

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
SIXTH SESSION – FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE  
4th day**

**Tuesday, February 11, 1964**

The Assembly met at 2:30 p.m.  
on the Orders of the Day

**QUESTION RE: NO. 14 HIGHWAY**

**Mr. James E. Snedker (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to ask the Provincial Treasurer if the pre-budget announcement, made by the Minister of Agriculture, as reported in the press of February 10th, regarding the spring re-building of no. 14 highway, is correct?

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to say I haven't seen the report.

**WELCOME TO THE STUDENTS**

**Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. members the fact that we have with us today the students from the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon and Regina campus, and also quite a number of international students, who are studying in Saskatchewan. I would like to welcome especially Mr. & Mrs. Harrington, who for a number of years have taken a keen interest in the international students who come to Saskatchewan. I hope that some of the young people will be interested in a political career of some kind, and that their visit to the legislature will be profitable to them and for the members.

Dinner is being served at 5:30 with Your Honour presiding as usual. Room 267 is available after the house adjourns in case any of the students have questions they would like to direct to members of either side of the House. I hope some of the hon. Members from both sides will be available to answer questions, that the students might have.

**Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**TRIBUTE TO FRANK BAILEY RINK**

**Mr. Gordon T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I think it would be appropriate at this time to pay tribute to the Frank Bailey rink of Central Collegiate Institute in Moose Jaw, who yesterday won the Saskatchewan Curling Championship for the high school boys, and I am sure that all members of the House will want to join with me in expressing our congratulations to them, and wishing them every success in their endeavors beginning with the Canadian Curling Championship, which starts in Regina on this coming Monday. I am sure that all members will want to join with me in extending to them our best wishes and congratulations on their achievement.

**Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. David Boldt (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery to your right, to the students from the Waldheim High School. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Clifford Jansen. I am sure that we all will give them a cordial welcome and hope that their stay will be a pleasant one.

**Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to welcome a group of some 50 school children from the Christ the King School, in Saskatoon, along with their teachers. I am sure all members will join with me in saying how delighted we are to have them here, we hope their stay will be an informative and a pleasant one.

**Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I think it would be appropriate for me to say how happy we all are that the girls from Meath Park, their curling team, did win the Saskatchewan Championship as I had hoped they would, and I am sure the hon. Members of this house wish them the best of success in any future competition.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Michayluk for an Address in Reply.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, my first remarks this afternoon, must be to associate myself and my colleagues, with the remarks which were made a few moments ago by the Minister from Saskatoon, in welcoming the university students who are with us today. Governments of course, at all levels are playing an increasing role in the lives of all of us. For that reason, it has never been more vital for young people to take some interest in government. No doubt, a few of our visitors, before very long will be occupying seats in this legislature and in the parliament at Ottawa. So we in the opposition, join with the government members in hoping that their visit will be enjoyable and fruitful.

Mr. Speaker, when the debate was adjourned yesterday, I had been speaking about the NDP, and indicating that in my opinion, it was a fading political force across Canada. I pointed out how we had had nine provincial elections in the past year or year and a half, and how in each of those elections NDP strength had dwindled to a very considerable degree. I pointed out that in the two bastions of Ontario and British Columbia their popular vote had gone down materially. I pointed out how in Newfoundland their popular vote had gone to three per cent — how in Manitoba it had fallen from 22 to 15 per cent — how in the Nova Scotia election it had dropped to four per cent. How in the Alberta election the NDP figure was down to nine per cent. I reminded my hon. Friends across the way that in Quebec, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, the NDP were so weak that they could not even field candidates. Since I spoke in the house yesterday, we have had two more federal by-elections and I think hon. members would be interested to know how the NDP fared in those elections. I remind you that the Liberals were declared elected, by Canadian Press, ten minutes after the polls were closed. In the Laurier constituency the NDP vote fell from 2,379 to 863, the popular vote for 13.2 per cent to 8.2 per cent. In the St. Denis riding the NDP strength fell from 2,637 last April to 606 yesterday — from 11.5 per cent down to 3.9 per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to be fair; the NDP yesterday did accomplish one thing, it was nip and tuck all night but they did defeat finally the Rhinoceros Party.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — And so I say, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP across Canada, and including the province of Saskatchewan, is fast going into oblivion.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Will the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Why certainly.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — When did the Liberals first win those seats?

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — They never lost them.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Why they never them and their majorities are getting bigger all the time.

Mr. Speaker, the duty of the opposition in this House and in any parliament is primarily to point out and criticize any weaknesses there may be in government policies. Sometimes in carrying out that task our actions are misinterpreted. Some people wonder if we are too harsh, others wonder if we are too destructive. There are a few who wonder if perhaps we are a bit unfair. However, I think that most people, regardless of their politics would agree that good government does require a hard working and I hope an alert opposition. I think that such opposition is the best safeguard that we have for our democratic way of life. This session of the legislature in all probability is a pre-election session. Within a few months the people of Saskatchewan will decide whether or not they want a change of administration. We on this side of the House believe that the election which is coming up is not an ordinary election, because the ballots cast next June will decide much more than which political party will win. The voters by their decision will either commit this province to the tighter grasp of socialism, perhaps for years to come, or swing it back into line with the rest of an expanding Canada.

Now as we prepare for the coming election, I think I speak for my colleagues when I say that the Liberal Party is cautiously optimistic. In the 1960 election some four years ago, we won 16 seats in this legislature. Since that time, apart from their defeat in the rest of Canada, the NDP in this province have met four successive defeats at the polls, each one with a larger figure. Perhaps I could remind you today that the Socialists lost the Athabaska deferred election by a 171 votes. I am sure every one remembers they lost the Turtleford by-election by 612 votes. They lost the Weyburn election by 874 votes, and by a resounding margin of 2,522 votes the NDP lost Prince Albert. In addition since 1960, the former Minister of Health has been welcomed to Liberal ranks. In short, Mr. Speaker, the NDP have had since 1960, five humiliating defeats. At the same time, strength on this side of the house has gone up by five seats, to where we have 21 members. I remind you that time and again in the past, ever since this province was formed in 1905, the government which lost by-elections, was invariably defeated when the main election came along.

I can tell you that since this province was formed, never was there a government that has lost so many by-elections as this one. I say that the lessons of history would indicate very clearly that the days of the NDP in office are numbered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why people have become disillusioned and disenchanted with the NDP. I'm not going to take much time on that subject this afternoon. However, I think there is one reason that does deserve mention. That is the amalgamation several years ago of the old CCF with the Canadian Labour Congress. From the very beginning of that merger, farmers in this province have been apprehensive of that kind of a tie-up. They have realized that in the NDP across Canada, labour has an overwhelming number of members. They have realized here in Saskatchewan that the farmer in this new alliance is a very junior partner, a very minor partner. Farmers know that in this NDP group, labour contributes most of the funds. Because of that fact labour leaders today dominate the NDP. Now the socialists have claimed for some time that the interests of labour and the farmer are the same. The farmers of this province simply haven't bought that proposition. They know that frequently the interests of the farmer and labour are different. They become more convinced of that fact last fall. Farmers in Saskatchewan, as everyone knows, raised the biggest grain crop in history this past year. Simultaneously the wheat board, the federal Liberal government, embarked on one of the most effective selling programs since Saskatchewan became a province. They sold hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat. But just as that wheat was starting out to market last fall, first the longshoremens, then the Seafarers International Union, went out on strike, endangering the very livelihood of the markets of our farmers. This naked interference in the movement of grain by eastern union bosses, and several American union leaders, was keenly resented by farmers in all political parties.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The NDP has been touted as a union of farm organization, of co-operatives and of trade unions. Surely it is significant, that not one farmers' organization, not one co-operative organization, has seen fit officially to join the NDP. Mrs. Speaker, I can tell you also that there are many prominent trade unionists who have wanted no part of the NDP. They have believed very strongly that when unions are politically independent they are wooed by all political parties. But as part of a small minority political group, particularly a socialist group, their influence has been diminished with the major parties. There are many trade unionists, particularly those who are Liberal or Conservative, who have resented being obliged to donate to the party of my hon. friends opposite through the political check-off from their pay envelopes. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I say, the NDP has been a failure. So much so that in the last federal election in the province of Saskatchewan, the vote of my hon. friends fell to a little more than 18 per cent. Now in the face of these facts, socialists are desperately trying to retrieve their strength by reviving the old CCF name. In their television broadcasts, in their overall publicity, the word NDP is now avoided like the plague. One would almost think my hon. friends consider the label a dirty word, Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday afternoon, the people of Saskatchewan will not be fooled or misled by party name juggling. They are not going to align themselves with a class party. If the Premier and his associates feel that they are unable to garner the farm vote by calling themselves NDP, then we on this side challenge them to openly repudiate the NDP, until they do this I believe they will continue to lose adherents.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the province of Saskatchewan today, two-thirds of our people, at least, would like to see this government defeated. Repeatedly in the past the socialists have been elected on a minority percentage, because the anti-socialists split their votes. I say that this must not happen again. Those who wish a change of government in the province of Saskatchewan today, must ask themselves a very simple question. Which party has the most realistic change of accomplishing this task?

