

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
SIXTH SESSION – FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE
7th day**

Friday, February 14, 1964

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

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. J.E. Cooper: — Mr. Speaker, before the Order of the Day, I would like to call the attention of the members to a group of students in the west gallery. I think the members will be interested to know that this group of students, especially selected, come from various schools, and they are a special class in geography and world affairs. Their teacher, Mr. Sanderson, is with them and I am sure all the members of the legislature would like to welcome them and hope that they will enjoy their afternoon spent around the legislative buildings and in this chamber.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

WHEAT BOARD PAYMENTS

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, are proceeded with, I would like to draw to the attention of the members of the house who have not heard the news report, that the final wheat payments have been announced which will amount to something between 37½¢ for No. 1 Northern, up to 70¢ on lower grades of durum. I am sure this will be helpful not only to Saskatchewan but to western Canada, when we think this will mean some \$200,000,000 being injected into the economy of the three prairie provinces, and I would presume this would be something over \$100,000,000 into the province of Saskatchewan, and I am sure all hon. members will be pleased that the Canadian Wheat Board has been successful in selling our wheat at these prices, when they realize what this will mean to the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Mr. J.W. Erb: — Mr. Speaker, I regret that due to a cold, I must again ask your indulgence and through you, that of the members of the house, for my bad voice I am sure that it is going to sound a lot worse to the members opposite by the time I get finished.

Mr. Speaker, before I adjourned the debate yesterday, I had congratulated the members, the mover of the motion of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, and the seconder of that motion, I commented upon the very excellent manner in which they delivered their addresses, saying that they wouldn't need very much practise for the same speeches in the coming election. I also congratulated the Leader of the Opposition on what I considered was one of the most excellent addresses he has made since his coming to this legislature. Judging from the comments that have been coming from all over parts of Saskatchewan, it was indeed well received.

Our critics, Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out, had always been saying now, where is the Liberal program. It is significant on one hand if you don't criticize the speech from the throne, they say, where is your program, and if you do criticize the throne speech, they say, you haven't got a program. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition very clearly laid the Liberal program on the line. I am sure that should silence for some considerable time, the critics pressing the Liberals for a program to be made known.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we heard a wonderful announcement this afternoon by the member for Moosomin, and I am sure we all delight in this good news. I want to say that except for the beneficence of Divine Providence, the Canadian Wheat Board and possibly Mitchell Sharp, the authors of the throne speech would have been hard pressed to put flesh on its skeleton. Well, in the light of this reality, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech was neither spectacular nor inspiring for it does not reflect appreciably the kind of economic growth and activity that suggests or assures a real measure of permanency to the present buoyant economy.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-two and 1963, in which Divine Providence has blessed Saskatchewan with unprecedented wheat harvests, fodder and feed, makes it crystal clear that prosperity in Saskatchewan, whenever it comes, is entirely due to the agricultural economy.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — This, of course, is clearly revealed by the D.B.S. statistics when they state for example that the average per capita income for Saskatchewan in 1961 was among the lowest among all the provinces of Canada. Some \$14.81 per capita. However, due to bumper harvests over these past two years, the per capita income for 1963, while the latest figures aren't available, I am quite confident will rank Saskatchewan among those provinces with the highest per capita income in Canada, if it is not the highest.

Well, it is evident therefore, that the recent large surpluses, which the NDP government had at its disposal, have resulted from greatly increased consumer spending in those areas where the various tax structures of the government apply, such as the five per cent sales tax, the liquor tax, the gasoline tax, etc., as well as the six per cent surcharge on income tax. The large increases in provincial revenues, Mr. Speaker, are therefore, not appreciably due to any accelerated resource and industrial development, but rather to the unprecedented production of agricultural products, for which no government can take credit.

The recommended five million dollars in school grants together with substantially increased grants for the university will be welcomed. The accelerating costs of education requires an ever increasing participation of the senior levels of government if the burden of taxation on property is to be ameliorated. The fact that property tax for school purposes is steadily increasing is an indication that government grants have been, and are, inadequate. The five million dollar increase in government grants to education recommended in the throne speech will not appreciably stabilize the present rate of taxation on property, and what is even more, it fails woefully short in meeting the hope held out to property taxpayers by this government for a number of years, that it would soon assume 50 per cent of the costs of education.

The fact that other provincial jurisdictions are meeting 50 per cent of educational costs in their respective provinces, is yet another indication, Mr. Speaker, of the extent to which the NDP government of Saskatchewan has caused Saskatchewan to lag behind other parts of Canada. No one will deny, Mr. Speaker, that in this day of mechanization, automation and change, with all its implications, that, as stated in the throne speech, plans should be made for a significant expansion of programs, facilities and opportunities in vocational education, technical training designed to serve the needs of young people and adults alike. While the recognition of such a need is elementary, including the provision of physical facilities wherein the various vocational education and technical training programs are made available, it is only as it were in the present context of things a treatment of symptoms. Having there, equipped our young people and adults with technical and other skills, Mr. Speaker, it follows then that employment opportunities must be, or become available, if these, our citizens of Saskatchewan, hope to prosper in our province.

I submit that such opportunities and such hopes do not lie within their grasp. The undeniable fact is that far too many, if not most, of our young people so trained will be required to leave Saskatchewan in order to apply their skills in industries located in other parts of Canada. One need only look at the D.B.S. figures of the rate of population growth of the 10 provinces of Canada, to be convinced that this is indeed the case, and has been over the last number of years. Saskatchewan has dropped from third highest population in Canada to sixth place, and its rate of population increase is surpassed by all provinces, including tiny Prince Edward Island.

I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that the government is concerned about the exodus of our citizens to other parts of Canada and the United States, and well it might be, for it is a reflection upon the administration of Saskatchewan — a province which has such great diversity and potential wealth in natural and mineral resources, that relatively little has been done in the exploitation thereof for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.

While the production of oil and gas in this province has been encouraging and the development of our potash resource a most welcome activity, it still represents a small, fraction of the great potential awaiting development. Saskatchewan and its people, I submit, Mr. Speaker, have been waiting far too long for the kind of economic growth that will create job opportunities for our citizens and who, because of the lack of them, are compelled to leave our province in such great numbers. Having equipped our young people so departing with educational and technical skills, their send-off to other parts of Canada has been rendered somewhat respectable. But just as long as our vast timber resources in northern Saskatchewan, capable, we are told of supporting in perpetuity, four large pulp mills remain untouched, as long as our untold treasure of mineral remains locked in the bowels of the earth, as long as lagging industrial development marks the rate of our economic growth, just so long will the exodus from Saskatchewan of so many of our young people continue. For in the last analysis, Mr. Speaker, our young people are our greatest resource, our most valuable asset. For it is only by their involvement in creative endeavor, that the term resources for people will have purpose and meaning. But analogous to the combining to two chemical compounds whose reaction is delayed until a catalyst has been added, likewise people plus resources remain idle until a catalyst is introduced to create a dynamic. This catalyst is of course, composed of two elements: investment capital and confidence, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the lack of this catalyst has caused Saskatchewan to lag far behind our sister provinces in resource and industrial development and consequently in population growth.

What then, Mr. Speaker, is the reason for our lethargic pace? Well, the Premier and a battery of a few selected writers of the NDP who contribute letters to the newspaper editors of Saskatchewan under the signatures of a host of people, have stated that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Thatcher, has discouraged industry from coming into Saskatchewan. Somehow they would attempt to portray Mr. Thatcher as an evil genius, whose preoccupation it is to downgrade Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Thatcher: — That is Mrs. Whelan.

Mr. Erb: — Such attempts to discredit the Leader of the Opposition in an effort to divert attention from the real cause for the general reluctance of industry to located in our province is, in the first instance, Mr. Speaker, an admission that industry is indeed bypassing this province, and secondly, their criticism, I suggest, is indicative of intellectual barrenness.

When the Leader of the Opposition criticizes policies of the NDP, particularly those policies which militate against the flow of investment capital into Saskatchewan, such criticism cannot by any stretch of the imagination be construed as discouraging industry from coming to our province. To interpret Mr. Thatcher's criticism of government policies as downgrading Saskatchewan, is I suggest, preposterous nonsense. Indeed the criticism levelled at the policies of this government by the Leader of the Opposition and his members have cause the government to make changes in regulations governing natural and mineral resources development in order to stimulate activity in these areas.

But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that it takes more than changing regulations to attract a continuous flow of large investment capital to this province. It requires a change in the attitude of the NDP, provincially and

nationally, to the free enterprise. This is fundamental to the problem we are facing in Saskatchewan in respect of economic development. To quote a trite phrase, "Once bitten, twice shy" is a summation of our experience with potential investors in the resources of our province.

Of course, the NDP are quick to point out the sizable investment in the potash industry in order to refute arguments such as the foregoing. Indeed, it is a great development and we welcome it wholeheartedly, but, Mr. Speaker, our good fortune in this regard is due to an act of the Creator in that the potash beds are peculiar to Saskatchewan alone. I suggest that these beds extended through Alberta and Manitoba as well, similar information and overburden, it is plain that potash development would not likely have occurred in this province. Because there is ample evidence for this assumption, Mr. Speaker, in the pulp mills we didn't get, in the petro-chemical industry we didn't get, nor a host of other industries we didn't get, which have bypassed Saskatchewan for a more favourable political and economic climate . . .

An Hon. Member: — Now we know the reason why we didn't get them . . .

Mr. Erb: — I would remind this house, Mr. Speaker, particularly the government, that there are nine other provinces in Canada, and 50 states in the union to the south of us, who are in competition for the same development capital that we are. I would also remind them that Saskatchewan does not have a monopoly on natural and mineral resources, except for potash, helium and to a lesser extent, oil. It is evident therefore, that with the exception of potash, oil and helium, development capital is being directed to our sister provinces of Manitoba, and Alberta where other similar resources abound.

During recent months the Premier and the NDP followers have been telling the people of this province that Saskatchewan has never looked better. Well, Mr. Speaker, that statement is just about as profound as the one made by an over-indulgent father when he said, "My son, Willie, has never been taller." Of course, Saskatchewan has never looked better. What province in Canada can say less. Indeed all provinces of Canada have never looked better but what our people want to know is this, does Saskatchewan look as good as our neighbouring province of Alberta and Manitoba? For it is only by measuring the performance of individuals in competition that degrees of excellence can be established. Likewise we can only get a true picture of progress in our province by measuring it against the progress of these provinces with similar economics, and when that is done by the best and latest statistics available, it obviously is not good enough for the people of Saskatchewan to be told that Saskatchewan has never looked better.

The NDP government will have to adopt a more convincing slogan. Last Monday, the seconder to the address in reply to the throne speech, the hon. member for Regina, (Mr. Whelan) stated and I quote:

Our opponents tried all the old tricks and some new ones speaking in respect of medical care plan.

One political barricade after another was thrown up, but the steady reliable parliamentary leadership of the government, particularly that of Premier Lloyd, prevailed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the only reason the government and Premier Lloyd prevailed is that they didn't call an election at the time of the medical care issue.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — Had they given the people of Saskatchewan the opportunity, neither the member for Regina, Premier Lloyd nor the NDP government, nor 9/10th of the members opposite would be in this house today, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — The member goes on, he says:

You wouldn't believe it, Mr. Speaker, it is beyond our wildest imagination, the members opposite are in favour of the plan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one thing I can agree with the Regina member, he has the wildest imagination and he has demonstrated it so superbly that I am sure can be classified as having a talent.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member on one hand, distorts the facts, and on the other, ignores them completely, and in so doing, he would have people believe that the Liberal opposition first opposed the plan, but since have reversed their position and are now in favour of the plan. Just that simple. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to injure the hon. member's latent because he is going to need it and lot more of it, if he is going to save his deposit in the next election against Ron Atchinson in north Regina, because all I intend to do is to state the Liberal party's position on medical care.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, for the record of this house, and secondly, in order that the people of Saskatchewan be accorded the courtesy of being given an honest account of the facts. For after all, the people of our province pay for these legislative broadcasts, and I should think they resent the kind of bunkum the member for Regina let loose in this chamber and over the air last Monday . . .

