that he realized that this was not payment in full.

Now, with respect to the question of the hon. member from Turtleford (Mr. Foley), it is possible, Mr. Speaker, that a number of the services rendered at Rochester would not have been insured services under the Medical Care Insurance Act. Members will know that the Medical Care Insurance Act does not cover cancer treatment and that treatment for cancer is covered by the cancer commission under their rules and regulations which have subsisted for many years, for 15 years or so, and it is quite possible for someone to get a very extensive operation for cancer and find that he can look to the medical care insurance commission for comparatively little money. He can, if he has taken the right procedures, usually look to the cancer commission for a substantial payment, but this is something I would ask all hon. members to check when their constituents come to them about this — is it a treatment for cancer, because this very frequently is a distinction which isn't appreciated by the public. We hope we can make this clear and this is the one which causes the most confusion.

I would also, in answer to the hon. member for Turtleford's question, point out that the out-of-province accounts are paid for on the basis of the prevailing Saskatchewan schedule of fees. This is usually reasonably adequate if the services are rendered in Canada but it has been our experience that those who seek care at Rochester frequently find that the reimbursement they receive is a considerably lesser amount of the total bill charged to them — Rochester fees are substantially higher than those in Canada. I suppose all of us can look forward in the years ahead to improving this plan and making it cover more extensively medical services sought outside the province. There are some pros and cons to this but the present act, as hon. members will know, provides that the medical services, insured services, may be sought outside the province freely but they will be paid for at the prevailing Saskatchewan schedule of fees.

These are a number of possible explanations. I couldn't, without examining further into the facts, indicate which one applied, if any, in the case raised by the hon. member from Turtleford (Mr. Foley).

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of comments made in the press, I think that is a very statesmanlike way to state that, a number of comments made about doctor supply and the fact that doctors were or might be leaving the province. And it is true that the number of doctors leaving the province during 1962 was somewhat higher than normal. We have always had a relatively high turnover of physicians. It is also true that a large number of doctors came into the province last year to set up permanent practices, and here I am not talking about temporary positions. I would refer you to figures reported to the Provincial Secretary by the Saskatchewan College of Physicians and Surgeons, which show that although 164 physicians left Saskatchewan for reasons other than post-graduate training, 160 new registrants were added to the list, 22 physicians died, making the total net loss 26 physicians. Now this true a net loss, but it is by no means the hundreds of doctors lost which were freely predicted, sometimes by members opposite, and which have indeed been reported as a fact in the press — 140, I've seen figures of that nature by some people who have not taken the trouble to check the figures issued by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Net loss of 26, Mr. Speaker.

I might mention that in January more physicians came into the province than left it.

We are grateful that doctors continue to come into Saskatchewan from medical colleges outside the province. We would be in a very unfortunate predicament if they did not, since our medical college does not produce graduates in all the specialties that this province will need. I think we can't count forever on this migration; we are going to, here in Saskatchewan and elsewhere in Canada, and indeed in North America, make our contribution to supplying doctors to areas of the world which need doctors much worse than we do, and in view of this I think we are going to have to train more medical practitioners, and I am accordingly very pleased that we were able to provide for the medical scholarships which the Hon. Provincial Treasurer reported in his address, and which I am confident will have a very beneficial effect on a number of students who are educated in Saskatchewan.

It has been true that all of the medical colleges in Canada have been experiencing difficulties in getting students to pursue medical careers. Various reasons have been advanced for this. The most prevalent one is that the glamour of nuclear-physics and the space age has drained off some potential students into research physics. However, this trend has been reversed in Canada. Last fall the medical

March 13, 1963

schools all across Canada, including the one at the University of Saskatchewan, were able to get a good supply of good applicants and there is every evidence that the medical education will again press forward and provide not only Saskatchewan, but all of Canada with an adequate supply of adequately trained doctors.

I want to just indicate one word about the medical care insurance commission votes as they appear in the printed estimates. You will have noted that the vote is slightly less money than was voted last year. Mr. Speaker, the explanation for that is that the yield from the appropriate taxes is estimated to be somewhat greater than last year — about \$16.4 million, but a number of programs which it was contemplated would be paid for out of this money are not now going to be paid through the medical care insurance commission. I just mentioned to the house that the College of Physicians and Surgeons has asked that the programs I and II be continued to be administered through the Department of Public Health. This is the provision of medical care to certain indigent groups. This was contemplated would be covered by the medical care insurance commission, and the cost of running that program and one or two other programs has been deducted to reduce this estimate to \$13.8 million, the precise difference between \$13.8 million and the estimated yield from the taxes will doubtless come out in estimates but that is the general explanation, Mr. Speaker.