Let us examine the alternatives. First of all, could Social Credit defeat my hon. friends? Well, last April, Social Credit candidates in this province were able to garner 3.6 per cent of the federal vote. Since that time both Mr. Thompson and Mr. Caouette have been feuding in Ottawa to such an extent, that they appear to have torn their party asunder. Their own leader Mr. Kelln has announced that Social Credit will only field a handful of candidates. Unless my hon. friends opposite can persuade them to do other wise, I suppose we shall only have a handful of Social Credit candidates. So I think I am not being unfair when I say that Social Credit is a negligible political force in Saskatchewan today.

What about our Conservative friends? It is now more than 34 years since the Tories elected a single member to this legislature on their own.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — What about the hon. member for Moosomin?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — He was elected with a Liberal convention and a Conservative convention, and became a Liberal as any sensible person would do.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — In the 1960 election, the Tories received 13.6 per cent of the vote. Conservative candidates lost their deposits in all but a handful of seats. It seems very probable that the same thing will happen in 1964.

Now the leader of the Conservative party said he would prefer an NDP government if he can't elect a Conservative one. I don't think his view is shared by very many Conservatives. I sincerely believe that by supporting their own candidates, the only role that the Conservatives can play in the coming election, is to split the vote, and perhaps disastrously again make possible the re-election of the socialists.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the Liberals? Surely the Liberals with 21 members in the legislature, are the only realistic and practical alternative to the socialists. We need nine more seats and we are going to get far more than that number.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — In some constituencies, local Liberals have expressed willingness to co-operate with the Conservatives, to make sure that the wishes of the majority are realized, and to ensure that this province gets the kind of government they want. I regret that fact that the Conservative leader has shown no interest in such overtures, although, of course, I recognize his right to take such an attitude. However, it does seem to me that there are times when the interests of a province should transcend the interests of a party. I believe that in this election the very well being of our province is at stake. If Saskatchewan is to begin a period of expansion and development, it is vital that the NDP be replaced by a government capable of changing the economic plan.

I say that Liberal-Conservative co-operation would have made certain the defeat of my hon. friends opposite. Since that co-operation has been rejected, I suggest that the only other alternative is for the anti-socialists to unite behind the Liberals. The issue in the 1964 election is already crystal clear — our people must choose either the socialism of the NDP or the reform policies of the Liberals.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — There is no other practical alternative.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the house, believe that the NDP has not made a good job of developing Saskatchewan these past few decades. We don't suggest that things are terrible but we do think — (a) that they are not as good as they could be — and (b) that they are worse than conditions in other provinces with similar or fewer resources.

This afternoon I could spend a good deal of my time discussing the sad and sorry socialist record in Saskatchewan. Believe me there is nothing I would like to do better. However, I feel that our people are not particularly interested in the past. They are far more interested in the future. They want to know how Saskatchewan's development compares to development in other parts of Canada. Not yesterday — but today. They want to know about employment opportunities, here and in the rest of Canada. Young people in our agricultural communities want to know what kind of assistance they can obtain to go farming or into business. As far as politics are concerned, I think they want to know which party has the best program to promote development and expansion in Saskatchewan. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I propose to devote most of my time this afternoon in outlining the reasons why Liberals believe — (a) that a change of administration is needed, — (b) that the Liberals have a vigorous program which is vitally needed by the people of Saskatchewan at this critical time.

As we prepare for the campaign, the NDP have tried to spread dire warnings to the people of Saskatchewan, as to what will happen if the Liberals take office. Among other things they have suggested that many civil servants will be fired. They have suggested that social welfare measures will be discarded, that crown corporations will all be sold, that legislation favorable to labour will be repealed. Mr. Speaker, I think that any unbiased person will agree that all governments have some good programs and all governments have some ineffective programs.

Just as the NDP left on the statute books, when they took office, many good pieces of legislation introduced by the Liberals, so also when we form a government next June, will we leave on the statute books any beneficial legislation which was introduced by the NDP.

The Liberal party is not interested in tearing down, were interested in building up. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the basic philosophy of the Liberal party?

Down through the years, the Liberals have been a reform party. As a matter of fact, most of the major social welfare measures introduced into this country, were brought in by Liberal governments. I think for a moment of old age pensions. I think of the \$10. increase the Liberal government just gave our pensioners a few months ago. I think of family allowances. I think of unemployment insurance. I think of PFA. I think of many aspects of PFRA.

These are things brought in by a reform Liberal government. I say that the Liberal party traditionally has never been content to remain static. It has been the party of new ideas, and the party of the fresh approach, and I hope it will maintain that kind of an outlook. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party has been something more. The Liberal party has been a party of responsibility, I believe very sincerely, that more and more people have come to realize that there is no magic in government finance. Before any administration, regardless of its policies, can take a dollar from the pocket of one person, it must take that dollar from the pocket of another person. I think that most of our tax payers are coming to realize that all political promises, ultimately must be paid for out of his pocketbook.

Therefore, the Liberals have always related their reforms to the economic capacity of the taxpayers. Last November the Liberal party held their annual convention. I am sure my hon. friends would be interested to know that it was perhaps the biggest convention that the Liberal party had ever held in this province. Certainly, the biggest in latter years. Twelve hundred and fifty delegates, plus several hundred visitors. Now this convention was a gathering of Liberals from all over the province. It included young Liberals, it included Indians, it included wives and mothers, it included trade unionists, and at that convention, the delegates formulated the program which will form the basis of our appeal in the next campaign. Personally I feel that it is a good program, bold, imaginative and constructive, designed to meet the needs of our people now. We don't for a moment say that our program overnight will solve all the problems which are facing the people of Saskatchewan, but we do believe that our platform contains honest, businesslike, practical answers which are so urgently needed in Saskatchewan today. In a general way I can say that the Liberal party does not intend in the months ahead, to try and buy political favour by outbidding the socialist in various giveaway programs. We don't intend to try seek election by trying to out-promise the NDP. In the first place one couldn't do so, even, if one wanted to try. Those who are seeking the spectacular and the sensational, will not find it our platform. Our main objective may be very simply stated. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals wish to give Saskatchewan good government. The Liberal program envisages sound administration of the province's affairs; major tax reductions; the pursuit of policies, which would bring about the industrial expansion to which we are entitled and a stop in the steady, steady population exodus.

I propose this afternoon to outline some of the major features of the Liberal program. In so doing I should like first of all to turn to finance and taxation.

In 1943 and 1944, the last Liberal government spent \$33 million. In 1963, overall expenditures under the NDP will exceed \$380 million. When the Liberals left office in 1944, our provincial debt was \$234 million – that is the gross debt. Just before Christmas, the Provincial Treasurer, made one of his amazing speeches. He said “We wiped out all the provincial debt” Isn't that typical socials arithmetic?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege the Leader of the Opposition is misquoting me. I never said that we wiped out all the provincial debt, and I want him to stand corrected. What I said was, “Saskatchewan now had no net debt, but had net assets.”

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't blame the minister for correcting such a silly statement as he made just before Christmas. Anyone who looks into the into the picture, knows that the gross provincial debt is \$580 million . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. Leader of the Opposition must recognize my correction, not of the statement I made last fall, but of the statement he made just now. That he misquoted me, and he was incorrect, and I have corrected him and he must not get up and infer that I was correcting myself. I was not doing that.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . Mr. Speaker, before the hon. minister gets high blood pressure, I'll let him play his record as he wishes.

Interest in the provincial debt in the last year of the Liberal administration was \$5.8 million. This year it will exceed \$27 million.

The history of the administration opposite for 20 years has been a long and steady increase in virtually all old taxes, and in the imposition of hundreds of new levies. As we sit here this afternoon, I say it is virtually impossible to think of any opportunity or any excuse for taxation, which has not been fully exploited by the socialists. Why in this session we weren't in the house for five minutes before the Attorney General got up and announced that we were going to have higher car insurance rates. Today, I remind the people of Saskatchewan of a return tabled by my hon. friends in the legislature, February 27th, 1961. That return by their own admission indicated that since 1944, 600 completely new taxes have been imposed by my hon. friends, and 650 other taxes have been increased. Of course, some of the increases were of minor nature, but some of them were of a very major nature. Back in the last election, my socialist friends campaigned on the slogan, "Support the party that keeps its promises". I would like to remind them today of some of the promises they made about taxes. What about land taxation? According to the Regina Leader Post on June 2nd, 1944, the then leader of the socialists said this:

Gravelbourg – the CCF will shift the basis of taxation from land and consumption to profits on mortgage companies.

Well there has been a shifting all right, Mr. Speaker, a shifting of more and more taxes on to the farmers and the property owners. Today, rural and urban property taxation on an average is four times higher than it was in 1944. I repeat today, what I have said on previous occasions, that if taxes on land go very much higher in Saskatchewan, our farmers won't have any land left for my hon. friends to socialize.

"Support the party that keeps its promises" they said. What did they promise about sales tax? In 1944 the NDP or the CCF damned the sales tax, which was then two per cent, from one end of this province to the other. Mr. Douglas said they would wipe it out, as soon as they found new revenues. As soon as they achieved office, they first of all increased the sales tax to three per cent, then a year or so ago, they put it up to five per cent. Instead of taking \$4,250,000 as the last Liberal government did from the sales tax, this year the NDP will take more than \$40,000,000. At a time when our fellow citizens in Manitoba and Alberta have no such thing as sales tax. Then I think of income tax . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — What about the Liberal government?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — In a few weeks we will be preparing our income tax. Once again our farmers and citizens will find that the people of this province pay 6 per cent more income tax than the people of all the other provinces in Canada, with the exception of one, another penalty of having socialist government. I could mention the increase in corporation taxes; I could mention the gasoline tax, raised from seven to fourteen cents a gallon by my hon. friends. I could mention the diesel tax which has gone from seven cents to seventeen cents. The last Liberal government took \$3-3/4 million from the people of Saskatchewan for gasoline tax, this year my hon. friends will take \$28 million. One could go on and on, all afternoon enumerating the various new taxes that this administration has introduced. The main result of these impositions has been that taxation in Saskatchewan bears more heavily on individuals and on families, than in any other province in Canada, according to a Canadian Press despatch, Wednesday, July 24th, page 21, in the Leader Post:

The ironic features of all these increased levies, is that they have been brought in by a government which promised more abundant living.