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — They are not getting value now . . .

Mr. Erb: — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, let me make this crystal clear. The plan which the hon. member for Regina says we are now in favour of, is not the same plan this NDP government wanted to ram down the throats of the doctors . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — . . . Oh, I know that the member for Regina and the NDP government would like to forget that plan, because it is that plan which cost the people of Saskatchewan some of our finest specialists and doctors. It was that plan which caused thousands of our finest citizens from all parts of Saskatchewan to march to the legislative buildings in Regina to protests against the plan, to a Premier who refused to speak to them. It is that plan which caused our doctors to withdraw their services on July 1st, 1962 which cast a shadow of gloom and despair and anxiety over this province. It was that plan over which I resigned from the NDP government, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — It was that plan which caused the former Mr. T.C. Douglas to go down to a humiliating defeat on election day in 1962. It was that plan which the Liberals voted against in this legislature, because it was unvarnished and unadulterated state medicine.

But, Mr. Speaker, the plan which we now have . . .

Mr. Nollet: — I'll . . .

Mr. Erb: — You know the story Toby, I told it all to you . . .

Mr. Nollet: — I'll never forget it.

Mr. Erb: — Well, Mr. Speaker, . . . don't pretend you didn't know it then, Toby. Well, Mr. Speaker, the plan which we now have and one that is working moderately well, is the plan that came into being at a special session of the legislature on August 2nd, 1962. It was at that session that the unacceptable plan was amended. Amendments the NDP government were reluctant to accept. Every Liberal member on this side of the house voted in favour of every amendment because these amendments removed the worst features of the original unacceptable Medical Care Act.

Having voted for the act, as amended, it follows then that we favour the present plan, because the Liberal party believes in universal comprehensive health insurance. Because 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. Yet, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the biased bigotry that emanates from those paragons of virtue and self-styled humanitarians of the NDP, one would get the impression that they, and they alone have had a revelation of the Kingdom of God; that they, and they alone had been endowed with the divine instinct of compassion and concern for their fellow man. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that they actually believe that . . .

The NDP are running about the province trying to frighten people by saying a Liberal government would throw out the medical care plan. The Minister of Public Health stated in a telecast that the Liberal government would substitute the Alberta plan for it. The hon. member for Regina states that the Liberal party favours the plan. Now which of these statements are the people of Saskatchewan to believe? Three different versions, Mr. Speaker. It shows how inconsistent they are. Now wouldn't you think, Mr. Speaker, that those statements make our friends opposite look just a little silly.

Well, Mr. Speaker, for the record of this house and to the people of Saskatchewan, I say categorically and without qualification, that a new Liberal government will not throw out the medical care plan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — We will not substitute it for the Alberta type plan. A new Liberal government will continue to operate the present plan but Mr. Speaker, I say this, we will take politics out of the plan by having it operate under an independent commission. A new Liberal government will improve the plan, and to the extent that it is possible to do so, we shall increase the benefits to include other areas of the health services.

We will use our best efforts to seek the return to Saskatchewan of the many fine specialists and doctors who have left our province.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — We shall engender a spirit of good will and co-operation with our doctors that will lead to mutual trust and understanding, so that medicine in Saskatchewan can move forward once again to regain the high standards of medical practise of which our doctors and the people of our province were so proud.

This then, Mr. Speaker, is the position of the Liberal party on the medical care plan. This is our policy. This is our unswerving resolution and when a new Liberal government takes office after the next election, this is how it will be!

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — The member for Regina in his address extolled the Premier for his quite and democratic manner in handling the medical care crisis. Well, Mr. Speaker, the same Premier speaking in this house on April 11th, 1962, was neither quite nor democratic when he stated that the medical care plan shall commence on July 1st, "with or without the co-operation of the doctors". Oh, I can vouch that he did not pound his desk with his shoe, but even if he had, his statement could have not been more undemocratic.

Only when the aroused public closed ranks behind their doctors in indignation against the arbitrary and dictatorial attitude of the Premier and the government, did the Premier become quite and democratic. He did then what he should have done in the first place, he and his colleagues met with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and only after assuring the doctors that a special session of the legislature would be called to repeal those sections which made the medical care unacceptable to the doctors and to the people, did the physicians return to their practises.

Neither the member for Regina, Mr. Speaker, nor anyone else will succeed in building an image for the Premier and the NDP government, that will catch votes on the basis of the manner in which they handled the medical care crisis. For during those anxious and unforgettable days, the Premier, the government, and Saskatchewan, never looked worse.

The throne speech proposes legislation based in part on the Woods Royal Commission. While the contents of this legislation will not be known until it is tabled in the house, of this, all concerned can be assured, the opposition will scrutinize its contents with greatest care lest there be any interference with the autonomy of local hospital boards.

The Woods Royal Commission unfortunately was a by-product of the medical care crisis of July, 1962. Had the Premier and the NDP government acted in the good faith that any medical care plan must be acceptable to both the providers of medical care service and the receivers, Saskatchewan would not have had a medical care crisis. Had there been no medical care crisis, there would have been no community health clinic centres, and of course, had there been no community health centres, there would have been no Woods Royal Commission. It is an undeniable fact, Mr. Speaker, that the community health clinics are a political creation by the NDP of Regina. They are the offspring of vengeance and contempt the NDP have for the medical profession of this province. The need for their existence in the minds of the NDP became demonstrable only when the NDP failed to ram an unacceptable act down the throats of the doctors.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — The intended purpose of these community health clinics is to oppose organized medicine in our province, and they have more than just the moral support of the NDP government., for now it appears the NDP government is prepared to have enacted on their behalf a law which will require medical and hospital boards to relinquish their traditional procedures in granting hospital privileges. For more than 50 years Saskatchewan has managed without such politically oriented clinics. During these years the standard of medical care had been continuously upgraded by the physicians of Saskatchewan. We had a reputation of having as high a standard of medicine as to be found anywhere in the world.

The medical care crisis precipitated by the NDP government during which time some of our most highly skilled specialists and doctors left the province and the advent of the community clinics, all this has caused the high standard of medical care to begin to decline. For it is inconceivable that skilled brain surgeons, specialists in surgery, pediatrics, gynecology and the like, can be replaced by community clinic doctors, who do not generally possess the high trainings of our Saskatchewan doctors, and who in most instances did not have hospital privileges in the United Kingdom from whence they come.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. G. Strum (Saskatoon): — Nonsense.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Nonsense.

Mr. Erb: — And I am not talking about the doctors who came here after the war, I am talking about the new arrivals, talking about the new arrivals that came to Saskatchewan during and after the medical care crisis. Mr. Speaker, my time is going on and the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) is anxious to get up.

Mr. Semchuk (Meadow Lake): — What is wrong with doctors now?

Mr. Erb: — In addition to all those factors that render these community clinics alien to our acceptable and traditional standards of medical practise, they are an abomination to these rural areas where NDP local organizations have set them up, for in doing so, Mr. Speaker, they have driven some fine Saskatchewan doctors out of these areas, but what is even more serious, that they have brought strife and dissension to our rural communities. They have divided our communities, they have set neighbour against neighbour, brother against brother, and house against house.

I say, Mr. Speaker, born out of deep conviction, out of years of experience as a member of this legislature, and a former Minister of the crown that the time has come for the people of Saskatchewan to remove the NDP government from office. It is time for a change, and I say high time. This NDP government has become arrogant and arbitrary, it has ridden roughshod over our cherished freedoms and traditions, it has paid lip service to the democratic process when it became politically expedient to do so. Having its roots in a class party, this NDP government has a profound dislike, in some instances bordering on contempt, for private enterprise, chambers of commerce, employees associations, and organized medicine.

Through the NDP organization, it has attempted and in some instances succeeded to subvert voluntary organizations to the role of political tools. By similar means this NDP government has sought control of local government. Such intentions were no hid from the public view when the resolution went before the convention, urging that party members to political action in municipal elections, so that the progressive measures of this NDP government might be promoted. The most brazen of all such attempts to exercise control of organizations, Mr. Speaker, is observed in a preamble to a resolution passed at the NDP convention of July, 1962, which refers to the civil service or public service, and that preamble states:

whereas there are too many employees in the public service that do not believe in the philosophies of the government, and therefore, do not work to the best of their ability in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, therefore, be it resolved that the entire question of hiring public servants be referred to the incoming council.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Shame, Shame.

Mr. Erb: — Well, Mr. Speaker, what a slur on our civil service. Mr. Speaker, as a member of this legislature for 16 years and a former cabinet minister of two departments of government, Public Health, and Public Works, I have had the opportunity to assess the civil service of Saskatchewan, and I want to tell this house and I want to tell the civil service and the public whom it serves, that there are no finer, no more dedicated men and women anywhere in the civilized world, than those who comprise the civil service of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — My experience with them as a former minister of the Crown, is one of my happiest reflections. For the NDP to state that unless a civil servant believes in the philosophies of the NDP government, he or she is incapable of doing a good and conscientious job for the public, is in my opinion nothing less than blind fanaticism and monstrous bigotry.

The NDP have been saying that under a Liberal government, there would be dismissal of civil servants. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me compare the resolution respecting the civil servants which was passed at the last Liberal convention last fall, and that says, "a Liberal government will continue the employment free of political interference and discrimination, of qualified government employees who are competently performing essential services."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask, which of these two resolutions assures the

civil servant the maximum in job security, promotion on the basis of seniority and ability and freedom from political harassment? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the men and women in our civil service are best able to answer that question. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have gone over my time. From what I have stated in my speech, it is evident that I shall not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. David Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, before I take part in this debate, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder for their performance at the opening of the debate. I could hardly agree with what they said.

The member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk), in typical NDP fashion took us back to the days prior to 1944, and tried to tell us how things would be today under a Liberal government. He tried to make us believe that under a Liberal government, we would have no power lines to the farmers, no dial telephones, no modern schools, no modern hospitals and so on. The same speech, word for word, has been rehearsed in this house for 20 years, and I am satisfied that the people of Saskatchewan are fed up with such nonsense and that the hon. members opposite will not be given the opportunity for a repeat performance after the next election.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Boldt: — The seconder the hon. member for Regina, (Mr. Whelan) was even more hypnotized, he went so far as to say that the re-election of the Liberal members for Turtleford, (Mr. Foley) and Rosthern, (Mr. Boldt), was in promotion in the north. Well, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, in some areas of my constituency, the NDP are so scarce, that if the people want to see them they turn on the television.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Boldt: — The Premier speaking at a public meeting in Rosthern, conceded the election to the Liberals. He told them he was convinced that the member for Rosthern after the next election would sit on the government side of the house.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Boldt: — Right now the NDP party is engaging outside organizers in Rosthern who are demanding campaign funds and memberships from the government employees, and threatening them the loss of their jobs if they don't.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Boldt: — They are getting desperate, even social aid recipients are threatened with the loss of their cheques if they don't support the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Boldt: — I also want to thank the Premier and the Minister of Social Welfare who is making frequent visits, and the member for Redberry, (Mr. Michayluk) who has visited my constituency in the last few months.

Referring to the two major concerns in Rosthern, namely the oiling of No. 11 and the natural gas services for the area. The Premier said while

in Rosthern he would not “prophesy nor predict”, but he did imply this, had we had different representation in Regina, we might have had more favourable considerations of our problems. Does the member for Regina believe that statements such as these, qualifies the Premier’s admittance into the hall of fame as one of a small group of great Canadians? I would suggest for him the hall of shame, as one of a very small group of small Canadians.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, the throne speech suggests that the amendments to the Secondary School Act respecting the levying of local taxes for support of education at the high school level will be proposed. As pointed out by the Premier, these amendments will not affect the private schools. If these private schools want to qualify for assistance, they are asked to make agreements with local units or districts boards whereby they would become part of the educational system of that area. To understand the private school setup, one must realize that they are not necessarily set up to meet the needs of a given school district or unit, but in many cases, they were set up to meet the needs of a denomination residing in many areas. Thus, some private schools would not necessarily qualify as a particular need in the district, and might find it difficult to negotiate with the local district. They would then be left out entirely of any assistance.