I want now, Mr. Speaker, just before resuming my seat, to comment on one or two remarks made by a couple of other members. I have not made them earlier since I would have liked the members to be in their seats and they are now there.

I was interested, Mr. Speaker, in the remarks from the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). She was indicating that she had a great admiration for the virtues of the family farm, for growing up on a farm, and for growing up in a small town, and want to say to her and to other members opposite that I share some of her views on the very considerable social advantages which may be available to young people who grow up in an appropriate environment. I want, however, to say to her, that it is not only farm families, it is not only young people who grow up in a small town, as I did, Mr. Speaker, but also people who live in the larger cities who can have a very real and useful life, a life rich not only in economic terms but in spiritual values. Now I know she wasn't suggesting that there was anything which prohibited city people from having and enjoying the full fruits of life, not only the economic fruits thereof, but I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that there was no particular reason why anyone who lived on a farm should have to pay a penalty for these particular virtues and these particular advantages which, I am suggesting, not only can be but are available to people who live not only on our farms but in our small towns and in our cities. And I



think my earlier remarks about Wascana Centre, about the centennial celebrations indicate that here are ways in which we can add another dimension to life, not only in the rural areas but in the cities.

Somehow, Mr. Speaker, she suggested that the Attorney General had suggested that there was something despicable — perhaps that's too strong a word — but there was something improper, at least, about someone who lived in a subsidized house, enjoying state education to make a representation to a government.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I cannot always speak for the Attorney General, and I certainly would not always undertake to, but I do say that I believe I understand him well enough to say that this was not intended and this is an improper inference from what he said. Surely no one would suggest that there is any diminution of freedom simply by taking a state education. Surely no one would suggest that there is any diminution of freedom simply by living in a subsidized house. I live in a subsidized house. I have an N.H.A. mortgage which is at a subsidized rate. I am wealthy enough to enjoy the fruits of socialism. If I were a little poorer I couldn't enjoy these fruits of socialism. And surely, Mr. Speaker, in the same way no one can honestly suggest that there is any diminution of freedom if they enjoy state medical care. I can see no distinction, Mr. Speaker, from those who enjoy a state subsidy in housing — their freedom is not impaired; if they take a state education — their freedom is not impaired; if they enjoy the fruits of state-provided medical care plan — their freedom is not impaired.

I think that these people have another freedom which the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) didn't mention. And this is a freedom — and she mentioned people on social aid — I am suggesting a freedom which they haven't enjoyed in this house, and this is the freedom to be free of unbridled abuse, free of abuse which has no basis in fact, free from being called, without evidence, drunks; free from being called, without evidence, deadbeats; free from being called, without evidence, chisellers. I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that this would have been a freedom which our people on social aid ought to have enjoyed. And Mr. Speaker, they do enjoy it from members on this side of the house, and it is a matter for great regret that they don't enjoy it from members in all parts of the house.

**Mrs. Batten:** — On a point of order. If the member is referring to anything I said, I have certainly not called anyone deadbeats, or drunks or chisellers.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I was not referring to the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). I am pleased to know that she would suggest that these were improper remarks just as I would.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want, before resuming by seat, to say a few words about education, and more particularly about the remarks of the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). I have already indicated that I felt that there was a good deal of merit in what he said. He advanced the idea that what this province needed was a foundation program for education, for the financing of education, and I must say that there is a considerable merit in the foundation program approach. But I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that it isn't all clear sailing when it comes to a foundation program.