More abundant living – all we have been given is more abundant taxes.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-three has been one of the most prosperous years in Saskatchewan history. The NDP, as I said yesterday, are running around taking credit, or trying to take credit for all this prosperity. Actually, everybody knows that we are prosperous this year just because we had a bumper crop, secondly, because we had a government in Ottawa that could sell our wheat, and thirdly, because, the price of wheat has gone up very substantially. We say that our hon. friends could have had a surplus this year of \$20 million. We think that surplus should have been used either for tax reduction or for debt reduction. Instead, the socialist are running around and trying to find all kind of different ways to spend the money to buy votes.

Mr. Speaker, I assure the house and the people of Saskatchewan, that if the Liberals form a government next June, one of our primary, consistent and determined purpose, will be major tax reduction. One, we will reduce the five per cent sales tax immediately to four per cent, and in our first four years in office, will endeavor to get it back to three per cent. Two, we will increase the list of goods exempt from sales tax, to include such items as clothing, shoes, which are after all necessities of life. Three, we believe that some method must be found for reducing taxes on land and property, and we will find some method. Four, we will permit farmers to use purple gas in their farm trucks. Something my hon. friends, year after year have refused to do. Five, we will reduce personal and corporal taxes to a level where at least they are not higher than similar taxes in other provinces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to industrial development – truly one of the saddest stories, one of the greatest fiascos of the NDP across the way. I can tell you that Liberals certainly feel that one of the major issues in this campaign will be the lack of industrial development in Saskatchewan these past two decades, as compared to the rest of Canada. We maintain that for 20 years development in this province has been held up and retarded by hon. friends opposite. The NDP of course, are running around –Saskatchewan, as the two members who spoke yesterday did, saying that we never had it so good. I can hardly believe that the socialist slogan in the next election will be “20 years of prosperity”. What are the facts? Does the NDP record indicate progress? Does it indicate industrial development?

Today, I would remind the people of Saskatchewan that the socialists in talking about the industrial progress, always like to apply a peculiar yardstick. For comparisons, they reach invariably back to the dark, bitter days of the depression. My hon. friend, the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) is particularly adept at such tactics. They point to the depressed thirties, and they say, “Look at those years, see how much better things are today under our administration.” Mr. Speaker, of course, Saskatchewan has made some industrial progress since the socialists took office. Of course our economy has grown. It couldn't help but develop any more than a seven pound baby, just must grow.

But I ask this question today, how does our industrial development since 1944 compare with other parts of Canada? In particular, how does our progress compare to Alberta and Manitoba? We say that is the acid test. Well, Mr. Speaker, any statistics on industrial progress that you want to use from DBS show up unfavourably for our province. Manufactured goods in 1962, the latest figures available. Alberta 976 million, Manitoba 856 million, and Saskatchewan a poor third, 381 million. New investments in manufacturing industries – 1963, Alberta 56 million, Manitoba 47 million, and Saskatchewan 21 million. Again a very poor third.

What about jobs in manufacturing? Jobs are after all the main reason why we need industry. The NDP talk about the spectacular progress in Saskatchewan. Yet statistics show that in September 1963, Manitoba had 42 thousand jobs in manufacturing, Alberta had 36 thousand, and Saskatchewan had 12 thousand. Again a poor third. Mr. Chairman. I want to repeat the figures that I used yesterday afternoon, because I think they are crucial figures. When the socialists took office in this province, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, there were 12,360 people engaged in manufacturing,, (industries with 15 people or over). After 20 years, of so-called progress, we find that according to their own figures at the end of 1962, there were only 13,200 people engaged in manufacturing – 840 jobs after 20 years. Is that the kind of progress my hon. friends want for the people of Saskatchewan? If that isn't stagnation, I ask the Premier, just what better word could be used to describe what we have had in this province. What about the number of factories, Mr. Speaker,? The hard facts are most revealing. From 1944 to 1960, the number of manufacturing establishments in Alberta increased by 683, the number of manufacturing establishments went up in Manitoba by 302, but in Saskatchewan at the end of 1960, after 17 years of CCF-NDP government, there were 167 fewer manufacturing establishments than when my hon. friends took office. If that isn't stagnation, what is it? Or take new construction figures, January to June this year, in Alberta, there was \$116 million invested in new construction, Manitoba had \$50 million, and Saskatchewan had \$35 million. In the city of Edmonton alone, during the first six months of this year had \$5 million more was spent on new construction than the whole province of Saskatchewan. The city of Calgary had as much. Is this what my hon. friends would call a booming economy?



This is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why about 260,000 young Saskatchewan citizens have left our province to move elsewhere, since my hon. friends took office. Yesterday, two speakers who participated in this debate, painted a glowing picture of development in this province. Why to hear them speak, one can see smoke stacks springing up on every horizon. Eastern industrialists are rushing into Saskatchewan. Well, if there is all this kind of prosperity, why is it that year after year, our province has the lowest growth rate in all Canada, as far as population is concerned? The figures for last year, showed the kind of growth we've had in Saskatchewan. Canada as a whole last year grew by 1.8 per cent. Newfoundland grew by 2.3 per cent, Alberta 2.3 per cent, British Columbia 2.3 per cent, Quebec 1.8 per cent, Ontario 1.8 per cent, Manitoba 1.7 per cent, Nova Scotia 1.6 per cent. Tiny Prince Edward Island grew by .9 per cent. Little old Saskatchewan 4/10th of 1 per cent. "Booming prosperity" they say, and yet thousands of our citizens have left the province year after year. I remind my hon. friends opposite, that since 1944, the population of British Columbia has grown 83 per cent, the population of Alberta has gone up by 75 per cent, the population of Manitoba has gone up by 32 per cent, and Saskatchewan brings up the rear with only 12 per cent. Why we haven't done as well percentage wise as the Yukon or the North West Territories . . .

**Mr. Mc Donald:** — They haven't got socialism.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, Liberal refuse to accept the proposition that our slow growth is caused by a lack of resources. We say it has been caused primarily by the theories, policies of this socialist government. I hope my young friends who were here from the university today, will look at these population figures, they're the people who in a year or so, will be out looking for jobs. If past history means anything, three out of four of them will have to leave Saskatchewan, in order to get the kind of jobs they want. As has been said by many people, our socialist government is like a dog in a manger. Or rather it is like a dog in a hen house; it can't itself lay eggs, and it won't allow the hens to do so. Twenty years ago the CC-NDP claimed that social owned crown corporations were the answer to the industrial program. They tried to produce dozens of products in their own factories and mills. I wish I had time to go into the long and sad history of the crown corporation fiasco. The past several years, the hostility of my hon. friends opposite towards business and industry has softened somewhat. The Minister of Industry has tried to do a little bit about getting some new businesses here recently. The last session of the legislature, hon. members will recall that the government established an agency called SEDCO, and it enlisted the support of some of our leading businessmen who are endeavouring to seek out new industry. A year ago the NDP put aside \$2 million by a vote in this legislature for this purpose. I remind hon. members that Nova Scotia has put aside \$50 million, for the same purpose, and they're getting some new industry. SEDCO is one more of a series of similar attempts that have been made by the NDP over the years to obtain new industry. In 1946, the economic advisory and planning board was constituted. This was their job, and I quote:

To formulate long term plans for the industrial development of this province.

The board didn't accomplish, much so in 1947, they tried again. They set up the Industrial Development Fund. The purpose, I quote:

To encourage the establishments and development of industrial plants and projects.

That agency didn't work very well either. So in 1960 they tried again. They set up a new department of industries and development. The purpose, I quote:

To promote the industrial and commercial developments of Saskatchewan.

Those three agencies and SEDCO, Mr. Speaker, have been unable to overcome the fundamental handicap rising out for the fact that we have a socialist government. So far the results obtained by SEDCO have been bitterly disappointing. Recently a delegation headed by my hon. friend the Minister of Industry and Information too, a jaunt to Japan at the taxpayer's expense. Now, we hope no less than they, that this trip will have some tangible results.

We all welcome investments from abroad, and I hope we get some. When the minister returned and he called a press conference, he said this trip to Japan was a wonderful success. I wish we could see some evidence of that success in new industry. I say, Mr. Speaker, that SEDCO and socialism will mix together as well as a republican senator and a Russian commissar.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — A few months ago, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Information dusted off the old speech he makes repeatedly before an election, announcing that we might soon have a new pulp mill. That of course, is a perennial, I just happened to be perusing my files here a short time ago and I was looking at some of the other provinces. Here's a pledge they made before the 1956 election,

Pulp mill for P.A. City selected as key centre of biggest industry in Saskatchewan. Announcement of plans to build a \$60 million pulp mill were made at a press conference attended by Honourable J.H. Brockelbank, L. MacIntosh, and C.M. Fines, costing \$50 or \$60 million. He said this mill would soon employ 3,000 people.