When we realize the benefit to society of these schools in every walk of life, they certainly merit support. Religion and Christianity are a choice, a freedom we cherish and want to preserve. Where these institutions comply with the curriculum and qualifications of the department, I urge the government to give careful consideration for financial support.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about farm credit. Very often this government has belittled the farm industry by claiming that other industry will soon outpace the farming industry. I maintain that the farm industry has again proven to be most stabilizing industry to our economy and province and dominion, and will remain so for a very long time, but this government has failed to realize the importance of this industry. The government is afraid to invest in agriculture. I am particularly interested in the farm credit program of this government. Truly, the throne speech indicates that provisions will be made for credit to farmers. The 1959 throne speech did note same, and in that year, The Family Farm Credit Act was passed. I sincerely hope that the intended legislation will be of real benefit to the small farmer, more so than the act of 1959.

I would like to examine the farm credit institution as it exists today. We have a few farm credit acts in existence, namely, The Canadian Farm Credit Corporation, The Farm Improvement Loan Act, which are federal acts, and provincially, we have The Family Farm Credit Act for 1959. I believe that The Farm Improvement Loan Act has been the most popular of these acts, and has throughout the years assisted every young farmer in Saskatchewan. Due to the high cost of machinery and building material, I would hope that the amount of the loans would be increased to at least \$10,000, and the terms extended to seven or eight years.

The federal act, The Canadian Farm Credit Corporation, has had the tendency to provide loans to the big farmer who had the assets to back the loan, the smaller farmer was left out. The provincial act, The Family Farm Credit Act, which was passed in 1959, has proven to be of very little benefit to the Saskatchewan farmer.

I have been told by the administrators of this act, that in the last year, only 50 loans to farmers have been made and about \$1,000,000. has constituted these loans.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe I could find that number of qualified applications in my own school district. One of the reasons this act has not been used is due to the fact that the government has stipulated that the seller has to invest 25 to 50 per cent of the amount received for his farm in co-op trust bonds at 4-½ per cent interest rate. The act has now been in force for five years, 450 loans have been made for a total of about \$5½ million, and the last two years, applications and approvals for loans were practically nonexistent.

Looking over the farm credit legislation in Canada, prepared by the economics division of the Canadian Department of Agriculture, we find that Manitoba and Quebec have perhaps the best farm credit legislation.

In Manitoba, the Agricultural Credit Act is administered by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. It is designed to assist in the transfer of a family farm from father to son, to assist in the enlargement of conversions of family farms that are non-economic into economic units. In Saskatchewan the main security is on land, while under certain conditions chattel security may be taken. However, in Manitoba 60 per cent of the security must be land and the balance could be 40 per cent livestock or 20 per cent in equipment and 20 per cent in livestock.

You can readily see that the act in Manitoba is more flexible and consequently much more use is made out of it. The amount of the loan is up to \$25,000. repayable up to 30 years with interest rates at 4½ per cent to young farmers who are between the ages of 21 and 31 years, and 6 per cent to all others. In Manitoba under the Agricultural Credit Act, part two of this act had as its objective, establishing and improving beef cattle herds in this province. Under this part, the corporation may make loans up to a maximum of \$10,000. for a period of 10 years. Security is taken on the beef breeding herd only, the borrower must have a minimum of 25 cattle of breeding age and obtain the use of brand registered services under The Animal Husbandry Act. The act is finance directly by the provincial government. The farmers in Manitoba are making good use of it. This act has been in force one year longer than ours here in Saskatchewan, but there the farmers have borrowed \$20,000,000. In Quebec the farms are smaller, so naturally the loans are smaller, a farmer may borrow up to \$15,000. and repay at the rate of two payments of \$20.00 each per year, interest included for each one thousand borrowed. The rate is 2½ per cent.

The end result of poor farm credit legislation for Saskatchewan farmers over a period of 20 years has been an exodus of young people leaving the farms and flocking to our cities or out of the province. The Liberal party is determined to correct this situation, we must have a more flexible credit act designed to assist not only the farmers to purchase more land, but also for the livestock and poultry producers to enlarge. The government must realize that to assist the farmer is an investment. Agriculture is our key industry and will be for many years to come. If the farm industry in Saskatchewan and Canada is prosperous, business and labour will not suffer. The Liberal party will introduce credit legislation to assist, particularly the young and smaller farmer, even if this means a risk in some areas.

The industry without youth will eventually collapse. I am positive that the young farmer today is not receiving fair consideration by this present NDP government. Credit should be made available through the lending facilities in the province, with a government guarantee. I urge a close scrutiny of farm credit acts in other provinces where the farmers have been able to take advantage of long term loans.

Mr. Speaker, I would not like to turn for a few moments to social aid. I have not too much time to enlarge upon it but I would just like to point out the Liberal program in regard to social aid. The Liberal party believes that in a province as productive as ours, it is inconceivable that needless suffering or hardship should exist. We believe that every citizen is entitled to a certain basic standard of living, always assuming that the healthy individual is prepared to work, we also believe, however, that social aid privileges must not be abused. A Liberal government will undertake to overhaul and improve the whole program of social welfare services with a view to assisting individuals to become self supporting and useful members of society.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Boldt: — Speaking in Rosthern last fall at the annual NDP meeting, the social Welfare Minister, Mr. Nicholson, criticized me and the Liberal party for attacking the social aid policies of this government. Mr. Speaker, the criticism, I believe, levelled at this government by the opposition has been well taken by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. We have seen numerous areas where improvements have been made. In regard to social welfare, I would also like to state that I believe that the maintenance and construction grants are too low and the serious consideration should be given to this area where the church organizations and other organizations are doing a tremendous job for our less fortunate.

I would also like to briefly say a few words in regard to crop insurance. The crop insurance in Saskatchewan doesn't look too bright. We have heard in this debate, speaker after speaker on the government side, congratulating and applauding one another for sound administration. When

we look at this crown corporation, we see that \$1.00 for every \$3.00 is used for administration and this is in a year when we had a good crop. The estimates would indicate that had we had an average crop when more inspection fees would have been subject to payment by this insurance fund, we would almost give dollar for dollar for administration.

I would urge the Minister of Agriculture, to take a very sincere look at the Saskatchewan Insurance Board, with the recommendation that perhaps the head of this department should be released and the staff completely overhauled.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Boldt — Now in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, because I am not convinced that the throne speech deals adequately with the problems facing the people of this province, I feel compelled to move, seconded by the hon. member from Athabaska, (Mr. A.R. Guy) that the following words be added to the address:

but this assembly regrets that the policies adopted by Your Honour's advisers have resulted in a heavy and continued exodus of people from Saskatchewan, retarded industrial development, and excessive taxation on the remaining residents of the province.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Speaker: — We have the amending motion here, moved by Mr. Boldt, and seconded by Mr. Guy, that the following words be added to the address:

but this assembly regrets that the policies adopted by Your Honour's advisers have resulted in a heavy and continued exodus of people from Saskatchewan, retarded industrial development, and excessive taxation on the remaining residents of the province.

I believe under our rules, the amendment is in order and I shall declare that both the amendment and the motion are debatable. Continue on.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. Russell Brown (Minister of Industry and Information): — Mr. Speaker, first I want to apologize for just now entering the chamber. I couldn't get here any sooner, I had the privilege a very short time ago of officiating at the opening of another one of these industries which my friends across the way continuously refer to as being non-existent. This was not one of those industries that my friends talk about, one of those with a large number of smoke stacks belching smoke and fumes over the landscape. Rather this is a small industry, but a very interesting one, it is one that produces a new product for Saskatchewan, a new product for Regina, and in fact is a first as far as Canada is concerned.

It is an industry which is based on our agricultural industry. It is a little industry known as "Golden Crest Foods". They produce a type of frozen bread dough and if any of you have an opportunity to try it, you will agree with me, that it is a tasty product, and one that is nice to have added to the many many products which are now being produced in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brown: — I am sure all members of the house will join with me in wishing this latest addition to the industrial complex of the province of Saskatchewan the very best of luck in the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this being Valentines Day, when love is supposed to bloom throughout the land, I want to assure you that I am properly imbued with the spirit of the day, and that being the case you can depend, Sir, as can the members of this house, that the remarks I make this afternoon will be made in my usual modest and moderate manner. I feel, Sir, too, that I would like at this time to present to the Leader of the Opposition something that I hope he will appreciate. This again is done in the spirit of Valentines Day, and I would like to present him at this time with a set of recordings of the first speech which the hon. gentleman made in this house when he first came in here in 1961.

Now I don't want him to think that he has to thank me for it, I can assure him that I have others that I have made over the years since he has been in this house. I still have those, they are all the same, so I'm really not giving up too much. If anybody wonders why I make recordings of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, I can tell you this, that I have found that they are one of the best things that I can have with me when I am on the campaign trail, because nothing gets me more support, than playing to these people a copy of the speeches that are made by the Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brown: — I must apologize to the member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) for not being in my place when he was speaking. I did listen to part of his speech on my way back to the legislature, however, and as usual I enjoyed it. I had to turn my radio down, it was as loud as it usually is. I must confess that as usual I did not understand half the words that he used but I did find it somewhat entertaining. I also discovered that he is following exactly the same theme as the hon. Leader of the Opposition and some other members who have spoken from across the way since this debate began. All I can say at this time, Mr. Speaker, having listened to the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I have never in all my life have seen a more apparent display of utter panic. Never have I seen a more desperate attempt by misrepresentation, manipulation, and misuse and abuse of statistics, to dispel a picture of the province of Saskatchewan as it is today, which obviously, Mr. Speaker, shakes the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues to their very boot tops.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brown: — The picture of a province today is swelling and pulsing with an economic boom second to none in the dominion of Canada. A province which last year set new records on all fronts. Where unemployment is almost nonexistent. A province where services available to the people are second to none among the provinces of Canada. A province, Mr. Speaker, where the burden of dead weight debt has been removed from the backs of the people. A province with a future which shines like a beacon to the rest of the provinces in this dominion.

I want to say too, Mr. Speaker, in all my life never have I seen such abject begging for political support. I'm sure however, that the best that the hon. Leader of the Opposition can do, or his worst efforts will be to no avail. You know I can't help wondering, Mr. Speaker, just whom my hon. friend expects that he can impress with the type of speeches which he makes in this house and on the hustings. Surely, Mr. Speaker, he does not expect to impress the 99 per cent of the work force of this province who are gainfully employed. Surely he does not expect to really impress the businessmen and the industrialists that are reaping the rewards of the booming economy of this province. Not surely, does he expect to impress our agriculturists who are enjoying their very best year in history. Certainly not the people outside the province, who are continuously confronted with stories and reports in every type of publication telling of the amazing developments which are taking place in the province of Saskatchewan today.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend is obviously confronted with a rather impossible task. I would suggest to you, that no matter how he may juggle the statistics and figures and facts, he is not going to impress very many people. Whether he realizes it or not, Sir, that people of this province can read, they have eyes, they can listen, they know what is going on in the province today, and all the sleight-of-hand efforts that he wants to try to kid the people that nothing is happening in the province of Saskatchewan will help him, not now or in the months ahead.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brown: — Small wonder then, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend begs and pleads for support from other parties, knowing full well that because of his blind and blatant efforts to blacken and sell short his own province, that even the 30 per cent of the votes that his party managed to gather in 1960 is rapidly fading away. I know my hon. friends will say this is not true. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that I have businessmen and industrialists coming to see me day in and day out, months in and months out. These people are becoming simply disgusted with the antics of my hon. friend. Many of them have expressed to me their belief that the worst thing that could happen to the province of Saskatchewan, would be to see the day that my hon. friend led a government in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brown: — My hon. friend talks about the 60 per cent of the people who he says don't want this government. Well I would suggest to him that there's apparently 70 per cent that don't want his government. I would suggest to my friend that it takes the nerve of a Missouri Mule in view of his record, to suggest that the 30 per cent of the people who didn't support either his party or ours would rather have him and a government than Premier Lloyd and this government. That they don't, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman admits himself in reminding this house the other day, that the Leader of the Tory party in Saskatchewan said that he would rather see a CCF government in office than a Liberal one, and I heartily agree with the opinion of that hon. gentleman. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is faced with an impossible task. There is today in Saskatchewan a swelling tide of support that I suggest to you, will sweep this government back into office and, like all tides do, when it recedes to return again another day, it will wash away the debris of a shattered and discredited Liberal party, and this I would suggest is one of the best things that could happen to the province of Saskatchewan in 1964.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has devoted a great deal of time in this house and elsewhere, in an attempt to paint a picture of stagnation and depression, referring time and time again to Saskatchewan as an economic wilderness. Referring to our people as poor country cousins. Well, of course industrial and economic development is of some concern to my department, and you'll remember too, that the gentleman suggested that the department in his views was ineffective and useless. Well, I can assure him that while that may be his opinion, and it probably is, it is because he probably doesn't like the kind of success which we have been able to achieve. I want to tell you, and I want to tell this house, the opinion which my hon. friend holds is not shared by the people generally, of this province, and from without this province.