A foundation program is predicated on this assumption — that a uniform mill rate provides an equitable basis for taxation. Now this, Mr. Speaker, is not an assumption which I am prepared to agree with. The difficulty is this, Mr. Speaker, that while the assessment programs which have been operated by the assessment commission provide a fair degree of comparability as between farm and farm, and as between house lot and house lot, it is my submission, Mr. Speaker, that the assessments as presently conceived do not provide a fair degree of comparison between a city property and farm property. Accordingly, the payment of a uniform mill rate on a city property and a town property, and a uniform mill rate on an adjacent rural property, is not necessarily an appropriate measure of the ability to pay.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that our unit boards throughout the province have consistently recognized this. And I think they are on the right track in so-doing. The unit boards have, in almost every case throughout the province, set a rural mill rate which was lower than the urban mill rate. One might take, let us say, a unit such as Shaunavon or Gull Lake — Gull Lake is a good one under the circumstances. The Gull Lake rural assessment is 25 mills, and the Gull Lake urban assessment is 33 mills. Now, Mr. Speaker, we might level that off at 27 or 28 mills if we were just operating a foundation program in the Gull Lake unit area. But I don't think it would be any more fair than this distribution. I rather think it would be less fair, and I think that the Gull Lake board are on the right track in having a differential mill rate between a rural property and urban property.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — You can do that under a foundation . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, this isn't the way it operates and there is no way, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that one can draw the distinctions that are made between rural and hamlet and village and town, which are all found in the present pattern of mill rates in a foundation program. I suppose all is theoretically possible but this is not what is normally envisaged by a foundation program. And the uniform mill rate, I am suggesting, does not produce equity. There are many, many places where this would be most unfair, and I may say, Mr. Speaker, that because our assessment does not now reflect full earning capacity of the land, because wheat farming has become a less stable method of earning income and cattle has become a more important basis for income. There are difficulties, the assessments do not fairly reflect the earning capacity of the land in every case. And under these circumstances it seems to me that a uniform mill rate would not produce any greater degree of equity than can be produced by the present system.

Now the foundation program has a number of other little difficulties. It involves the provincial government reviewing the budgets of all school districts and, at least as practised in Alberta, it represents a substantial measure of central control by the Department of Education on the program offered by the school districts. Now, there is much to be said for a uniform approach to education and this is possibly inherent in the desire which we all have to see every young person, wherever he may grow up, having an equal educational opportunity. But on the other hand, there is much to be said for the Department of Education not attempting to have too precise measure of direction on the type of programs offered by all of the school boards in Saskatchewan.

Now I am not by any means suggesting that there is no merit in the foundation program. I am just meaning to suggest that all is not clear sailing when we come to the consideration of a foundation program. The introduction of a foundation program in Alberta had some very startling results. It caused very sharp increases in mill rates in many areas and I am sure it would in Saskatchewan — people with mill rates like Shaunavon rural of 22, or Eastend rural of 25, or Milestone rural of 23, Gull Lake rural of 25, could, I think, anticipate a very substantial increase in their mill rate even if we used a uniform rate for rural areas only. And while it may be alleged that this would be fairer, I am not sure that in every case it would be a fairer distribution of the burden of educational costs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), in the course of his remarks on education, suggested that the government was doing nothing to recognize the grave responsibilities of the trustees. That was my note of what he said. Well, I just want to remind the house again of the increases in school grants. 1949-50 — \$6 million; 1954-55 — \$10 million; 1959-60 — \$24 million; 1960-61 — \$28 million; 1961-62 — \$32 million; 1962-63 — \$34 million — a very sustained and sharp increase in the level of school grants.

March 13, 1963

Mr. Speaker, it is probably true that the grants are not all that the trustees and teachers would like to see, but, however they can be described, they cannot be described as doing nothing to recognize the grave responsibilities of trustees.

Now a word or two about federal aid to education. I was pleased, very pleased I may say, to hear the views expressed by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) and I hope it is the policy of the provincial Liberal party, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that it is the policy of the federal Liberal Party. I wish it had been the policy of the federal Liberal party in 1957 because, Mr. Speaker, members on this side of the house, prior to 1957, advanced the idea that the problems of education required an approach, an organization of all our resources, both federal, provincial and municipal, and at that time, Mr. Speaker, the federal Liberal government did not take the view that was expressed by the hon. member for Maple Creek.

Now, I want freely to admit that the educational problems at that time were not quite as acute as they are now, and that there is no reason why, in a change of circumstances, one cannot change one's views. I just want to express the hope that members opposite urge upon their colleagues in the federal government, the federal M.P.'s, that federal aid be made available to education.