Well, I haven't been up to Prince Albert lately, Mr. Speaker, but I haven't heard that the pulp mill has yet arrived. Maybe the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) might be able to enlighten us.

Well, it wasn't very much longer when my hon. friend the Minister of Natural Resources, here's a report that the Star Phoenix carried of his speech:

Forty million dollar pulp mill in Meadow Lake area starts work this year. The second million dollar pulp mill operation in Northern Saskatchewan opening 12,000 square miles of virgin timber, was disclosed early today, when Natural Resources Minister, A.G. Kuziak, confirmed in tela-interview, the signing of an agreement last September.

and he goes on to say:

there were to be 1,500 people working at that particular mill.

A while later we came into the 1959 election or just before the 1960 campaign. Nothing had happened about those two, but were the NDP dismayed? Not at all. Soon they announced another. Regina Leader Post, April 14th, 1959-headlined

#### New Pulp Mill Proposed

Answering questions from opposition leader A.H. McDonald in the legislature on Monday, Natural Resources Minister A.G. Kuziak, said, Churchill Forest Holdings Limited have taken an option on 9,800 square miles of land in the Island Falls area, north of Flin Flon and Mr. Kuziak said the government would be negotiating with the company and with Swedish Cellulose Limited in the next few days.

We haven't heard much about that pulp mill either.

A few weeks ago, the Minister of Industry and Information got up again. He said, we are working on another pulp mill, and we will soon be able to announce it, unless those rascals in Ottawa prevent it.

**Hon. R. Brown (Minister of Industry and Information):** — The only announcement of the pulp mill came from Mr. Pederson of the Conservative party. I have never announced the pulp mill yet. Let's get the record straight.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You have announced so many that everybody starts laughing, when you come up with one. Well, as I say, most people will say that seeing is believing. The Liberal party says, Mr. Speaker, that we can't wait much longer for industrialization to happen. A Liberal government will take action to bring about industrialization, and if given a mandate, we will at once institute the first phase of a four year program to regenerate the economic face of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We are convinced that the next four years can be fruitful and exciting years for our province, years when once more the political climate of this province will encourage the revival of individual initiative of vigorous enterprise and diversified expansion. Our four year program will have a minimum objective of \$20,000 industrial jobs. We will proceed systematically and progressively to fill the many gaps in our industrial structure. We say that these goals are not unrealistic. They are already the normal growth pattern in all other provinces except Saskatchewan a pattern of growth that has missed our province under the socialists. The Liberal party offers Saskatchewan a program of challenge to obtain new industries and new jobs. I say to the people of Saskatchewan today, we can't very well do much worse than the NDP, why not give us a chance to do better.

Well, what specific legislation will we use to attract new industries. First of all, a Liberal government will introduce tax concessions to new industry or new mines locating in this province, with, if necessary, major tax holidays to those corporations. Secondly, the rates of royalties on natural resources will be made competitive with other provinces and, where feasible, lower. Thirdly, we will see that electric power and natural gas rates are made competitive with other provinces. Fourth, we will remove all unfair competition from government subsidized corporations. Fifth, in cooperation with the municipal governments we will endeavor to provide land for industry at cost and sewer and water on a local improvement basis. Sixth, we will make loans available to new industries on a comprehensive and far-reaching basis.

This program of action is the Liberal answer to stagnation in Saskatchewan today, to Saskatchewan unemployment, population exodus and lack of development.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about agriculture. Agriculture still remains the most important industry in Saskatchewan. As I said a moment ago, our province has recently experienced the biggest crop in her history, and we think the federal Liberal government, by obtaining such huge wheat sales, by increasing the price of wheat from \$1.95-3/8 to \$2.08 in a short time, has done an effective job. What about the provincial government? The chief accomplishment of the CCF-NDP in agriculture, as I pointed out a few moments ago, has been an almost unbelievable increase in taxes the farmer has to pay.

Under the socialists in Saskatchewan, we have seen a mass exodus of young farmers, and other farmers, off the farms. In the 1944 census, there were 130,700 farmers in Saskatchewan. By 1951, according to DBS, the number of census farmers was down to 112,000. By 1951, the number was down to 94,000 and it is still going down. Think of it, 28-1/2 per cent of all our farmers in Saskatchewan, have left their farms since my hon. friends took office. We have seen many of our small towns and villages become virtually ghost towns. Is this what the Premier calls 20 years of progress? The Liberal party believes that there are a number of things that could be done on a provincial basis for agriculture today. What is the Liberal program for agriculture?

First of all I refer to long-term credit. In our opinion long-term credit which would permit a young farmer to purchase land over a long period of time is most inadequate in Saskatchewan. That lack has caused major difficulties. Back in 1944, the CCF government introduced a bill called The Farm Security Act. The effect of that legislation was to prevent lending institutions obtaining security on the home quarter. No doubt this legislation was introduced in good faith. However, the lending institutions feeling that they no longer had security, moved out of this province, lock, stock and barrel, as far as farm lending was concerned. The result in Saskatchewan today, is that it is almost impossible for a young farmer, or any other farmer to borrow money to buy a farm from a private lending institution. That is not the case in other provinces.

Under the old Liberal government, we used to have a provincial farm loaning board, called the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board. One of the first acts of this government when they took power was to discard that legislation. Now these two acts on the part of the CCF-NDP have meant that in Saskatchewan today about one farmer in 50 can get the kind of loan that he needs to buy a farm. It is quite true that we have a federal act, and it is a good act. But its provisions are too stringent, the interest rates are too high, and not enough farmers can qualify. Other provincial governments have recognized this problem, Mr. Speaker. The province of Quebec has an act where young farmers can borrow money at 2½ per cent interest over a 40 year period. The government of Ontario has an act where young farmers can borrow money at four per

cent. Alberta and Manitoba have long-term credit acts for young farmers. A few years ago this government did recognize the problem. They set up an act which was called The Family Farm Credit Act. By working through co-ops, some funds are loaned to young farmers. The Liberals contended at the time that the provisions would be inadequate. They pointed out that the interest rates were too high. They pointed out the fact that farmers over 40 couldn't borrow under this act. This act has been in effect for a little over three years. In the first three years of operation, do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that only 420 farmers in all Saskatchewan were able to borrow money under its provisions? An average of a little over 106 farmers per year.

So we say that something has to be done about long-term farm credit in Saskatchewan. I wish to assure you, Sir, that a Liberal government will rectify this situation. We believe that the family farm is vital to the very future of Saskatchewan. We are determined to make it possible for farmers, and particularly young farmers, to borrow money on reasonable terms to commence farming. We will make farm loans available on a much more extensive basis, with lower interest rates, and over a longer period of time. We will work closely with the federal government in order to avoid duplications. Personally I would hope, that these new loan arrangements could be made through the banks, through credit unions, with the government guaranteeing a high percentage of the loans. But if satisfactory arrangements cannot be made along those lines, the Liberal government will be prepared to set up a government loaning agency.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That is the first plank in the Liberal agricultural program. Our second plank has to do with grazing leases on crown land. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you realize, and I am sure you do, that the crown today in this province, holds almost six million acres which are leased to farmers for a nominal fee. The purpose of the program is three-fold, as I understand it. First, to help farmers form an economic unit. Secondly, to promote livestock production, thirdly, to see that the best possible use is made of the sub-marginal land, and in the opinion of this party, I think the department has done a useful and effective job over the years. However, Mr. Speaker, from the Manitoba border to the Alberta border, from the state line to the north, you will hear farmers and ranchers complaining that far too often leased land is given out for political reasons rather than for other considerations.

If the Liberal party forms a government, we will change certain aspects of the provinces' leasing programs. First, where a farmer is today leasing land from the crown and wishes to purchase that land to make an economic unit, we believe that under normal circumstances, the land should be sold. Safeguards of course, would have to be taken to see that unsuitable land was not cultivated. Secondly, a Liberal government under certain circumstances would favour the breaking-up of large leases into smaller units in order to give the small operator a better chance of becoming a successful farmer. Thirdly, a Liberal government would take the leasing of crown lands out of politics. It would set up an independent board or commission to allocate all grazing leases. Representatives of such organizations as the Saskatchewan Livestock Association, The Farm Union, The Wheat Pool, and others would be out on that board. Four, what would we do with the cultivation leases? I think you will realize, Mr. Speaker, that the crown owns about 845,000 acres in cultivated lease land. A good deal of this acreage in the northern areas, was leased out to veterans at the end of the war on a 33 year period plan. There are a great many Saskatchewan citizens who are located on this kind of land, who would like to be able to purchase it. I quite realize that veterans today have that privilege. As I understand it, other citizens have not got that privilege, or if they have it, Mr. Speaker, the department makes it so difficult that they can't afford the down payment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Personally, I believe and the Liberal party believes that this kind of land should be sold. We would favour a down payment of about 10 per cent, we would favour a low interest rate, we would favour a 30 year repayment period. But above all, we say that rental payments that have been made, should be credited against the purchase price. That is the Liberal program.