In his attempts to paint his picture of stagnation, my hon. friend continuously stoops to misrepresentation and misuses of statistics and facts. He also at times finds it convenient to completely ignore some facts which actually are a matter of record. When the Premier replied the other day, he did a very good job of straightening out my hon. friend in respect to a lot of facts and some of the statistics which he quoted.

I'd like to refer to just one or two because I think some mention should be made of them. My hon. friend made much of some figures which he produced with respect to projected investment in the province in 1963. He mentioned that the province of Alberta expected an investment of about some \$56,000,000, some \$47,000,000 in Manitoba, and he cried the blues because it had been projected that only some \$21,000,000 was to be invested in Saskatchewan.

Well I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, just how meaningful are these figures which have been quoted? I would suggest that they really are not meaningful at all. They are figures with respect to announced or known intention of investment. They have no relationship to any actual investments which were made during the years. Nor do they take into consideration announcements of intentions to invest that were made after those projections were made. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that its only right and proper that we add to the figures which have been quoted, the investments with respect to a number of projects which were announced after these figures were brought

out and, if you do that, Sir, you will find that we had announcements here in Saskatchewan of some \$3,000,000 of investments for a helium plant. We had announcement of some \$5,000,000 for the Consolidated Mining and Smelting \fertilizer plant in Regina. We had announcement of \$1,000,000 investment by Redi-Mix concrete Products. We had announcement of \$40,000,000 for Kalium Chemicals Corporation. We had \$5,000,000 announced as investment for Armo Chemicals Corporation. We had \$50,000,000 announced as investment by Alwinal Potash company. There were many other announcements of smaller investments, but if you take some of these major ones and add up the total of some of these smaller ones, you come up with some thing like \$110,000,000 which it was announced as to be invested in Saskatchewan after the projected figures were released. I want to suggest to you, that if we look at the picture in that way, and I think its only right and proper, Saskatchewan, Sir, has no need to take a backseat to any other province insofar as investment is concerned.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brown: — I mentioned the Alwinal project, Mr. Speaker, and I must comment on this because this is a very interesting once. You'll recall that shortly after the first session of legislature, that my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition attended, he found it necessary to take a holiday and went to Europe. I understood that he was tired, weary from his labours in the house. I'm sure he was, because he spent a great deal of effort in that session trying to explain the reasons the Liberal party lost the election in 1960, and a great deal of time and effort to knock and degrade the progressive measures which the government was proposing at that time. My hon. friend, and I hope he enjoyed the holiday, I only wish I could have one sometimes myself, took his trip to Europe and on his return, he went around the province and he made a statement, that while he was in Europe he visited the potash interest there, and these people had told him that they would not come into the province of Saskatchewan, as long as the present government was in office. Well, all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is this, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman pretty well confirms what we have suggested all along. That he does take the time and trouble to go around suggesting to the people who may be interested in this province that it would be as well if they stayed away.

My hon. friend too, took a great deal of time and quoted and juggled a great number of statistics with respect to the jobs which have been created here in the province of Saskatchewan. He made much of some statistics which he said indicated that over 20 years only some 847 jobs were created. Well, I don't think that anybody really pays much attention to that, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — In manufacturing . . .

Mr. Brown: — . . . because people only have too look around and see what is taking place in this province and they will come to the conclusions that the hon. gentleman just doesn't really know what he is talking about. I've got some figures too, I can dig them up and juggle them around just as well as my hon. friend, but I want to suggest to you, that it is only recently that a number of our major industries have come into production here in the province. Some of the major industries which are those that create the greatest amount of employment. It is only recently that the Interprovincial Steel Mills came into production, it is now in full production and it employs some 530 men. This industry of course, has been pointed out as one of those which my hon. friend did his best to destroy and to chase out of province of Saskatchewan. International Minerals and Chemicals with some 500 employees just recently came into production. Interprovincial Co-op with their chemical plant with a large number of employees. Armour chemicals just recently came into production with a number of employees. Wisewood at Hudson Bay. These are only a few, but these alone have added some 1200 new jobs to the province in only the last little while. I would suggest to you, besides some of these major ones, we must add the new jobs which have been created by dozens of smaller industries which have been established in the province during the last little while.

I want to remind you too, Sir, That besides the new industries which have been developed here in the province, we have an imposing list of major expansions of established industries. These too, have created hundreds of new jobs for the province of Saskatchewan. I think when we are talking about jobs, we should not confine ourselves to one very narrow

area. Jobs are jobs to the working man, whether it be in manufacturing or anywhere else. When you look at the additional jobs which have been provided in this province as a result of the work required in construction of these many new industries, we'll find that thousands more jobs have been created for Saskatchewan people in the last little while.

I'm going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, that with the continuation of the kind of development that we have had; the kind of development which we can expect to continue under this present government, Saskatchewan is rapidly reaching the point where we will have a shortage of labour to fill the new jobs which are becoming available in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brown: — We will, Sir, providing we are not held back and frustrated, not only by my hon. friends opposite, but by their colleagues who form the government at Ottawa at the present time, and this can happen, Sir. We already have had some examples of how some of the policies recently introduced by the new Liberal government at Ottawa, can react against development here in the province of Saskatchewan. Some of you may recall not too long ago, I took exception to the fact that political interference had caused an industry which Saskatchewan could reasonably have expected to obtain, to be placed elsewhere in this country. I'm referring to a heavy water plant which only recently it was announced would go to the province of Nova Scotia. I want to tell you that we were making very good progress with respect to this particular industry, one which would have called for something like a \$30,000,000 investment. One which would have used a tremendous amount of the lignite coal which we have in abundance in the Estevan area, and at the last minute because of the policies of the federal Liberal government, this plant went to Nova Scotia, and Saskatchewan and the other western provinces never had a change in open competition. This is a plant that when I complained about the activities of the federal government, my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition said that it was perfectly right for the Liberal government to see that this plant of some \$30,000,000 went to Nova Scotia, rather than Saskatchewan. He said there was no question that Glace Bay district of Nova Scotia was a depressed area and deserved special federal subsidies. Well, I replied, and of course, I said that I was very pleased that the hon. Leader of the Opposition in spite of what he has been saying for years, now admitted that the province of Saskatchewan was not a depressed area and he was also telling the people of this province no matter how it might hurt the province, if it was Liberal, it was right . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Chairman, I must rise on the point of privilege and take exception to the words of the minister. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! that's not a point of privilege. ORDER!

Mr. Brown: — You'll have the opportunity . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — He is putting words in my mouth, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! He is referring to the statements that were made in the press and that is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Brown: — I want to state too, Mr. Speaker, that there are other discriminatory policies recently introduced by the federal government . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, again on a point of privilege, I would like the minister to withdraw those words or show some definite proof where I had said them, because certainly I have never said what he said I said.

Mr. Brown: — I have a report of a statement attributed to the Leader of the Opposition which came over CKCK-TV on December 4th, 1963. If the hon. gentleman says that he didn't make this statement, I'm quite prepared to accept it.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, I don't know really, read what it says, I don't know . . .

Mr. Brown: — I quote:

The Saskatchewan Liberal leader, Mr. Ross Thatcher, today defended the Liberal government in Ottawa for authorizing the construction of a \$30,000,000 heavy water plant in Nova Scotia, rather than Saskatchewan. The Liberal Leader said there was no question of the fact Glace Bay in Nova Scotia was depressed area and deserved special federal subsidy.

Mr. Thatcher: — Yes, but I didn't say necessarily

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! You can't debate that now.

Mr. Thatcher: — Quite different from what the minister said originally.

Mr. Brown: — Now I hate to quarrel with my hon. friend. He's a likeable chap, but I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that other policies of the Liberal government in Ottawa recently announced are too going to be a hindrance insofar as development in the province of Saskatchewan is concerned. The proposals for special incentives of industries locating in designated areas, incentives which provide additional tax concessions, more rapid write offs and more latterly accelerated spending on winter works programs, these, Mr. Speaker, are available in some measures or other to every province in the dominion of Canada with the exception of the province of Saskatchewan. The reason they are not made available, I am told, is because Saskatchewan is not an area where the rate of growth is slow, it is not an area where we have an overly large segment of our population unemployed, and for that reason, these policies are not available or applicable to the province of Saskatchewan. This then means, Mr. Speaker, that there are industries which we might well be able to attract to the province of Saskatchewan in the normal course of events, in open competition with other areas, that we lose because of these incentives which are available in other provinces, and not available to the province of Saskatchewan.

I would suggest, Sir, that rather than criticizing efforts of this government, that my hon. friends opposite would do well to have a word or two with their friends in Ottawa, to see if they can induce them to make the same kind consideration available to their province that is made available to the other nine provinces of this dominion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brown: — I'm not sure whether they're on speaking terms or not, and I couldn't care less, but my hon. Friends opposite like to try to put the responsibility for the so-called slow rate of growth of the population of this province on this government, and this government alone. I would . . . just a minute, I'll try to straighten you out on this. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the basic cause of the population problems in this province, and other western provinces, has been the responsibility of the continuous Liberal and Tory governments, which have occupied the seats in Ottawa. They, yes, they are the ones who are responsible for the pattern of development of this country which emerged since this country first became a country. They are the ones who have been satisfied, Mr. Speaker, quite satisfied, to see industry concentrated in the central provinces of this dominion. They are the ones whose concept of development in Canada was concentration of industry in central Canada, with the western part of this

dominion to be satisfied with growing food stuff and livestock and that sort of thing. They are the ones who were content to see the concentration of the population in some areas and to the devil with the rest of the country. They are the ones who have never lifted their hand to assist the prairie provinces in any way in gaining diversification of their economies, by attempting to divert industry to the prairie provinces.

Now of course, because we are making some progress in western Canada; because we are making some progress in Saskatchewan, and because those other areas are beginning to hurt a little; now they come in with policies that are going to hold us back again, in the interests of the other parts of the dominion which they seem so concerned about.

They are the ones, Mr. Speaker, who over the years were quite content to see the population of Saskatchewan drift away to those areas where industry was concentrated, looking for jobs, and I have told the federal people and the federal minister, it is no great problem for a province to maintain a low rate of unemployment, providing they are prepared to see their population drift away looking for jobs elsewhere. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is there any reason why we in Saskatchewan should have to accept this sort of thing anymore than the other provinces.

Mrs. M. Batten (Humboldt): — This is the first opportunity I've had; I didn't want to interrupt the hon. minister while he was on the air, but a point of privilege. Is the hon. minister not in contempt of this house when he makes recordings of speeches given in this house without your consent, or am I to presume that he had your consent, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — I don't quite follow the hon. lady member.