Mr. Speaker, we may after the next election see a Liberal government. It will be unlikely, I know . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . but we may, we may indeed see a situation where the support of Liberal M.P.'s of a government of another political stripe, which will probably get the majority of seats, or at least the largest single block, would be enough to ensure that federal aid was made available to education. And I think hon. members opposite, if indeed it is a Liberal policy, can do a great deal to influence their Liberal M.P.'s at Ottawa to see that this policy is not one which is simply enunciated when Liberals are in opposition, but is enunciated when a Liberal vote will do something to introduce this policy into Canada.

Now, the member made a few remarks, and there wasn't anything that one could take exception to, except to suggest that he somehow suggested that the existing curriculum in Saskatchewan schools might give too much way to frills. Now, these weren't his words, but he talked about people who wished to introduce psychiatry, and wished to introduce sociology, and these sort of thing. He didn't say they were a part of the present curriculum, but in case any members might be confused

as to the nature of the curriculum, and whether or not it is an appropriate intellectual fare, I would like to call attention of the hon. members to the Grade 12 subjects.

And I will just read them off and ask yourself which of these present an intellectual challenge and which of them will be a waste of the student's time.

There is literature, composition, social studies, algebra, geometry, trigonometry, physics, chemistry, biology, economics, home-economics, geology, history of English literature, Latin, French, German and Ukrainian. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a fairly rich intellectual diet, and whatever else it can be described, it cannot be described as a program which will do anything else than challenge the students in Grade 12.

Now, admittedly, Mr. Speaker, there are other schools, which offer commercial subjects, typing, shorthand, bookkeeping, office practice, commercial law, woodworking, motor mechanics, machine shop and drafting. But I think, Mr. Speaker, all of us are agreed that these are part of the broadening of the school system in Saskatchewan which must take place if we are to make our system appeal to all of the young people in Saskatchewan and make the services of our Saskatchewan high schools available to all young people.

And, Mr. Speaker, I see you are looking at the clock, I will simply want to say in conclusion, before you read me the rules, that because the budget provides funds for many projects which I think are worthy, such as the Wascana Centre, a project which is one of broadening horizons; because it provides for an expansion of very worthwhile services such as highways and grid roads; because it provides massive sums of school and particularly, university education; and because it will permit the extension of our general health programs; continued leadership in Saskatchewan in mental health care; and because it provides funds for a comprehensive medical care plan and thereby holds out the promise of this care to all Canadians; because of all of these things, Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the amendment and support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Before the minister sits down, I wonder if he would mind answering one question. I was quite interested in his comments and I would like to ask you this: Do you now favor federal aid for education on the primary and secondary levels?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, I think at this time I have to interrupt all proceedings and allow the mover of the motion 20 minutes, if he wishes to exercise that right, to close the debate.

March 13, 1963

**Mr. Cameron:** — I don't know if the minister wishes to answer, but if time will not permit him . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The time will not permit him to. In committee you can maybe ask him that.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I'll answer it again when I have an opportunity.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — On March 1, when I moved the Speaker now leave the chair, I recognized that it was going to be quite a few days before that would take place. I was sure at that time that we had a very good budget, and after listening to the debate in this house since that time, and listening to the criticism of the opposition, I am now double sure that we have a good budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I am sure because of the difficulty that the members of the opposition had in finding grounds to criticize the budget. That was demonstrated by their wanderings over a great deal of time and quite a bit of country. And I would first like to mention, for example, the wanderings from the budget of the hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein). In the opposition there used to be a member for Redberry, Mr. Korchinski, who adopted the role of a Senator McCarthy, for the Liberal party. It seems to me that the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch is now adopting the role of Senator McCarthy, which everyone knows was a case of smearing people by association.

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . whole party.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now this hon. member was a student in the Teacher's College in Moose Jaw, prior to 1953, and it was in 1953 that Dr. Mahood, left the Teachers' College at Moose Jaw. Cuba was not in the news; Cuba then, I suppose, had a Batista dictatorship that pleased the hon. member. Neither Castro nor even Khrushchev was in the news at that time, and I'm informed that Dr. Mahood has never talked with the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch since that time, so I wonder how he knows, or presumes to know, opinions of Dr. Mahood, and certainly Dr. Mahood has informed me that if the hon. member is implying that Dr. Mahood has ever been, or is now, a communist, it is completely false.