I would like to say a word about feed and fodder reserves. Liberal government believes that some action must be taken in favorable years to build up major fodder reserves for dry years. We thought the government had such a program a few years ago, and then the drought came, and there wasn't a bale of hay on hand. Repeatedly in the past when drought strikes, the government has been obliged to pay subsidies amounting to millions of dollars to bring hay from Manitoba or from Alberta. The Liberal party believes that encouragement should be given to farmers throughout the province, and particularly in the northern parkland areas, to sow higher acreages of feed grain and forage crops.

We believe government itself, if necessary, should put aside hay reserves from some of the hayland which it owns. But if it is going to do that first of all it must build some kind of suitable warehousing facilities, to protect the hay from rain and so on.

The Liberal party believes that farm diversification is still eminently desirable in this province. Large population of cattle, hogs and sheep can only help promote stability in Saskatchewan. Today, there is no branch of agriculture probably that has such a bright future as the livestock industry. The population of United States and Canada is growing so rapidly that most of our experts say that in the next 20 or 30 years, we will have no trouble in absorbing the beef which will be produced. I commend the government on the community pasture program, which they have expanded in conjunction with the federal government, to a point where we now have two and half million acres in community pasture. The Liberal would like to see the program continued and expanded.

Sheep production has slipped very badly in Saskatchewan. I don't know if there is an easy answer to the sheep problem, but we do know that today, we are bringing in a great deal of mutton, from New Zealand and Australia. Personally, I would like to see the department experimenting with one or two community pastures solely for sheep. Perhaps such a policy is not feasible, but I would like to see it tried.

These are a few suggestions which the Liberals have for agriculture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment to highways. In the prosperous years since the war, the government has built a great many highways. I do not in any way detract from the improvements which they have made. However, I would remind the people of Saskatchewan, that every other province has also made improvements since the war. As a matter of fact, most have been spending a good deal more on the highways, than the government of Saskatchewan. For example, last year British Columbia spent \$95 million on her highways, Alberta spent \$64 million, Manitoba spent \$34 million, and Saskatchewan spent only \$29 million. This has been the case year after year.

Mr. Speaker, we have always maintained that tourist business is closely related to the condition of the province highways. I was rather interested in hearing the hon. member for Redberry, (Mr. Michayluk) talk about the tremendous tourist development that is taking place in northern Saskatchewan. Why, he said, with all our new roads, with all our new parks, the tourists are pouring in. This is a tremendous asset to Saskatchewan. Twenty years of progress. I was rather interested also to read a story in the last Saskatchewan Commonwealth, about the tourist industry. Here it is, in case you gentlemen haven't read it; What is the heading?

#### Tourists Flock to Saskatchewan

The province of Saskatchewan showed the greatest increase of all provinces, in American traffic entering the province in 1963.

The announcement was made by Harvey Dryden. Mr. Dryden said;

The Dominion Bureau of Statistics year end reports, show that Saskatchewan experienced an increase of 17.1 per cent in United States tourist traffic over the previous year in 1963. The national average was only 5.5 per cent.

Mr. Dryden said he was very pleased with the figures. What are those figures? Well, I looked them up – 20 years of progress. DBS shows that on the first nine months of 1963, U.S. entries by plane, bus, rail and boat, Canada as a whole \$1,400,000. British Columbia – 217,000, Manitoba – 27,000, Alberta – 16,000, Saskatchewan – 2,800, or 1/5 of one per cent. One fifth of one per cent. Twenty years of progress.

DBS also shows U.S. vehicles entering Canada as a whole – the first nine months of this year – 8,329,000. British Columbia 505,000, Manitoba – 155,000, Alberta – 89,000, Saskatchewan – 69,000. Saskatchewan's share of the Canadian total U.S. vehicles entering Canada – 4/5ths of one per cent. The socialists boast about a 17 per cent increase in the tourist business, the highest in Canada, they claim. Well, may I remind the house that twice nothing is still nothing, and that 17 per cent increase, a very insignificant figure is still a very insignificant figure. Saskatchewan's record for tourists is one that my hon. friends opposite shouldn't talk about very much in the next 16 weeks of the campaign. If Mr. Dryden is happy with those figures, I can assure hon. members that a Liberal government certainly will not be very happy with them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party believes that if we are going to have American tourists come into Saskatchewan, something must be done to improve the highways that come from the border. A few weeks ago I went down to the United States on highway No. 2. It is supposed to be the second best highway in Saskatchewan. Sir, I can tell you that from Rockglen, 60 miles to the border, I have seldom seen such a rough, dusty dirty road. Why if an American got on that road, he would think he was on a back lane. Small wonder so few Americans visit Saskatchewan. I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Minister of Highways, that I believe there are either 12 or 13 border points where you can go through customs in Saskatchewan. Only one of them has a paved road. Three others have oiled roads. The rest of them have gravel and dirt. I say that those roads, and I have travelled on most of them, are a provincial disgrace. I also say that we are not going to get any substantial number of tourists, until we pave them. I wish to say flatly on behalf of the Liberal party, that a Liberal administration will bring highway No. 2 to trans-Canada specifications, from the border right up to the northern park areas, and we will do it quickly. Moreover, I would like to say that we are going to hard-surface roads from border, No. 4, south of Swift Current, No. 37 highway, south from Gull Lake and Shaunavon.

May I also say a word about divided highways. I don't know exactly how many miles we have on either side of Regina, but I suppose it is about 35 miles of divided highways in Saskatchewan. All over this continent, I travel a fair amount in other provinces and other states, you will find that governments have built many miles of divided highways. This government, as usual, lags far behind most of the rest of the continent. I say that a Liberal government would be very interested in building a double highway from Moose Jaw to Regina, from Regina to Saskatoon, in our first four years in office.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — You should have . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Oh – there he is back to the depression again. You know the Provincial Treasurer never wants to compare Saskatchewan's progress to the rest of Canada.

Something else, the Liberals would like to have in this province is a second trans-Canada highway. We believe such a highway is needed, and an influence we may have with the federal government will be used to see that we do get a second trans-Canada highway in the province of Saskatchewan. We believe additional assistance should be given to grid roads. In consultation with municipal officials we will place in the provincial highway systems, those parts of the grid roads bearing a high percentage of the provincial traffic, as compared to local traffic. Finally, we will pay 50 per cent of the cost of paving the main streets in towns and villages. I say again, that as far as highways are concerned, we have made some progress, but our progress is not impressive when you compare what has been done elsewhere in Canada.

I want to say a word or so about the Liberal program for small business. The Liberal party believes very strongly that small business in this province has been neglected, if not forgotten by the present administration. The government spends hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly to develop co-ops and I don't necessarily criticize those expenditures. However, the small businessman is still the backbone of our province, commercially. Many of our people, particularly many of our young people, would like to have a small business if they could find funds to commence operations. Small business development will have a positive place in the Liberal program.

We believe that financial assistance should be made available in the form of loans, where they can be economically used, to help young people become established in business. If we form an administration, we will open up a branch of government, whose primary purpose will be to assist small business in all its phases.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to financial aid to private high schools. I refer to the proposal, which was made in the throne speech in connection with financial aid to separate high schools. Of course, until we see the government's legislation, we cannot comment in detail on this legislation. Let me say at once, however, that the Liberal party supports the principle of financial aid to private high schools of all denominations. We hope that the criticism made by Saskatchewan Lutherans last week, to the effect that Protestant or private schools will be discriminated against by the legislation which is proposed, is unfounded. If such should be the case, in our opinion, it would be inexcusable. It is a well known fact that for some years most private high schools in Saskatchewan, whether they be Mennonite, whether they be Lutheran, Anglican or Roman Catholic, have found themselves in serious financial difficulties. They must depend almost completely on fees and donations for support, because they receive little or no public monies. We think that today in Saskatchewan, the private high schools are doing a sound, outstanding, educational job. They are teaching the same curriculum and operate under the same standards, as our tax supported high schools. In general they are inspected by the departmental high school superintendents, and their students as I understand it, write the regular examinations. Today the supporters of these private schools are obliged to support the public education system, and in addition pay for the education of their children in the private schools.

To us, this seems unfair. Repeatedly, representation from the private schools authorities have been made to the government for assistance. Repeatedly, their requests have been turned down. Now, on Tuesday, March 13th, 1962, the Minister of Education told the Catholic School Trustee Association, and I quote the *Star Phoenix*:

Separate high schools in Saskatchewan were a possibility, said Hon. Mr. Turnbull, here Monday, but he was personally not in favour of them. The idea was opposed to current government policy.

Some months later, the Premier made this statement, according to the *Regina Leader Post*, and I quote again: Premier Woodrow Lloyd said:

The government did not contemplate taking any action in the legislature, which would allow tax support for Roman Catholic high schools.

This attitude appeared to Liberals as being unfair and unjust. Separate schools at the elementary level already receive tax support and public monies, from grade one to grade eight. If it is fair and just to give separate schools that kind of support from grade one to grade eight, why isn't it fair and just to give it to them, from grade nine to grade 12? Last November, the Liberal attitude was made very clear on this subject. I would like to quote the resolution which was passed by our annual convention,

Liberal government will provide approved private high schools, with an equitable and fair share of tax revenue. Such assistance will be made in manner that it will be economically sound. Care will be taken to protect the taxpayer from unnecessary duplication of facilities.

We on this side of the house, admit that we do find it strange that just before an election, the government has abruptly changed course. For 20 years in office, they have had an opportunity to deal with this issue. However, always they flatly refused to take action. Now, a few months before the election, we witness a death-bed repentance.