Mrs. Batten: — Well, I understand the hon. minister has made recordings of speeches that were given in this house by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I understand this to be in contempt of this house, unless it was done with your consent.

Mr. Speaker: — I have no knowledge of any recordings of the speeches made in this house. I heard the hon. member here refer to a speech which was made over the TV back in December, but I do not know just . . .

Mr. Brown: — I didn't make the recording around here, Mr. Speaker, I have a little hobby of recording various things at home and I arranged to have this one recorded there and I don't think there's any law against anyone recording anything that comes over the radio. I think this is right, isn't it?

Mrs. Batten: — I was under the impression that whatever was said in this house could not be reproduced by anyone, in any way, without the permission of the Speaker, without the permission of the house.

Mr. Brown: — That is very true.

Mrs. Batten: — The only reason the radio could transmit the proceedings of this house for transmission was because the consent of the house has been given to such a thing. I think I am correct, Mr. Speaker, in saying that the hon. minister reported this recording to be a recording of speeches, or rather of a speech made, by the hon. Leader of the Opposition in this house. If this is not so, please correct me.

Mr. Speaker: — That is quite true, this is the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition in the house. The recording was not made here.

Mr. Thatcher: — I have no objection to these records being made if the hon.

minister would learn something from them, but apparently he hasn't learned anything . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! You are not aiding me in making a decision on this point which has been well raised. You are just adding to the confusion.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I believe each of us has a right if we have something to say on a point of privilege, to express an opinion, and I would like to say that I think if anyone is allowed to go around stating that he has a reproduction of proceedings in this house, there could be . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! A point of privilege cannot be raised when the speaker is taking under consideration a point of order.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, the minister has admitted that he has done so and two or three days ago at the beginning of this session, there was a document read which was the rules of this house and it stated there could be no reproduction or production of anything that took place in this house without the consent of the speaker of the house. That has been done . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I am prepared to listen to advice from the members on the point of order, but not to raise a point of privilege while the discussion is on the point of order which the hon. member raised. It is a point of order which the hon. lady member raised, not a point of privilege, and she is quite within her rights to raise a point of order and have it settled, whether it is a point of order or not, and I am going to check and find out.

Mr. Danielson: — He has abused the privileges of this house without your consent.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! That I am about to find out.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, this ruling on the point of privileges of the house is a very old one. It was a relatively simple one before the days of so much publications. Of course, one of the first things that came in was the question of "Press Galleries" and the press being allowed to report on the debates in the house. This has been established for a long, long time. Then of course when the radio and T.V. came into existence, the press reports were put over the radio and television. It was still a further step in this regard when houses, and more than our house, in the Commonwealth, I believe began broadcasting part of the debate. But I think it is correct that it is no sin for me to carry around either an official report of this legislature in visual form, or to carry around clippings from the newspaper on the speech of any of the hon. members in this house. Once this house made the decision that we were going to broadcast our debates, or some of our debates, it seems to me that the logical outcome of that is that these broadcasts, these recordings by virtue of the fact that they were broadcast and anybody could record them, anyone of 100,000 people in Saskatchewan, that this was another extension, the same as took place in the fact that publications were in newspapers and so forth, except in a different field.

I agree that this question is a very difficult one, but I really don't think that the hon. member is in contempt of the house by doing this.

Mr. Speaker: — I have one motion here over which I think there is some confusion in the house. It was moved by the hon. Premier at the start of this session, and seconded by the hon. Mr. Blakeney, it was ordered that the votes and proceedings, which I hold in my hand, that the votes and proceedings be printed after first having been approved by Mr. Speaker, that he do appoint the printer thereof, that no person but each as he shall appoint, shall presume to do the same. That motion refers specifically to the votes and proceedings.

Now there are certain rulings in the books, if proceedings are used for a perverted purpose. I would like time to peruse them further so if it will meet with the approval of the house I would like to reserve my decision on that, so that I have time to peruse it further and bring in a ruling at a later date.

Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — If I might say a word in connection with this perusing that you are going to do. This opens up a pretty wide field. Now if I understand this correctly, certain recordings have been brought into this house, it doesn't matter whether they have been brought in here or anywhere else, but that have been brought somewhat reputedly and reportably to have been the words of some member in this house at some time. Well, now when you quote in this house or anywhere else, the press, that is on the record, it is in the press, and you can be checked up as whether you are telling the truth or whether you are not. When you quote from the debates and the proceedings in this house, you can be checked up as to whether you are telling the truth or not. But if you walk around this country, whether it be in this house or public meetings or anywhere else, and hold up a record up in your hand and say these are the words of Mr. So and So, now play it and listen to what he said, there is absolutely no guarantee that those are the words of So and So, or anybody else could have this stuck on there, or himself or had a friend stick them on there . . . I would ask that you give that consideration too, this opens up the whole field, the whole recording field in the field of politics and other things too, now how do you prove that those are the words that were actually given by the man, that they were supposed to be given by.

Mr. Speaker: — I am prepared to look into the question as raised by the hon. lady member from Humboldt, but I believe offhand, that actions accounted to members outside this house are their responsibility. A member cannot be sued for libel for statements in this house, but he can for statement he makes outside the house, so he has to assume responsibility himself. But I am prepared to look at the field.

Mr. Snedker: — Off the record . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Snedker: — this house . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! I am not prepared to discuss it any further at this time, I am reserving my ruling.

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I am seeing this as a very serious instance, and I wish to move, seconded by the member for Melville, (Mr. Gardiner) that the recording referred to be tabled in this house . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think I can accept that motion. I have reserved my ruling at this time; after I have brought my ruling in, I believe you would be in order to make a motion of that kind, but I do not think you would be at this time, that is my thinking.

Mr. Snedker: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the ruling that you are going to make has no relationship to the motion which has just been made that the recording to be tabled . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! I am not going to permit anymore debate; how do you know it won't have a bearing on it? That will be seen.

Mr. Snedker: — Very respectfully, I want to tell you this, Sir, the motion has no relationship to the decision you are going to be making . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. McFarlane: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! I am not accepting the motion at this time until I have had a chance to ascertain the legality of the points raised, and I think the hon. lady member from Humboldt has not signified to me that it is the proper procedure nor thinking, if . . .

Mrs. Batten: — The motion that has been moved has nothing to do with any decision that you or anybody else may, or may not make, it is a motion before this house and, I think you must accept it.

Mr. Speaker: — I have no motion.

Mrs. Batten: — You have a motion, it has been moved and seconded . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I have received no motion and when the Speaker is ruling and reserving his decision, I think the Speaker also has the right to reserve decisions arising out of that incident.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the idea that this is a motion that is properly introduced at this particular time, is simply ridiculous. There is nothing else to go on. This is the asking for the tabling of some private property; you may as well ask for the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) to table his love letters in the house . . .

Mr. McDonald: — They may shock you . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: — Besides that we have before the house this Special Order, and this is not the way to introduce it . . .

Mrs. Batten: — On a point of order, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I agree you have reserved your decision on the point of order that I first raised, but I agree that anybody in this house has the right to ask that certain documents that have been referred to or recordings that have been referred to in this house, should be tabled. I suppose now that the hon. member from Moosomin love letters have been referred to, they could be tabled too. But this recording was referred to, it formed part of the speech of the hon. minister, and therefore, although there has been a completed gift of this particular recording, because there was the intention to give a gift and the delivery of the item, it would have to be up to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to table these documents, But I think outside of that, the motion should be in order.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with one motion already, that is the motion indicated by the Special Order and an amendment also, Now, nobody assembling in this house is going to suggest that you interrupt these proceedings and put before the house a motion without notice of any kind whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker: — My ruling on this motion is still that at this time the motion is not in order. The Premier raised the point which I have in mind, that there was no notice of motion, we are under Special order and the house cannot be interrupted by a motion under Special Order. But after I have given my ruling on the point raised by the hon. member from Humboldt, at that time this motion may or may not, be in order, a motion along similar lines.

Mr. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — I would like to say a word on this thing . . . inaudible . . . and ask to table that letter at that time . . .

Mr. Speaker: — If you quote from a letter, then you must table it, if requested. But that is a point I want to look into, whether he has quoted from a record or referred to the record. He didn't play the record, so will the hon. member proceed . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brown: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I caused all this furor and when we get around to talking about contempt, I am sure all my friends opposite, at least, will agree that I am contemptible, and all I can say is that I am now beginning, to regret the fact that I allowed my love for the Leader of the Opposition to so overcome me that I felt called upon to make this presentation to him today. Possibly I should have kept it until we were alone together some time.

I'm not even sure where I was not, but I'll get going again, don't worry about it. Shall I start from the beginning?

I was mentioning something about where some of the responsibility lay with respect to the position and conditions in which the western provinces, including Saskatchewan, find themselves today. I mentioned that it had been a concept over the years, as far as the various federal governments have been concerned, they are quite satisfied to see the concentration of industry in central Canada and the west left to their own devices for production of foodstuffs and livestock and this sort of thing.

Mr. C.A. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Same old speech . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Not Alberta . . .

Mr. Brown: — I beg your pardon, they are all in the same boat, and I want to suggest to you that we have every indication that this is still the thinking insofar as the present Liberal government in Ottawa is concerned. It was not too long ago, in an interview, the hon. C.M. Drury, the new federal Minister of Industry, said this:

In a province like Saskatchewan they must carefully take into account its geographical and natural resources, position, and adapt to existing conditions.

he went on to say:

the possibility of expanding potash processing industry in the province should be carefully looked into.

I have discussed this with the hon. minister and I get the same impression, that he does feel that all the province of Saskatchewan need to concern itself with is the agricultural industry, that we shouldn't be worrying about getting industry, this should more properly continue to develop in central Canada. That we should be satisfied with our role as agricultural province; we should be thankful that we have some oil to produce, we should be

thankful that we have potash to produce, but beyond that we should have no expectations whatsoever. It is this kind of thinking, Mr. Speaker, that adds to the difficulties of the job to the work of bringing industry into this province.

Now I don't want to take up too much time, I don't want to run over and take somebody else's time, but I can't help saying a word or two about the tourist industry.

my hon. friend you will recall, made some very snide remarks about the tourist industry and about the tourist branch, which is under the direction of Harvey Dryden. He ridiculed the efforts which we are making. He ridiculed the number of tourists that he said were coming into the province of Saskatchewan. Now this time my friend really drew a long bow, Mr. Speaker, he really reached far and wide to find statistics to back up his contention that the tourist industry was getting nowhere in Saskatchewan. He tried to show that Saskatchewan wasn't getting its fair share of tourists from the United States.

This is what he came up with, Mr. Speaker, just pay attention to this:

A table from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics showing the number of foreign travelers entering Canada from the United States, by boat, by plane, by rail and by bus

and he said;

look at all Saskatchewan got was some 2,800 visitors from the United States.

How low can you get to try and make a black picture out of a situation that exists in this province.

I would like to be otherwise, Mr. Speaker, but I am afraid that we can't expect any American tourists to enter Saskatchewan by boat, I have- not seen any docking on Wascana Lake recently. A lot of them do bring their own boats up behind their cars, but surely, let's not be so ridiculous as to suggest that Saskatchewan should be getting visitors from the United States by boat.

Mr. Thatcher: — How about cars?

Mr. Brown: — Just a minute, I'll get around to talking about cars. he talked about trains. Well, Mr. Speaker, we don't have any rail connection directly with the United States, how could we get visitors by rail. We don't even have any commercial bus connection directly with the United States, so how can we count on visitors coming in by bus. You know that we have been trying our best the last little while to try and get a direct air link with the United States. We don't have that. We didn't have that in 1963, so when my friend said we didn't get any tourists by boat, by rail, by bus and by plane, I suggest to you, he really is drawing a long bow in trying to paint a black picture insofar as the tourist industry in Saskatchewan is concerned.

my hon. friend knows I am sure, that most of the American tourists entering the province of Saskatchewan come in by private automobile and it is correct that during 1963, Saskatchewan enjoyed the largest percentage increase of any province in Canada insofar as the number of tourists entering the province was concerned, by automobile. The increase amounted to 17.1 per cent, and I would suggest to you that it is quite a respectable increase . . .