Dr. Mahood states that he never invited Mr. Matson to address any meeting at any time, and he says it is untrue that he ever set up any little select group to meet two or three times a week. And the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch called this a cell meeting. Well, I don't know and Dr. Mahood doesn't know whether the member attended cell meetings or not,

but there were weekly discussion club meetings of the students where they brought in their own guest speakers where they controlled their own discussions and so forth, and now the member calls this by name. We are convinced that there is grave doubt about the hon. member's real desire to have free speech in this country, the people cannot get together and discuss these things.

This is not a new tactic. We have been used to this, ever since the CCF was organized we have been used to this tactic of trying to smear the party and all who were connected with it.

Most of the opposition speakers refused completely to recognize the good financial position in which the province found itself at this time, with no net debt. I would have thought that if the hon. members take any pride in their province at all, they would be happy about this situation. I'm not claiming credit for it, although we probably could claim credit for a little bit of good management and some fortuitous circumstances, and some good luck.

But this measure of net debt, is a measure that is commonly used all across Canada. It is used by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as a measure. We not only have, as I said when I was introducing the motion, no net debt, we have some net interest revenue over and above the interest revenue which we have to pay.

The member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie), when he was speaking, warned us of the danger of having a substantial part of our debt, payable in United States funds. I will be able, in a short time, to inform the members in regards to that question in some detail. I will certainly go farther than my colleague the Minister of Public Health went. In the recent loans in the United States, the value of the Canadian dollar would have to go down to .85 percent of the American dollar and stay there for the whole term of the loan before we would lose. But I will get some facts and figures on that for my hon. friend in this house.

One of the members of the opposition was in my constituency at the village of Weekes last spring on May 28, and this statement was made at that meeting: "The legislature had to vote \$23 million to cover interest on borrowing, so how can the public debt be only \$17 million. That was in May, 1962. Well, Mr. Speaker, what was wrong with the statement? First of all, the legislature didn't have to vote it; the interest item was a statutory appropriation. Second, the public debt at that time was not \$17 million, and he doesn't define whether he is talking about net debt or gross debt. The net debt was, at that time, \$22 million. It was \$17 million back in 1960, so he was wrong on that count, but it is quite evident that he was trying to leave the impression with the people of Saskatchewan

March 13, 1963

that out of the taxes and out of the general revenue of the province, there was going \$23 million for interest, and that when we reported that the net debt of the province was \$17 or 19, or 22 million, that was not correct. That is what he was trying to impress on these people, and that member was the hon. member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) who was at that meeting. But the people of that district can't be fooled quite that easily.

I often remember what the Liberal party said 20 years ago, and even later than 20 years ago. They said "that if ever a group of farmers and teachers and preachers got elected to the government, what a mess the province would find itself in. They could never run the business."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We had a net debt of nearly \$170 million and now it has disappeared. Figures on exactly the same basis for the \$170 million as for the present time. But, Mr. Speaker, I really never expect to convince my hon. friends in that regard. I was very much amused when the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) said "This government has had the best 18 years in our history" . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . and this is right. This is one of the rare occasions on which we can agree.

**An Hon. Member:** — In Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Why? We, in this government wouldn't like to take all of the credit by any means for the good 18 years. Not by any means.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — That's a switch.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — But I do want to point out that before these 18 years, we had Liberal and Conservative governments, and my hon. friends have had associations with both those parties, in power in Saskatchewan and in Ottawa.

**Mr. McDonald:** — So have you.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And none of those governments were able to cope with the economic problems of the day, and when my hon. friend from Moosomin takes this line, that it is a mere matter of chance as to whether you



get 18 years or not, well, I guess he is going back to the good old doctrine of predestination. It's that way and you can't do anything about it. We don't think that.

**Mr. McDonald:** — We're there whether you like it or not.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We think things can be changed; that an economic system that has been built by men can be changed and repaired and made to work by men.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — I can see why there is more . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) quotes a radio speech of mine, made in 1942, about the revenue from natural resources. Sorry, the hon. member isn't here because I wanted to remind him that in 1941-42 the revenue to the province from resources was \$2.5 million, by 1957-58 that revenue had become \$28.7 million, and in the last complete fiscal year \$24 million.