Our main object is to assure the children of Saskatchewan equal opportunities for a good education, and justice to the Saskatchewan taxpayer. Our prime concern is to see that this important issue is kept out of the field of politics. In any event, Mr. Speaker, as we debate this issue, I believe there is no place in the house for either prejudice or intolerance.

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I now turn to labour. Our socialist friends are frequently telling the people that, if the Liberals form a government, we will be anti-labour, that we will take away the gains which our working people in Saskatchewan have made through the years. I say that those charges are simply not correct. Liberalism in Canada and in Saskatchewan has always identified itself with the just, desirable aspiration of our working people. My hon. friends opposite can't deny that a very major portion of the labour legislation which was placed on the statute books, either at Ottawa or in Regina, was placed there by a Liberal government. I think for example, The Unemployment Insurance Act, brought in by the federal Liberals. As far as Saskatchewan is concerned, I think of Saskatchewan's first Trade Union Act, The minimum Wage Act, The Industrial Standards Act, The Holiday Act, The Mechanics Act, The Apprentice Act, Trade School Regulations Act, and a host of others, all brought in by provincial Liberals. Now of course, the NDP government, like governments in every other province since the war, has improved those regulations. We don't hesitate to give them credit for this fact. I say that similar changes would have been made by any government that had been in power in this province.

One thing a Liberal government wouldn't have done, it wouldn't have tried to exploit the labour movement for their selfish political advantages, the way my hon. friends have tried to do.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The socialist we say, have failed to do one thing. What good are a lot of fancy labour statutes, if there aren't jobs in Saskatchewan. My hon. friends are talking about increasing the minimum wage. The finest minimum wage in the world isn't as useful to the worker as his actual wage. The minimum wage in Saskatchewan may be high, but, Sir, the average wage in Saskatchewan is not high, when compared to other provinces, this side of Quebec. I say that a dominant and persistent purpose of a Liberal government in the province will be to change some of these things. We won't just talk about industrial development, we'll take the steps necessary to bring factories and industries to Saskatchewan. The results will be more jobs, better wages, working people of Saskatchewan have nothing to lose and everything to gain by a Liberal government taking office.

I repeat most emphatically, that a Liberal administration will not take from our workers, any of the gains which they, like the workers of other provinces, have made in recent years. Assertion to the contrary is only partisan propaganda, on the part of hon. friends opposite.

Now, I want to say a word about civil service. Our socialist friends say that when we take office, we are going to fire most of the civil servants. Many civil servants are a little apprehensive about this. In the short time that I have been in politics, as I said a year ago, I have been a bit impressed by the calibre, by the ability of our civil servants. I think that most of them are doing a conscientious job for the people of Saskatchewan. Those people have also nothing to lose, and everything to gain by a Liberal government. I say flatly, Mr. Speaker, that no employee who is performing a useful and needed job in a competent manner need fear dismissal. The Liberals propose no witch hunt. Their political independence will be respected and their jobs will be secure. Back in 1944, the CCF-NDP promised to take the civil service out of politics. Instead, they put politics into the civil service. Advancement today depends frequently not how much you know, but who you know. Today, when the top jobs are being handed out in civil service, usually the only ones that need to apply are the so-called pinks or the left-wingers or the defeated politicians. Repeatedly, so-called experts are brought in from outside the province to replace people who are already here. Years of service, seniority, or ability very frequently since 1944, meant very little when a top appointment is made. The Liberal party believes that a civil servant's politics is his or her business. We also believe whether it is a socialist government, A Liberal government or a Conservative government, members of the civil service should maintain political neutrality on their jobs. We give fair warning that if we do form a government, those individuals who participate in politics on government time, should do so, realizing that they are jeopardizing their position in the future. I say that under the Liberal administration, advancement in the service will be made on the basis of ability, not on a basis of political service.



I come now to medicare, Mr. Speaker. Never have the NDP members opposite gone to greater trouble to misrepresent the position of the Liberal party than on the issue of medical health insurance. The NDP is running around this province saying that if a Liberal government gets in, they'll deprive our people of medical care insurance. Several months ago the Minister of Health, went on to say that a Liberal government will substitute an Alberta-type medical care plan, for the one presently operating in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals never said this. This is what the NDP members are saying. They're saying it frequently and often. The Liberal party believes in universal comprehensive medical insurance. I say categorically and without qualifications, that none of our citizens need fear that a Liberal government will try to deprive our people, of such insurance. The Liberal party insists that every citizen of Saskatchewan has a right to hospital and medical care, regardless of his or her ability to pay.

**Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, as we debate the subject this afternoon, there are several facts I think we should keep in mind. The medical care plan we have in Saskatchewan today, is not the plan the NDP wanted. The medical care plan which we have today, is not the plan which the NDP brought in originally, and the Liberals tried to amend. The original plan, which my hon. friends opposite brought in, was state medicine and they introduced it. They rammed it through this house. Our people viewed with revulsion the manner in which the socialist machine rode rough shod over the rights of the very people upon whom the success of their plan depended. Dozens of our people took to the streets, they marched on the capitol, to protect that original legislation. The NDP would like to forget those troubled days, when health services were disrupted and virtually collapsed. If amendments to the Medical Care Act, as suggested by a Liberal opposition in 1961, had been adopted, we wouldn't have had the kind of crisis we did have. I remind the hon. friends opposite and the members of this government, that the medical care issue in this legislature has never medicare versus no medicare. The issue has been a coercive type of government plan versus a scheme which was acceptable to all concerned, including those providing the services, and which my hon. friends promised before an election.

**Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Hon. members will recall that the socialists rammed through the first original bill. The medical profession simply said, we will not work under that bill, and a storm of public protests, endorsed their position. Having failed to enforce the original bill, the government did what it should have done in the first place. It sat down at a meeting with the College of Physicians and Surgeons. They negotiated and reconciled many of the difficulties which existed. My hon. friend across the way refers to Ontario. Well, the Ontario leader of the NDP said, if he brought in a medical care scheme, he certainly wouldn't do it the way hon. friends opposite.

**Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, a special session of the legislature was called for August 2nd, 1962. A second session that year, and I would remind you and hon. friends opposite, and the people of Saskatchewan, that it was only the co-operation of the Liberal members that made it possible to amend the act and end the crisis in one day. Every Liberal member voted for the amended act. Why? Because the most objectional features of it had been eliminated. Today, I remind the legislature and the people of Saskatchewan, of the amendments which the NDP were reluctantly forced by public opinion to adopt. As originally written and forced through this legislature, the medical care insurance plan would have pressed the entire medical profession under the control and direction of a politically appointed and a politically motivated commission. That commission was designated to decide the terms and conditions under which medical men might practise. The degree of control was such that in effect, there was recognized no right on the part of doctors or bargain with the commission, concerning the condition under which they would work. The rights of collective bargaining, which the NDP government claimed they favour for workers, rights which the Minister of Labour says, everybody must have, were to be refused to the medical profession. Liberals insisted that doctors should be privileged to practise either inside the act or outside the act. Such amendments were reluctantly adopted by my hon. friends opposite.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that in the first act, the NDP would have eliminated the voluntary plans, such as MSI and Group Medical. All citizens in securing payment of their bills would have been obliged to go through the government commission.

The NDP tried to wipe out this freedom of choice, but strong opposition thwarted that compulsion. Now since the amended act was passed, the NDP have continued to harass the profession in countless ways. As a result, the exodus of our most skilled and cherished medical practitioners has continued. Personally, I doubt if the unhappiness and the mistrust which today exists over medicare, can ever be dispelled by the present government. The scars and wounds are too deep. However, the Liberal party knows that the plan basically is working today. We think it could work better, with a little change of heart and a few modifications.

If Liberals form a government in June, first, we will take politics out of medicare. We do not think that medical care should be run by politicians whether they are socialists, Liberals or Conservatives. I say that if this is done, nine-tenths of the present difficulties would disappear. Secondly, we will sit down with the profession in an effort to regain their confidence, and we will make sincere efforts to secure the return of some of the doctors who have left Saskatchewan. Thirdly, under a Liberal government, people will not be thrown in jail, because they are unable to pay their medical and hospital premiums.

In short, Mr. Speaker, by good faith, by honest efforts, something which has been lacking in hon. friends opposite, we'll make medical care work.

Liberals will aim not at the destruction of medical health insurance but at an improvement.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have this afternoon, tired to briefly outline some of the main planks of the Liberal platform. My colleagues will discuss the remaining aspects of our platform during this debate. You will, I hope, understand, Mr. Speaker, from my remarks, that Liberals are far from satisfied with the economic progress which has taken place in Saskatchewan these past two decades, as compared to the rest of Canada.

Liberals are sick and tired of having Saskatchewan known as the province that is out of step with the rest of Canada. The province which is always looked upon as Canada's poor country cousin. We've had enough of policies which send thousands and thousands of our people out of Saskatchewan each year to look for jobs. We're unhappy over the fact that not one immigrant in 50 coming to Canada, chooses Saskatchewan as his or her home. The Liberal party does not want Saskatchewan to remain isolated any longer from the economic growth, the progress and the development that is taking place elsewhere in Canada. The election of Liberal government will end this political and economic isolation. In a government climate receptive not hostile to private businesses, we will embark on the biggest industrial selling program that this nation has ever seen.

**Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Personally, I am proud of the program of challenge that has been formulated by Liberals to meet Saskatchewan's current problems. Our platform is constructive and businesslike, it is imaginative, yet practical. It's a program, which if I may paraphrase certain famous words, will get Saskatchewan moving again. The Liberal program offers not the authoritarian state, for while it may be efficient, it is not free. It offers not the welfare state, for while it may be well-intended, it distributes poverty not wealth. The Liberal program offers what I would like to call, the opportunity state. It's the kind of state which offers opportunities to every individual to cultivate his talents in order that they may develop; to invest his treasure in order that it may grow; to apply his skills in order that they may be augmented. Out of the benefits that each individual as a human being derives, public interest will be advanced.

Before resuming my seat, Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter to which I should like to refer. Recently, there have been reports, particularly in Eastern Canada, that ideas of a Liberal – NDP alliance or amalgamation are current in some points. I think I speak for every Saskatchewan Liberal, when I say those kind of ideas cause dismay. We've lived under socialism for 20 years. We know the regimentation the industrial stagnation, the lack of development which socialism brings about. Surely, after all these years, we have learned that the philosophy of these two parties is at complete variance. The NDP stands for socialism, they stand for government ownership of the means of production. They stand for bureaucratic control, they stand for compulsion.

The Liberal party on the other hand, is fundamentally opposed to socialism. We believe in private enterprise, in personal initiative, and in individual liberty. There are persons who have been supporters of the old CCF, who were never socialists. There are others who were socialists, but who now see its futility. People from both these groups are now joining the Liberals and they are welcomed in the Liberal party as individuals. I am convinced that Liberals in Saskatchewan want no truck or trade with any kind of an alliance with the NDP for the sake of political expediency. Personally, I think that all these rumors are coming out of Eastern Canada, represent only wishful thinking on the part of the NDP, as they see their ship sinking.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — However, I serve fair warning to anyone who may be interested at any attempt to promote an alliance between the Liberals and the socialists, whether it comes from Eastern Canada or anywhere else, will meet with the unswerving resistance of the government Liberal party. Our Liberals without exception, I think feel that as they are on the verge of getting rid of one socialist party, they don't want any part of another socialist party.

Liberals are a middle of the road reform party, Mr. Speaker. We are not travelling to the left or to the right, but just straight ahead.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege now to be in public service for more than 22 years and with the indulgence of the house, I conclude my remarks by expressing a few personal views which I have formed during that period of that time.

I believe that the system of responsible enterprise, coupled as it is with social legislation which puts a floor under the living standards of all, without jeopardizing individual initiative, offers the best promise of maximizing the benefits of freedom and security.

I am opposed to socialism and all that it stands for, because I think, given time, socialism erodes and destroys man's initiative and independence. I believe that a greater investment of capital in Saskatchewan is the one vital step towards the achievement of virtually every economic and social goal which we hold dear. I believe that you cannot make a nation or a province strong, united or productive, by fermenting class hatred. I believe in the dignity of labour and I support its reasonable and legitimate aspirations, but I do not believe that government is helping the wage earner, by trying to undermine the people who pay the wages.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree that the world owes every man a living, but it does owe every man the right and the opportunity to make a decent living. As a businessman, I believe that the economy of a country or province, is subject to the same economic laws as the economy of a family household. If you live beyond your means, sooner or later, you are in economic trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I could be wrong, but I rather feel that this is the last throne speech where Liberal members will be sitting on this side of the house. As I said earlier, I would rather think the end of an era has come. Like in all other parts of Canada, the NDP is a spent force. It is hardly necessary for me to say I shall not support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Hon. W. S. Lloyd (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, there are one or two matters which the Leader of the Opposition raised in his closing remarks, which I hasten to add my very hearty and ready concurrence. I refer to his reference to certain episodes which allegedly have taken place in the province of Ontario. He is prepared to reject any offers which may come his way and I think we can assure him that he will not have to really go to the trouble of rejecting, because offers will not be coming his way.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I thought he made rather touching little swan song, saying good-bye to the house sort of thing, not only did he dismiss himself, but he dismissed all his members over there, saying this is the last time they

would be sitting there. I should have thought that he would have expected that some of them, at least would be re-elected Mr. Speaker, but apparently not.

I want to concur in one other remark that has been made and that is in the words of welcome directed to the representatives of the students from the two university campuses in Saskatchewan, and those who are attending our university, whose homes are in other parts of the world. Saskatchewan is proud of its university, we are pleased with the growth which we can witness it is good to have the opportunity of being able to associate with some of the representatives of the student body on these occasions and we look forward to seeing them before too long, at least I think insofar as I am concerned I can make it before too long, this evening.

Now I want to say something about some of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, both this afternoon and yesterday afternoon. It seems to me that the most noticeable thing about what he has said is that he forgot to talk about the debate which is presumable underway, and that is the debate on the speech from the throne. Because, except for a few minutes yesterday, he devoted no attention whatsoever to the items that had been placed before us in the throne speech document. I should have thought, Mr. Speaker, that an occasion of this kind would have been an opportunity for the leader of the Saskatchewan Liberal party, to have put on record, something of his and his party's position, with regard to federal-provincial relationship particularly in the fields of tax-sharing agreements. I should have thought this would have been an opportunity when he would have wanted to have said something about proposals for northern development, as referred to in the speech from the throne. I should have thought that we might have heard something about where they stand on the extremely important matters of hospital privileges. I should have thought this might have been an occasion on which some reference would have been made to one of Saskatchewan's most pressing problems, namely that of rail line abandonment. I should have thought there might have been something said about the proposals for extending and conserving and making better use of our water resources in the province of Saskatchewan. All of these have been placed before the legislature, none of them warranted a single word of reference insofar as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned.

I think too that probably the most telling thing to look at, is his entire speech is his reference to medical care insurance near the end of his speech. Mr. Speaker, I submit, it is still absolutely impossible to tell from those words where the Liberal party stands on the subject of medical care insurance.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — They talk boldly . . .

**Mr. D.G. Steuart:** — Even denser than I thought . . .

**Mr. Lloyd:** — They talk boldly and bravely and I submit bluffingly, about sitting down with the Saskatchewan College of Physicians and Surgeons, and restoring confidences — a plan which will be acceptable to them. If they do that, then they will do that which he denied they would do, introduce a plan modelled on the basis of that which is in effect in Alberta or which is proposed for Ontario, and which is simply not good enough for Saskatchewan people, or the other parts of Canada either.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, there were some differences in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition this year, compared to other years, and this is refreshing, I admit. It is the first time in many years. A lot of the speech was still the same, but there is a difference in the attitude, I submit, of the Leader of the Opposition and presumable of the party which he represents. You will note that he said that the Liberal party approaches the election this year with cautious optimism. Why the change from the last year, Mr. Speaker? Last year, they were most belligerently over-optimistic about this matter. The Liberal party has changed very considerably. Never, might I say, Mr. Speaker, has so much happened to so little in such a short time, as has happened to the Liberal party in the last 12 months. The party tried at times to present something of the new-look which they evidently think the people want the Liberal party to take on. He said at some point,

things really aren't so terrible in Saskatchewan, but then it wasn't long before he was drifting back to his old phrases of stagnation in every aspect of endeavor, in the province. Saskatchewan — still a poor country cousin, those were his exact words not very long afterwards, but he spent a great deal of his time, you will notice, sort of wooing or continuing to woo, the Conservative party, once again we witnessed some public love making on his part, here in the house. I am not quite sure what it is that he is proposing to the Conservative party, but it seems to be kind of limited term common-law marriage arrangement — one, mostly of his own convenience, without any sanction on the part of the parents, lacking any contractual arrangement whatsoever.

The Conservatives, it seems to me, are doubting very sincerely the honourableness of the gentleman's intentions.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Many of them, I am sure are remembering a little ditty which goes like this, Mr. Speaker, and applying it to what they are being invited to do.

There was a young lady from Niger  
Who went out for a ride on a tiger  
They came back from the ride with the  
lady inside and a smile on the face of the tiger.

and they know exactly where they are expected to end up if they enter into any such kind of companionship.

Now, that the Liberal party is a party of responsibility, and then he went on to say, we are not going to out-promise anybody, we are a party of responsibility, we are not going to out-promise anybody, and then spent 40 or 45 minutes in promises to the extent of many million of dollars.

He proposes tax-reductions which would cost in the neighbourhood of \$20 million, and then he went on after that to talk about further reductions in royalties and possibly tax-holidays to industry. He proposed millions of dollars of expenditures on roads, loans to industries, loans to agriculture and goodness knows how many other things. The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is this, he said, we are a party of responsibility, we are not going to out-promise anybody, and went on to promise reductions in sales tax, fewer articles to be taxed under the sales tax arrangement, lowering the property tax, doing away with some parts of the gasoline tax, doing away with some portion of revenues from royalties, providing a tax-free holiday for other industries . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You'll find out . . .

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . reducing income taxes, both personal and corporation income taxes, a responsible party which is not going to out-promise anybody, after which he adds many million of dollars of expenditures. But I think, Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting comments on this matter of responsibility or otherwise, is contained in his use of one particular document. You will recall he referred to a Canadian Press Despatch appearing in the Leader Post. He suggested that this shows that taxation bears more heavily on Saskatchewan than in other provinces, but unfortunately, he didn't read the whole despatch. If he had, he would have found this very interesting and meaningful statement —

but comparing taxes in one province and another can be misleading, particularly if they prompt conclusions as to which provinces are easy and which are tough on your pocketbook. Tax rates would have to be balanced against other factors such as how much money-savings you get in return.

and I invite him, or I invite anybody else, to take a look at the whole picture, at the taxation and also what that taxation provides in the province of Saskatchewan and what has to be bought outside of or in addition to taxation in other provinces. Consider one item alone, consider the added cost of medical care insurance in every other province except Saskatchewan, something that is included in your tax bill in this province.