Mr. Thatcher: Less than . . .

Mr. Brown: — Just a minute, just a minute, my friend. The whole of Canada showed an increase of 5.5 per cent. We had the largest with 17.1, the province of Manitoba, was next with 10.7 per cent. During the past year, the total of some 9,249 cars carrying American tourists entered the province of Saskatchewan along our southern border. Using the figure which is generally used for four persons per car, it indicates something like 240,000 American visitors entered Saskatchewan directly across the American border.

Our neighbouring province of Alberta, I suggest to you, that Alberta has long been known as a tourist province, famed for its Rock Mountains, they had just over 66,000 cars in 1963, and I would submit, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — 89,000 . . .

Mr. Brown: — I beg your pardon, the correct figure is 66,000. Don't try to juggle the figures again, let me quote the correct one. Sixty-six thousand cars and I would suggest to you, our 60,000 compares very favourably with the 66,000 that went into Alberta. It is quite true that our neighbouring province of Manitoba attracted quite a considerably larger number of cars than we did, but we must remember, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba is closer than we are to the main market areas as far as the tourists industry is concerned, and many, many American tourists enter Canada through the province of Manitoba. This doesn't mean that they stay there. They travel west to Saskatchewan, Alberta and into British Columbia. So any kind of juggling that my hon. friend may try to do will not dispel the fact that Saskatchewan travel industry, is in fact progressing very nicely . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister has accused me of juggling figures. Now I don't know whether juggling is unparliamentary or not, but the fact is, we still get less than one per cent of the tourist . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Thatcher: — By the same token, Mr. Speaker, Alberta got about one per cent, so what are we crying about?

Mr. Brown: — There is an old saying, ms goes something like this, "Figures don't lie" but some people are experts in manipulating them or something like that. I would suggest my hon. friend is quite an expert in that regard.

Now, my hon. friend, before he starts to decry the level of the tourist industry in Saskatchewan, should pay some attention to what people who are engaged in the tourist industry in this province have to say about it. Irwin McIntosh, the president of the Saskatchewan Tourist Association, said this; (he doesn't hold the same opinion of the travel industry, or the efforts of the travel department as my hon. friend) he said this in a recent meeting;

I want to stop here and say that no province in Canada gets better value from its tourist bureau than we do here in Saskatchewan. Tourist supervisor, Harvey Dryden, does more with his budget of just over \$100,000., than any provinces of states do with budgets five to ten times as large. It is a tribute to the work that he had done that Saskatchewan leads all of Canada in percentage increases.

and then he added;

It would be totally unfair of me or this association to suggest that the government has been doing nothing. Indeed had not the government showed leadership, the tourist industry in this province would be almost non-existent. The government has done an admirable job in highway construction, park development and tourist promotion. Indeed, they have been responsible for creating many of the fine facilities which have helped us become an attractive tourist haven. Not it is up to us and to them to make sure that the ball continues to roll and gather speed.

We are not entirely satisfied, Mr. Speaker, certainly we would like more tourists to come into Saskatchewan, but let's not accept the kind of things which the hon. Leader of the Opposition like to say about the tourist industry and our efforts in that regard.

Now, I am not going to take up too much time, but there is just one or two things I do want to touch on, I would have said more if we had not had our jolly little time trying to decide whether I was contemptible or not, but there are other people who I believe deserve some time in this house at least.

I would like to mention briefly SEDCO. The hon. Leader of the Opposition said that the results were disappointing. He made some silly remark about the government and the SEDCO organization being rather a ridiculous combination of interests, and I want to assure him that the businessmen who comprise the Board of Directors won't appreciate the remarks which he has made. I want at this time, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to these leading businessmen of the province of Saskatchewan, who accepted the responsibility for the direction of this new development corporation. These are all businessmen with wide interests of their own. They are also men who have a great deal of interest in the welfare and the development of their own province, and they were happy indeed to have an opportunity to serve on the Board of Directors of SEDCO, as opportunity to do something to assist in the development of their own province.

Now SEDCO only became active about midway through 1963. A Good deal of the early time was taken up with organization matters, trying to establish staff and find office quarters. Nevertheless, we have had an opportunity to consider a fairly reasonable number of requests for financial assistance from a wide range of companies and individuals, interested in establishing new operations here in the province of Saskatchewan. I am happy to be able to report that as knowledge and information with respect to SEDCO and the policies and programs which it administers becomes more wide spread, the name of the corporation is becoming known far and wide across the dominion of Canada, and is being hailed in other provinces, and by the press, as a very progressive and forward step in a program that is designed to attract new industry to this province.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Brown: — My. Hon. friend mentioned that we were being rather niggardly. He said, "why they only provided \$2,000,000 for SEDCO for their operations, and little Nova Scotia had provided some \$50,000,000 for the same purpose". Well as usual, he didn't know what he was talking about. The \$50,000,000 voted by Nova Scotia was for loans. The \$2,000,000 that he referred to, was the \$2,000,000 that was voted for grants for various purposes, such as the purchase of machinery, equipment, the training grants for employees, for economic and feasibility studies and that sort of thing.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition should know that the bill which provided for the establishment of SEDCO last year, provided that we were in a position to obtain \$15,000,000 for loaning purposes. He should recall too, that during the discussion of this measure, it was pointed out that while a limit of \$15,000,000 was place don it at that time, that if we did, in fact find it necessary to have more funds available, that these funds would be found by the provincial treasury.

The hon. member also mentioned the trip to Japan which was sponsored by the Saskatchewan Industry Advisory council. He said he hoped it would be a success, and by the very tone of this voice, he indicated that he hoped it would be a complete flop so he would be able to come into this house, if he every does come back in it, and criticize us for having sent this group of Saskatchewan industrialists to Japan in the interest of promoting more industry for this province.

Well, I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, the trip has been a success. I issued a statement to the press yesterday, I believe it was, advising that we had already been notified that on the 7th of March, representatives from two of the leading organizations in Japan, will be visiting Saskatchewan. Later on in the month and I believe the date is the 17th of March, again representatives from two other Japanese organizations will be visiting Saskatchewan.

These people are coming here as a direct result of the promotional tour which was undertaken under the auspices of the Industry Advisory Council. These people are coming here to look at the possibilities of establishing manufacturing operations either on their own or in co-operation with Saskatchewan and Canadian Industrialists. These are only forerunners. We know that there are others who will be visiting Saskatchewan later on in the year. So I want my hon. friend to rest assured, he need have no concern. The trip to Japan was indeed a very marked success, and I want to again at this time,

pay tribute to the larger group of Saskatchewan businessmen and industrialists who have accepted appointments to the Industry Advisory Council and are doing a very excellent job indeed in looking at the problems we are confronted with, with respect to developing industry in this province. They are looking at the problems which confront industry itself as it comes in or as it begins to operate. They are doing a worthwhile job on behalf of the economic life of this province and I think that this legislature, yes and all Saskatchewan owes them a very great deal of thanks for the efforts which they are putting forth.

One of the major undertakings of the Industry Advisory council, Mr. Speaker, was the sponsorship together with a number of other organizations in the province, of our first full scale resources conference which was held in Saskatoon in the month of January. This is to my mind, an outstanding event in the life of the province of Saskatchewan, the results of which will unquestionably provide guide lines for future and accelerated development of the resources of this province.

I thought, and I think those who attended will agree with me, that this gathering was indeed a success. We had over 300 people there. Leaders of industries, from universities, from financial institutions, from governments, all down the lines, and this group of leading citizens sat down and thoroughly reviewed the resources and the development picture in this province, suggested ways and proper means through which they may be developed, and as I say, I am sure that the results of the conference can only augur well for the proper and accelerated development of natural resources.

I was disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that I didn't see any of my friends opposite in attendance at this conference. I would have thought that the members of the legislature and the opposition would have had some interest in a conference of this kind. I regret that they didn't see fit to attend, because I can assure that they would have indeed have found it extremely interesting and a very valuable experience. For one thing, my hon. friend would have found out, much that when they make snide remarks about pulp mills in Saskatchewan, they would have found out if they had attended that conference and listened to the discussions with respect to the possibilities of obtaining pulp development in Saskatchewan, if they had listened to the discussion in respect to the problems which were involved in this kind of developments, they would have concluded that what we have been trying to put across to them for a number of years is correct. It is not just a matter of saying we want a pulp mill, we will get a pulp mill, it is a matter of cold hard economic facts and the possibility of being able to put a picture together sufficiently good, that will warrant someone making an investment of the magnitude that is required in order to see this kind of industry established.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. minister a question?

Mr. Brown: — Certainly.

Mr. Foley: — Were the members of the legislature formally invited to the resources conference?

Mr. Brown: — My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that the steering committee and I was told at least, sent invitations to all members of the legislature. I can't argue with you, all I know is that this is my advice that these went out. If this is the case, if you did not receive invitations then gentlemen, I am very sorry that you didn't, and I will certainly find out why, because most certainly, the invitations were to be extended to all members of the legislature, yes, in fact the members of parliament were also to be invited.

Now, I don't want to take up more time, its twenty to five, I'd just like to say a word or two and I'll make it very brief, about rail line abandonment because it has been referred to in the speech from the throne.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! Do we happen now to have a motion on the order papers, specifically dealing with rail line abandonment, which precludes discussion at this time, taking over in the general debate.

Mr. Brown: — I will have an opportunity to say something about it when the motion is up. I suppose if I talked about the Welland Canal tolls, I'd be out of order too. So I won't.

I'd just briefly then like to say in conclusion and I promise not to be too long, sir, I would like to remind you that the hon. Leader of the Opposition the other day when he spoke, devoted the major portion of the time that he was on his feet to developing and explaining the Liberal election program which apparently they intended to place before the people of this province at some time when an election is called. I made some notes here and I am only going to touch on those which I am directly interested in by virtue of the portfolio which I hold. That is the economic climate, the economic phase, the things which the hon. Leader said they would do, in order to, as he put it, regenerate the economic life of Saskatchewan.

The hon. gentleman said for one thing that they would provide tax concessions for industries and mines, a major tax holiday to corporations. Now I don't know just what they have in mind here, but I want to suggest to you that the major load of taxation which falls on industry comes from the application of federal taxes and not provincial. The major tax which falls on industries coming into Saskatchewan, provincial tax — is the E and H or so called sales tax. We have nothing to do with the application of municipal taxes and that sort of thing.

Now you can't very well give anybody a major tax holiday from E and H tax because you only pay it once. As far as tax concessions are concerned, I want to suggest that when you talk about tax concession for mines, that we can in fact expect in this province that the main mining development which will take place will be in our potash ores. These are going to come anyway as somebody has already suggested. They are going to come because the potash is here, and they can't find it anywhere else. We don't really need to throw public funds away in that regard in order to get these people to come into the province, and I frankly can see no reasons why in view of the profitability of these operations that we should be silly enough to suggest that we should fatten the profits by throwing more public funds their way, by way of tax concessions.

As far as taxes on other industries are concerned, there is already some consideration given under the present programs which are in effect. Under SEDCO, authority is provided for that organization to make grants to new manufacturing industries at a level of 10 per cent for manufacturing and productive equipment. This in itself, more than offsets any provincial tax which might fall on the industry when it comes into the province.

I would suggest, that the suggestion that they will make these things available, is nothing more than window dressing, it is in fact already being done to some extent and as far as the other is concerned, it would only be a waste of public funds if it was carried out.

The hon. gentleman said that they would make royalties comparable or lower than other provinces. I want to suggest to him that he should compare them, and he will find that in the main, they are comparable or lower than in the other provinces. My hon. friend said that he would make power and gas competitive with other provinces. What other provinces? If he's suggesting that we should make our gas rates comparable or competitive with the province of Alberta, this is only one which has gas rates lower than Saskatchewan, and is it really necessary to try to compete with Alberta, in view of the fact that they are sitting right on the gas fields. I don't think it's a particular problem.