I was right when I said we should get and we would get more returns from our natural resources with a CCF government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Whenever a member in the opposition mentions a municipality, I always want to find out what municipality it is, and the member for Yorkton spoke about the R.M. of Calder, No. 241, and he said one of the poorest municipalities in the province, so I decided to look it up. It isn't one of the poorest municipalities in the province; it isn't a poor municipality at all. He said, "Why, they only built a few miles of road and they had a \$1,200 deficit this year". This, of "course, is a favorite tactic of the opposition. They are picking out, as my hon. friend says, selected, carefully selected statistics to give a part of the picture. This municipality has slightly less than nine townships in its area, and it is not a regular shaped municipality. Hon. members can see the shape. These big heavy black lines crossing the municipality are provincial highways. This municipality has 38.5 miles of provincial highways. There is only about ten sections of land in this municipality that are more than six miles from the highway. They have a relatively simple problem in regard to roads. They have a grid road program of 18 miles, and they have built 15.5 miles; they have their grid road program 86 percent completed.

March 13, 1963

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I say I am more than ever convinced that we have a good budget, because this is the kind of criticism that has been introduced in this debate.

The member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) I think it was talked about the potash mine at Esterhazy, and it is amazing how all the members in the opposition are so possessive and so proud of this great potash mine. And he said that this mine was established because of unsatisfied world demand. I was just reading the paper the other day and I find that the present potash mines can produce up to 25 percent more than world demand. This, too, was not based on facts at all.

We come to the question of the budget, and this was again the member for Gravelbourg, the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), and a whole list of them: "the budget surplus means over-taxation".

Well, let's look at the situation. What is meant is that there was a whale of a lot of good luck, and nobody should complain about that, not even the opposition.

Our consumption taxes in Saskatchewan could definitely go down a million, two million, three million, yes, I would say with a very light and poor crop, even five million dollars. This year they were up because of greater economic activity and a good crop. Resources revenues unexpectedly were up about five million dollars, and this might occur again.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think probably we have fallen victim to the depressed feelings of the opposition; they sometimes get us convinced that we are not doing as well in Saskatchewan as we really are; and we underestimate our revenues from the development of resources; but anyway, we have \$5 million more in resources than we expected. Who is complaining about it? Who is kicking? Was it over-taxation?

**Premier Lloyd:** — They are.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The federal-provincial tax-sharing agreement is up nearly \$7 million between the miscalculation in regard to the growth of Saskatchewan population, and Ontario and B.C.'s population, because of the very good growth in gross national production, and because of adjustments over the previous agreement term, and that is not likely to occur again. But that isn't, I would say, something that won't occur again.

And then the shared programs with the federal government, up \$1 to \$2 million. The member for Maple Creek was very vocal in saying "Oh, this is terrible, having this kind of a surplus. This should be returned to the people of Saskatchewan or should be spent for services". Well, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be spent for services, and all those people over there are going to vote against it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — In a few minutes they are going to vote against us going into committee of supply to vote these very things. This is what they are going to do.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — One minute.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — This is what they are going to do. No, and when they say this is a deliberate attempt to cover up; it is the first time I ever heard described an official paper, tabled in the house, on every member's desk, with all the figures in it, as an attempt to cover up.

You know what they do in some other provinces, of course. They take the surplus at the end of the year, if there is any, and they count it as revenue for the next year. We don't do that, and I don't think that is a good practice that gives a very true picture.

Now, these supplementary estimates, a good many of them have been mentioned, and if we were as ambitious as the Liberal governments we had in the past in Saskatchewan, why, we wouldn't be doing any of these things. We wouldn't bother with community well-development program, with land development for community pastures, with land acquisition for highways and construction of highways, when we didn't have to. We wouldn't . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the time has come to interrupt the minister.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is all right, Mr. Speaker, and I will just say it is needless for me to say that I will oppose the amendment and support my motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Amendment negatived.

March 13, 1963

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	Dahlman
Walker	Nicholson	Stevens
Nollet	Stone	Kluzak
Kuziak	Whelan	Peterson
Cooper (Mrs.)	Thibault	Broten
Strum (Mrs.)	Berezowsky	

**NAYS — 19**

**Messieurs**

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

The Assembly, accordingly, resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.