I submit to him that it is not responsible to make use of these figures without indicating the important qualifications with regard to them, I shall come back with some more statistics with regard to that.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, will the Premier permit a question?

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Yes.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Today, information that you offered a moment ago, was asked by the members of the opposition in this house a year ago, and you refused the answer to the question.

This question was asked a year ago.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, this is no question at all, and may I say this . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Put it up.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I am quite prepared to put up and I have not as yet been shut up in this legislature by you, and I doubt very much if I ever shall be, although you have tried it on many occasions.

**Mr. Gardiner (Melville):** — Temper, Temper.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on the matter of what this province provides in taxation and services, I have a lot to say about that in the next hour or so, not all of it falling immediately after this little bit. Also, about how matters compare with the situations in other parts of Canada. The Leader of the Opposition had some general remarks to make about the state of the economy in Saskatchewan. At times he said it was good, and at other times he said it was stagnant, of course, but he did start out yesterday by saying it was pretty good. In all of this he saw nothing for which any credit should be given to the Saskatchewan government. The credit he claimed should all go to either Divine Providence or the federal Liberal party, and he really didn't differentiate much between the two of them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I submit, Mr. Speaker, that had there been a poor crop in Saskatchewan, had there been no sale of wheat, then he would have found reason to have blamed the provincial government in that particular way. Now, all of us will admit that we have reasons to be thankful in Saskatchewan for 1961. Climatic conditions were good; we have reasons again to be proud of our agricultural industry and the men and women who operate it. I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition might have found some opportunity to give credit to programs and staff of the Department of Agriculture of the university, to the contribution of agriculture research and a number of other matters, which in addition to Divine Providence and the Liberal party in Ottawa, have added productivity or helped to underwrite production of our agricultural industry.

I would like you to recall what he said about the sale and the price of wheat. Admittedly, these have contributed greatly to our economy. Let me refer the Leader of the Opposition to a press comment in the Leader Post, February 25th, 1963. It tells of a meeting at Assiniboia, and one of the speakers was the Hon. Paul Martin, who is now the federal Minister of External Affairs, and he was talking about the situation at that time, when you remember a Conservative government was selling wheat and in rather large quantities, and Mr. Martin had this to say, this whole matter of the wheat payments, and sales were the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the Canadian farmers. When a conservative government was involved in selling wheat rather successfully, it was a hoax, but when a Liberal government does it, this was a great accomplishment under those circumstances.

At the same meeting, Saskatchewan Mr. Argue spoke and he talked about payments for wheat and he said this is not the result of Conservative generosity but a return of the farmers' own hard earned money. That is a perfectly accurate statement, of course. Mr. Argue went on to say, on March 7th at Weyburn, to say in talking about returns from the sale of wheat, you can't bribe the farmer with his own money. Well, in the mouths of the Liberals an alleged Conservative bribe becomes an act of magnanimity and great skill when it is performed by a Liberal government in Ottawa. This is specifically what the Leader of the Opposition maintained here on Monday.

The Hon. Mr. Sharp, federal minister in charge of this, is much more subtle, and much more generous, and much more accurate, may I say. He, you will recall, on many occasions, has given credit to the wheat board and credit ought to be given to the wheat board. If we are going to give credit to the wheat board, then we ought to give credit also to some of the organizations, which have made it possible for us to have a wheat board in Canada. I submit when we are doing this, we need to give credit to farm groups and to co-ops, who were fighting for a wheat board at a time when Liberal federal members of parliament were opposing it in parliament and outside of parliament.

**Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!**

**Mr. Lloyd:** — If the wheat board is, in the opinion of the Liberals, such an excellent piece of machinery as we agree it is, then I suggest this should encourage them to show enough faith in it, to pass the necessary legislation to make it a permanent one. They should show enough faith in it to extend its operations to grains which are now excluded from the operation of the wheat board. Mr. Speaker, a main reason, of course, for good sales of wheat and good prices in 1963, and anticipated in 1964, has in fact, nothing to do with the federal government at Ottawa, or the provincial government in Saskatchewan. A main reason is that millions of people in Russia and in China needed the wheat we had to sell. The Liberal party, I should think is not going to seek to take any particular credit for the fact that there was a crop failure in either Russia or China. Insofar as we in Saskatchewan are concerned, we can be gratified that when millions of bushels of wheat were needed by people in other parts of the world, we were in a position to supply it. The fact that we had the wheat to supply this year has presented some dramatic evidence again of the value of our Saskatchewan industry, its value, not only to Saskatchewan, but its value to all of Canada. Few things, Mr. Speaker, have given the upward thrust and outward surge to the Canadian economy as did Saskatchewan's production this year and its sale. It has affected employment from one end of Canada to the other, it has affected beneficially our balance of trade, it has improved materially our influence in the world in general.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to this afternoon, just say a few words about the matter of manufacturing and industrial development and what the Leader of the Opposition has had to say of it. You know, almost at the time that he was speaking in the house yesterday, these papers which I have in my hand or one of them at least, must have been in the process of printing. I picked up the Leader Post this morning, and I found on page two, one headline saying Plants first stage complete, it refers to the Falcon Engineering Company, which has completed the first stage of its program to establish a branch plant at Weyburn, manufacturing a variety of steel, reinforced fibre glass products. It is located on five acres of land at the Weyburn Municipal Airport. It will employ labour force of 12 men initially, and within six months will employ 40 men with an annual payroll of more than \$250,000.00

On the same page, Company formed to make Plastics, date line Swift Current. The establishment of a plastic manufacturing plant, announced Monday by Prairie Plastics Company. The gentleman who was making the announcement was good enough to say, "there is not any particular association between Prairie Plastics and the Industrial Development Corporation, although credit can go to the corporation for prompting the establishment of this business."

The same page carries news about a new map relating to resources in northern Saskatchewan published jointly by the dominion government and the provincial government.

The Saskatchewan paper, which came to my desk just this morning, "La Ronge area interesting Prospectors." It tells of interest, probably because of the fact of claims which cover an interesting copper-gold prospecting area that has become what is known as hot. North of Lac La Ronge in recent months . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — You wouldn't know that . . .

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Rio Tinto staked about 50 claims. Augustus Exploration had previously acquired a claim block covering some 5,000 acres. Within the last two weeks, another group of 30 claims was recorded by the same company in the same area. More than 600 claims now in good standing. Mr. Speaker, one can read the newspapers every day, reporting activities in this province and find there ample contradiction of the ridiculous, repeated attempts of the Liberal party to paint this province as one in which one finds nothing but stagnation and lack of development . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Now about D.B.S. . .

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Yes, I shall come to D.B.S. as well, Mr. Speaker. One of the other comments which the Leader of the Opposition made yesterday, Mr. Speaker, you know was, he was getting sort of sorry for us on this side of the house. He got into a bit of a mellow mood, carried away by his sentimental associations of days long past perhaps, referred to a group of so-called “tired old men” over here. Well, Mr. Speaker, I admit we haven’t attempted to demonstrate our energy and imagination and grasp public problems by having our pictures taken kicking on any legislative doors. We haven’t wasted any additional energies when the photographer didn’t catch us the first time, doing an encore for him . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . and we haven’t tried to illustrate our initiative by hiring a public opinion firm to go about seeking information as to what we look like in the eyes of the public, but instead of doing these things, we have been mighty busy, doing things which contribute to the present and the future of this province of Saskatchewan. Let me indicate just a few of those things in the few additional moments I want to take this afternoon. Of course, we have been busy in making work the most important recent social legislation in the dominion of Canada. Namely, Medical Care Insurance. We have been busy making it work. Second, we have been busy with plans and discussions with other provincial governments, with the federal government, with local communities, as to ways and means of keeping branch rail lines from being abandoned in the manner with out consideration of consequences to people in communities. Thirdly, we have been busy and active on plans and discussions with other provincial governments and the federal government, on how to conserve and supplement and redirect the water supplies so essential to Saskatchewan and Canada’s future. Fourth, we have been busy standing up for the rights of the province of Saskatchewan at a series of important federal-provincial conferences. We have been busy building a great dam and power plant at Squaw Rapids, the first harnessing of that important resource for the use by the people of Saskatchewan. We have been busy working with industries to the end that the gross value of non-agricultural production in Saskatchewan in 1963, exceeded one billion dollars for the first time in our history. We have been busy helping to bring water and sewage to thousands of people in farm homes and tens of thousands of people in smaller urban communities. We have been busy getting on with the job of massive extension of Vocational Education facilities and university facilities. We have been busy building dust-free highways so that some three-quarters of the traffic which moves on provincial highways moves on highways with that kind of quality service. Mr. Speaker, those are just some of the things which this group of “tired old men” have been doing. I think the conclusion is that tired or not, there is still a lot more energy and competency and capability here than one finds in the group that we look at across the other side of the house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — HEAR! HEAR!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, may I ask leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

The debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:50 o’clock p.m.