Besides that, I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that we have never yet had any difficulty at all in providing a level of gas rates to an industry interested in locating in the province of Saskatchewan. We have always been able to provide something comparable to what they could receive elsewhere and something that was suitable to the need of that particular operation. As far as power rates are concerned, again, we are quite comparable insofar as industrial rates are concerned, with other provinces. The hon. gentleman suggests that they will make land available for industry at cost, and sewer and water. Well, I don't know what he means by land for industry at costs, it's at cost for industry now, all they have to do is go out and buy it. We go further than that, under SEDCO. SEDCO can provide land and buildings to an industry if they so wish, so there's really nothing new there. Loans on a far reaching basis, again I am not quite sure what the hon. gentleman has in mind, but I would like to point out that loans are available at the present time. Loans, and not only loans, but guarantee where the amounts involved make that necessary. What the hon. Leader of the Opposition was suggesting is that they will pretty well carry on exactly the same kind of program that we have been carrying on in the province for quite some time.

The hon. gentleman cried a few crocodile tears about the small businessman. He says that they are neglected, if not forgotten. He suggested they would set up a branch. Again the hon. gentleman should get up to date; a great deal of assistance has been available through the Department of Industry and Information to the small businessman for a long, long time. Most recent, has been provision of a management training course which is now in operation and meeting with a very fine response in every community in which the program is being sponsored.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is about all that I want to say at this time. In conclusion, I would like to suggest that when the hon. gentleman suggests that we are not really doing what we should do in order to attract industry and businesses to this province, he really doesn't know what he is talking about. Here's a little clipping that I picked up the other day. I won't bother reading the headline on it because it just simply says that the government is going to be re-elected, and it gives as the reasons though, that the good crops and the big Russian wheat sale are contributing factor but that the main pitch is industrial development. This came from the financial Post, and I would just like to read you one little paragraph. What it says is this:

That what's mainly helping the government is the success of some of its industrial development programs. Biggest impact in major industries such as the potash mines at Esterhazy and Belle Plaine, but small industries also are growing, and the government is adapting to industrial development. The Ag-rep system used in western agriculture, sending out advisors to work with businessmen in small towns, who want help in expanding their business or adapting to new conditions. To get new investments, to enlarge scale business, the government has been wooing investors in Japan, and the United States and Eastern Canada.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that one gentleman said to me the other day, in view of the programs which we have instituted for the small businessman in this province, he said to me, he said:

I can say to you, Russ, that in my humble opinion, the province of Saskatchewan is the only one where anybody seems really to have some concern for small businessman.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition should get a little more up to date before he starts to draft he remainder of this election program or it too will fall as flat as that part which he has already unveiled. That is about all I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to conclude by saying though, that I recall that the Leader of the Opposition said the other day that they were approaching the election with cautious optimism. The Premier pointed out that this was a far cry from the usual bluster and challenges which emanate from across the floor, challenging us to have an election to test the will of the people and all that sort of thing. Well, I just want to say this, Sir, that my hon. friend may be approaching it with cautious optimism, and well he should, believe you me. What I want to say to you that I will welcome an opportunity to face the electors of this province on the record of this government and the development which is taking place and as far as I'm concerned, I hope the Premier will see fit to call an election at a very early date in order that we can get back to doing the jobs which we have been doing for quite some time.

Mr. Speaker, is there any doubt? I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate all those who have taken part in the debate, and a special mention to the mover and the seconder for the fine job they did of putting the motion before the house.

Mr. Speaker, you no doubt will remember that at the last session the members on the other side of the house were quite cocky. Almost everyone on that side of the house called the government to go to the people, that we were just a caretaker government and people were ready to turn us out and it was only a matter of counting the votes. What a spectacle this great party that was going to sweep the province, is putting on. I might mention in the city of Saskatoon, just before the new year, a group of businessmen, reportedly the Liberal executives, met and decided that the only way to get to defeat this socialist government was to have a saw-off, and so they laid down an ultimatum to the conservative Party, and they said, “we’ll elect three seats to the government side, and we’ll let you elect two seats on the opposition side.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, you would think that if only the only purpose of saw-off was to defeat the socialist government, the Liberals would have sat down with others who had the same mind and discuss the best possible approach to get to this end. If they had done that, it's quite possible that they would have come up with the idea that it would have been better to have three Conservatives and two Liberals. Personally, as I know Saskatoon, and I think I do, I suggest that the best possible plan of attack, would be for the Liberals to stay out and let the conservatives run five candidates in the Saskatoon election. I say this is very generous of the Liberals to decide just to nominate three candidates, especially in a conservative city like Saskatoon, where they have piled up the biggest majority for the Conservative Party in the last two federal elections, and the last one, by the way against the strongest possible Liberal candidate that they could possibly find. I might also refer them back to the last time they had a saw-off in the Saskatoon city in 1948, there again, the Conservative candidate pulled almost 3,000 more votes than did his colleague, the Liberal candidate. I notice the president of the provincial Liberal Party is now scared and run out of the city of Saskatoon and seeking nomination in a constituency of Hanley, as he knows full well, that there isn't much hope of the Liberals ever electing a man in the city of Saskatoon.

The philosophy of the Liberal Party has not changed one iota since the days that they were invincible in this province and they are the same selfish, ruthless, domineering bunch who would stop at nothing to obtain their ends and woe tied to anyone who would dare cross their path. The Liberals are evidently depending on the short memories of the electors.

I have lived in this province for 50 years, Mr. Speaker, and most of it under a Liberal government, and those were the days when we really were ashamed to admit that you came from Saskatchewan. People in other parts of Canada would sympathize with you for being one of the poor relations of the Canadian family. Tourists crossing Canada would bypass Saskatchewan. They dipped down into the United States to miss the mud trails of Saskatchewan. Today the people of Saskatchewan can hold their heads high anywhere, and be told by the people in other parts of Canada, how fortunate they are to be enjoying benefits of which they have dreamed of, but never hope to receive. I had a little experience of this in 1962, when I toured Eastern Canada, Ontario, Quebec and parts of New Brunswick. They would see the Saskatchewan licenses, come over and say;

Oh yes, you're from Saskatchewan, how are you getting along? How are you getting along with the medicare? I hope you boys stay with it and put it over. When you do, it won't be long before we down here will enjoy the same kind of program.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stone: — The Liberal government of 1910, '20, and '30's were not in a true sense, governments giving leadership to their people. They were merely custodians, just going through the motions. They had such an obsession of free enterprise could and would take care of all the needs of the people. The only time that the government ever acted was in extreme circumstances when public pressure was such that they had to take some action. They were entirely unaware of the gross inequalities that existed between people in this province. When the 1930's came along, and free enterprise failed completely, the Liberal government of that day was completely bewildered and

completely bankrupt of ideas as to what to do in the situation. Nothing had been done, Mr. Speaker, to develop the resources, not even a survey had been taken. Although the resources that have been developed now, were in exactly the same place then, as they are today. They did know there was a good stand of timber in the North of Prince Albert, I suggest they could see the trees growing so they knew they were there, but what did they do about these resources which belong to the people of the province? Why they gave them away? Hundreds of square miles of the very best timber, Mr. Speaker, at \$1.00 per square mile were leased to private individuals, to cut out and get out. Service to the people in most part of the province broke down completely. The educational system was broken down because of the lack of facilities and especially because there was a lack of funds to pay teachers even a meager salary.

There were fairly good medical services if you had the money to pay for them, and you were not too far away from those services. There were no highways, very little power, and no such thing as natural gas and running water, which were things that the people in the rural areas never hoped to enjoy, and the plight of our aged, crippled and those who were unable to look after themselves was a crime to society. We had the worst labour legislation the lowest minimum wages. Thousands of the workers were without compensation for injuries until the Anderson government introduced the present act in 1930. Because Liberal government had, Mr. Speaker, relied on free enterprise to look after the needs of the people, holidays with pay, pensions plans and other fringe benefits were unheard of. Outside the railroad workers and building trades, the opportunity for workers to improve their status through trade unions was almost impossible. Yesterday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) spent considerable time reading of the labour acts put on the statute books by the former Liberal government and this is quite true, and they also put a lot of other acts on the statute books. But, Mr. Speaker, an act isn't worth the paper it is printed on unless it is properly administered and there are teeth in the act to make it operative. Nearly every member on the opposite side has yelled to high heaven about the teeth in our Trade Union Act. They say "this is outrageous, this unfair to the employer, and that if we get on the government side, we will take these teeth out".

This is quite true, Mr. Speaker, they will take the teeth out, and The Trade Union Act will become like the other labour legislation, just so much window dressing.

Mr. Speaker, I had years of personal experience trying in a lost cause to obtain benefits for workers under such acts as the Liberal government has brought down. I could spend an hour relating my experience, trying to get benefits under the Minimum Wage Act, The Workmen's Compensation Act, and the so called Freedom of Trade Union Association. Trying to assist workers to organize themselves in order to better their conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this province in the 1930's not only lost their individual freedom, they lost the freedom to obtain even the bare necessities of life, and 100,000 lost their self-respect. They found it almost impossible to believe that they could be reduced to such conditions in a land of plenty, and so the people with plenty, at least one thing, plenty of time, read. They possibly read more books on economics than in any other period of history. They met and they discussed, trying to find the reasons and the answers of their plight. The efforts of those gallant people in their thirties are reflected in the kind of province which most of us, at least, are proud to call Saskatchewan today.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stone: — We are free of deadweight debt. We have an educational system from elementary to university which compares favourably with any other in the country. We have a good system of highways, most of them dust-free. We have power reaching into every part of the province, and natural gas for thousands of our people, and a real and sincere approach to the care of our aged citizens and other related groups. A human approach to the problems affecting our industrial workers. Our rural people are enjoying first class roads to markets, and an accelerated programs in bringing sewer and water to people in small towns, villages and on the farms.

More and more recreational sites are being established for people to relax and enjoy their leisure time. The development of our natural resources has been phenomenal. People all over are seeing things happen around them today. They are seeing Saskatchewan take on a new look and are proud to be a part of it.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stone: — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is known in every province of Canada, every state in the Union, and in many parts of the world apart from having the only people's government in North America, it is known for its leadership in the field of health. In our tuberculosis, in our mental health, in our cancer, our air ambulance, our care of our aged. We were the pioneers of the universal hospitalization, and the now Universal medical care.

I say we pride ourselves on our program for the care of the sick. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we have done very little in the prevention of sickness. Every year without fail, when winter approaches, there appears in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, and I suppose this is also true of the Regina Leader Post, an alarming statement pointing out the number of people wishing hospital beds, along with the number of beds available.

This also provides an opportunity for a member or two of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, to take a swing at all levels of government. Overlooking the fact, Mr. Speaker, that they are the most vulnerable, that they have completely failed to keep people out of the hospital, by not adopting an aggressive, preventive medical program.

For one thing, Mr. Speaker, the schedule of fees designed by the college does not encourage members of their association, to practise preventative medicine. Then of course, I suppose it is more spectacular to perform a delicate operation and have the satisfaction of saving a life than to check a person over and to tell him or her, that there is nothing wrong with them or a little wrong with them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those who subscribe to the idea that doctors are overly paid. If their salaries are compared with those of movie stars, or baseball and football players and perhaps executives of large corporations, the comparison is just ridiculous. No matter which way you make look at it. The training of a medical student is a long and costly process and a doctor is often well on in years before he is able to establish a good medical practise. He has many years to catch up, and is naturally concerned for his security and the security of his family, and so he is more likely to go into the lucrative field of the care of the sick. And so, away we go, Mr. Speaker, spending millions and millions more on hospital beds, millions on facilities and staff, millions on research for the curative side of medicine. One very good thing, in my opinion, that came out of the medicare crisis and to a large extent, we have to thank our "Keep our Doctors" organization, who unconsciously stirred up thousands of good citizens in this province, awakened them to the fact that the control of their health needs was entirely in the hands of a very few people, just as the control of their hospitals, the people's hospitals were in control of a very few people, and without any discussion with the people, this very small group decided what was best for the health needs of all the people. So out of this crisis, came the community health services association, and if the sole purpose of the community health services association was merely to have a different method of dealing with the sick, their efforts, I suggest, would hardly be worthwhile.

But it is the hope of this association that a real effort will be made to educate people, to educate their members, Mr. Speaker, that it makes good sense to at least see your doctor periodically, to let your doctor have a file on every member of your family, so that any likelihood of impending sickness can be nipped in the bud.

I imagine most people have forgotten the terrifying results of the medical examinations of our young men and women when they joined the arm forces in the two world wars. If we haven't forgotten, certainly, we have learned a lesson from that examination.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it will probably take generations to educate people to thing along the lines of preventative medicine. It will take a good many years, more years to train enough doctors, who are willing to go into the preventative side of medicine. Certainly, the psychological approach to the training of our medical students in our medical colleges will have to change considerably if we ever expect to fill the needs in the preventative field of medicine. But, I say, Mr. Speaker, that day will come, perhaps not in my lifetime, but the day will come when the people will realize that there is too much unnecessary suffering, too much unnecessary waste of human and economic resources, and when that day comes, and I venture that when it comes, it will be once again the people of Saskatchewan that will lead the way.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stone: — When that day comes, Mr. Speaker, and only when it comes, can we really say that we have accomplished great strides in the health needs of our people.

Mr. Speaker, now this may be my last opportunity to give my swan song. I wish to say that it has been a great privilege and honour to service the people of Saskatchewan. I also thank all the good people of Saskatoon for the confidence they have placed in me over the last 20 years. It has been particularly pleasing to me to have taken a small part in the general betterment of the industrial world, and I say this because of my association in the trade union movement brought me in touch with the atrocious conditions which existed under the Liberal government.

It has always been difficult for me to understand why any teacher could even become mildly interested in the Liberal Party . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stone: — . . . and to oppose a man, such as our Premier, who has fought so hard before he was a member of this house, and since becoming a member of this house. No person has contributed so much to the raising of the status of the teaching profession and surely this ought to warrant the unanimous support of every teacher in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Stone: — Mr. Speaker, I leave this chamber with a certain amount of pride, in having a part in the uplifting and the welfare of our senior citizens, and the other unfortunate citizens, who because of their sickness, or because of other circumstances, are unable to look after themselves. I wish to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your tolerance and the Clerk of the Legislature the staff in the office at the back of the chamber. I also wish to convey my thanks to the staff of the legislative library, for without their kind assistance, my task here would have been much more difficult.

I wish to thank the boys and girls in the press gallery, who have been very fair to me in my stay here. There is no denying that I will miss the work of the house, and many friends that I have made on both sides of the house, but you may depend that I will be following with great interest future proceedings in the years to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with those few words, it ought not be necessary for me to say that I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. Mr. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with others first of all, in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address and to commend them for the very forthright manner in which they, particularly the mover, placed on record, the record of the government over the past years.

They do not need to be alarmed, in my opinion, regarding some of the editorials that have been written that they were eulogizing the government beyond expectations, and beyond reason. It merely outlined in a very factual manner the progressive measures that have been brought forth by this administration over the years, in which we do all take modest pride. We do not hold ourselves up as people who are beyond fault or infallible and this was never intended. So I say to the mover and the seconder of the motion, that they do not need to concern themselves too much with the type of editorial that we are seeing the press these days, because the daily press is hard bent, and hard put, to avoid the obvious fact that in Saskatchewan, we have experienced tremendous progress over the years.

I wish to particularly congratulate the hon. member for Saskatoon, (Mr. Stone) who has made his throne speech address in this house, Mr. Speaker, and to wish him well in his retirement. He will certainly be missed in the legislature and I am sure he will be missed by the people of Saskatoon as they have had a very worthy representative in this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nollet: — I wish also to express my regrets that the hon. Minister of Labour will not be with us another session again. He too has signified that he intends to retire from public life after a very long term, a term of years that many of us would be proud of. He has been in public life since 1934, and I think Charlie is quite right that the time has come when he deserves a well-earned rest. Our congratulations to him for the invaluable service that he has rendered, not only in this house and to the province, in terms of advanced labour legislation, but in service to the citizens of Regina, he will be greatly missed.

If anyone ever needed a friend, they could always depend on calling Charlie Williams, who was ever ready to help anyone, no matter how much he was inconvenienced by a request of this kind.

I wish to congratulate the Premier and again, I am not going to eulogize the Premier; he has eulogized himself. But I do want to say that his address reflected this man's intellectual, not only his intellectual maturity, but his personal integrity and straight forward honesty of purpose, as well. Because of these qualities, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of our province has established a desirable type of image for public men that has won acceptance and recognition right across Canada.

I wish of course, to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition, particularly in his frantic endeavor to find a logical basis for criticism. In his search, he became increasing illogical, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps this was due to some extent to the effect of or definings of certain poll results, or more likely, I think it was because of the fact that the Premier's image is accepted not only in Saskatchewan, as an image of personal integrity and responsibility, but of necessity, the Leader of the Opposition had to do something about an image, and endeavored to create a similar pattern, and project a similar image to the public.

He left the impression that now he wants to be both responsible and progressive. Well, in the course of his remarks, it was quite evident that old habits and old behavior patterns die hard, and at one moment he would be apparently the most responsible person in the world, and in the next moment, he would revert to his old self again with illogical condemnation of policies and programs of the government, but finally he realized that perhaps this wouldn't be too well, that there were after all, some good things that were done by this administration that were so well accepted that they couldn't be denied.

Then he turned the reformer again. It is hard for me to imagine, Mr. Speaker, how the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who at one time claimed to be an adherent of the socialist philosophy, should somersault completely and then go out on a campaign of a complete eradication of everything that had any resemblance of socialism or a social philosophy to it. It is hard for

me to conceive that a man could change his philosophy so abruptly, but it is still harder for me to conceive that this man who didn't have a good word to say for any type of social legislation, any type of program, whether it was in the economic or social field that would be of benefit to our people, that then he would condemn it as being just another socialistic experiment that deserved nothing but complete condemnation, and now would say, "well, we are not completely against all of this, as a matter of fact, we are a Liberal reform party."

So now he goes back towards the left again and follows a course in that particular direction. I think that the hon. member is trying to accommodate his sails to the prevailing winds.

He didn't make much reference to the throne speech at all. The only real reference that he made to it, was that the throne speech marks the end of an era. Immediately the question arose in my mind, at the end of what kind of era, does the throne speech signify. Well, when one looks backwards very quickly, as has been done by the hon. member that just took his seat from Saskatoon, (Mr. Stone) who documented the various progressive steps that have been taken and the improvements that have resulted not only in the social but the economic aspects of our province, that this was a pretty good era. What the hon. Leader of the Opposition doesn't realize is that an era came to an end in 1944. An era, which previous to that time, some 39 years of Liberal rule, brought Saskatchewan the enviable reputation as being one of the most backward provinces in Canada.

I can recall in the years prior to 1944, we were known as the mud-road province. No tourist could get around in this province at that time. We didn't have any gravelled highways and just a very few miles of black-top. I can recall making some comparisons during that period of time. I happened to be visiting in the United States at one time, and was speaking to a county official and I asked him how much road equipment they had, and he gave me their annual report, I brought it back with me and I compared it with the annual report of the Department of Highways and lo and behold, one county in the state of Minnesota had more equipment, a higher investment in road building and maintenance equipment at that time, than the provincial Department of Highways for Saskatchewan. Well, we had even at that time, some 58,000 miles of road to keep up. That was the year previous to 1940.

Everyone must admit that a tremendous change has taken place since then. Again I say we can take justifiable pride in the accomplishments. We are not satisfied, never will be satisfied, with the progress that has been made, we expect to go forward to greater accomplishments still in the future.

Such things were overlooked as the transformation from mud roads to black-tops roads. Automobile insurance was ignored. Hospitalization was, yes and medicare too, for which our hon. friends opposite would now like to take some credit, on the subject, well in effect, we kicked on the door, we changed the thing, we created a great big ruckus in the province, and I'll say this, never was there a greater hoax perpetrated on the people of this province than the hoax that somehow or other, the medicare scheme as brought down by the former Minister of Public Health in this legislature would somehow regiment doctors and take away freedom from people. This was a pure hoax, which the Liberal Party fastened on and it created more bitterness in this province, the like of which I hope I never see again. Then the hon. former Minister of Public Health has the nerve and the audacity to stand up in this house today, and suggest that the Premier of this province contributed to the irritation. This may be his opinion, and I think his opinions are influenced by other factors, perhaps of a more personal nature, as far as he is concerned. Surely the image of the Premier of this province will endure into the future when the image of the hon. former Minister of Public Health is forgotten entirely, and the ignoble role that he played in this entire medicare problem in our province.

Mr. Speaker, but while on one hand they condemn, they condemn the plan, the hon. member from Milestone, (Mr. Erb) states, "you people were afraid to call an election at that time". This is just what they wanted us to do, endeavored to compel us to do, by what I say were very questionable means to bring it about.

He overlooked the fact entirely that this government had just a mandate from the people and that we were prepared to go forward with a medical care plan that had no connotations of evil, or all of the wickedness that was held forth by the hon. members opposite.

So they encouraged people to endeavor to force an election at that time. I say to the hon. member for Milestone, (Mr. Erb), why didn't he respond to the invitation of his own constituency and come back and have a by-election. Why doesn't he now run in his own constituency of Milestone, and place this issue before the electors of his former constituency? He hasn't got the political courage to do so, and he doesn't want to face them, so he is going to run in Regina East, and I am pretty sure that the sensible people in Regina East will treat this man as he deserves to be treated and would be treated if he ran in the Milestone constituency again.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at some of the things that were ignored entirely in the speech from the throne. IT makes pretty good reading, and I just want to make reference to some of the things that are contained in the speech from the throne. Just simply to indicate that some of the reasons why we have this somersaulting, and back paddling that is going on in the tactics of the hon. members opposite.

Here are some very significant things and I would have hoped that when the hon. Leader of the Opposition was on his feet in making his speech in reply to the humble address from His Honour, that he would have taken each one of these paragraphs, one at a time, and told the house and told the people of Saskatchewan, the kind of program he had in each case, that would be better than what is contained in the speech from the throne.

It is an obvious fact that agriculture production this year is at its highest level, but I want to remind hon. members in this house that we came through a very severe crop failure in the year 1961 unscathed, and that we had a normal crop in 1962, and that it wasn't just because of 1963 that we had an agricultural production that exceeded in value the \$1,000,000,000 mark, and a non-agriculture production that also exceeded the \$1,000,000,000 mark. These are not accidents. They are not entirely due to the bounty of nature; they are to a large extent, but not altogether by any means. We have made solid progress. We have made good progress in stabilizing the base of our agricultural industry.

Reference was made to the quickening pace of our entire economy and that it focussed attention on the great diversity in potential wealth of our natural and mineral resources. The hon. Minister of Industry and Information has given this house a very good resume of what has been accomplished in this area. It mentions in the throne speech that legislation would be introduced to authorize a broader program, aimed towards a further development of the agricultural industry of the province, including the provision of credit adjustment and land use and rehabilitation of rural areas.

No reference was made to this at all. You will be asked, it says, to approve legislation which will authorize the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation to broaden its field of activities.

No reference was made to the South Saskatchewan Project, on which tremendous sums of money will be spent in the future for both power development and irrigation development. These are all significant facts that are contained in the speech from the throne.

No mention was made of the fact . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to draw the attention of the minister to the clock, whether he wishes to adjourn or proceed this evening.

Mr. Nollet: — It is 5:30, Mr. Speaker? yes, I . . .

Mr. Speaker: — No, I say our time is 5:30.

Mr. Nollet: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to adjourn the debate, if the house is willing at this time.

February 14, 1964

Debate adjourned

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 p.m.