

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
SIXTH SESSION – FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE
9th day**

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock
on the Orders of the Day

CORRECTION OF FIGURES RE CENSORSHIP OF FILMS

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour and Telephones): — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to correct the figure I used in my speech yesterday, when I indicated that there were 213 persons that had stated that they were favorable towards the censorship of films and 24 against. Mail received yesterday afternoon and this morning has changed those details to 337 for and 26 against.

Mr. Speaker: — If your statistics have changed since yesterday, you cannot change the records. You must leave the records you gave yesterday.

Mr. Williams: — I quite understand that, Mr. Speaker. It was for your information particularly I wanted to change them.

INQUIRY RE RETURNS

Mr. Bernard D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I wonder if the Premier might indicate to the house when e might expect to clear these motions for returns off the order papers. There is some information requested in these returns that we, as members of the opposition, would like and we would like to see these motions for returns cleared off as soon as possible.

Premier W.S. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, we will get them off as soon as the house sits long enough, after the Special Order is completed, to be able to deal with it. I would have thought it might have been dealt with last night. I understand the house is sitting this evening, probably it can be dealt with then.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, are proceeded with I would like to welcome a group of students from the Buena Vista School in Saskatoon, along with their teacher, Mrs. Haug, I am sure all members of the legislature will join with me in saying how pleased we are to have them with us today. We hope their stay in the capital city will be an enjoyable and a profitable one.

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 and the amendment thereto by Mr. Boldt.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation): — Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with my remarks I want to join the senior member from Saskatoon, in saying how pleased we are to have another grade 7 class from Saskatoon; with their teacher, Mrs. Haug. I am sure hon. members might be interested in knowing that every grade 7 from Saskatoon has the privilege of having a special excursion to Regina. The lady member from Saskatoon, the senior member and I usually spend a brief period with them

talking a little about the operations of our school. We also express the hope that they will give high priority to public service, whether it be on the municipal, the provincial, the national or probably in the international field during their lifetime, and so I hope that they will enjoy their outing to the capital city of Saskatchewan. I will not be able to join them this afternoon as I have a speech to deliver in the house but my colleagues will be excused if they wish to walk out on me.

Every four years prior to elections, the CCF publishes a convenient card giving something of the program that it proposes to introduce during the term of office. I have in my hand the 1960 CCF program for more abundant living. This program makes reference to two activities of our department, expansion of social welfare benefits, and more senior citizens' housing. I will not have time to develop all the achievements that have been recorded to indicate that we have made real progress, but I should mention that is the expansion of social welfare benefits the previous mothers' allowances program has been changed to aid dependent families, and the average monthly payments have increased by more than 40 per cent during the past four years. I mentioned last night that the old age assistance, the blind persons' allowance, disable persons' allowances and the supplementary allowances are all shared with the federal government.

The federal government, since we met last, increased the allowances from \$65 to \$75 on condition that the provinces paid their share. I am happy to say that Saskatchewan has always paid the maximum permitted at the earliest possible date. We were not advised of these changes until well on in December. It was too late to get the changes in the December cheques, or even in the January cheques, but we did get word out that the allowances would be increased effective December 1st, and I hope that before the end of the month, that the citizens in these particular groups we would have had their special cheque to make up the difference. We have also adjusted the supplementary allowances so that the majority of the people in this group are able to have the benefit of the increase in this amount with adjustments to take into account the cost of living for this age group.

The provision for our children has been more generous. This large family continues increase, and we are continually appealing to citizens in the province to make their homes available for a child for adoption or on a foster home basis. We have many families in Saskatchewan whose children have gone away and who are getting a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction from having an additional child come into the home. The expansion of social welfare benefits will be outlined in greater detail tomorrow.

The next reference was to more senior citizens' housing. I want to say again that this is one of the most exciting programs that any cabinet minister could be associated with. There are a variety of programs. There are programs where the provincial government shares with religious and charitable organizations, where the provincial government makes an outright grant of 20 per cent and the sponsoring organization is responsible for 80 per cent and the management. In a number of the other projects three levels of government are involved, the federal government, through Central Mortgage and Housing has made mortgage money available on a 40 or 50 year basis. The province for these projects makes an outright grant of 20 per cent plus a continuing maintenance grant of \$40 for the self contained units, and \$60 for the beds in the hostel portion.

I am greatly indebted to the leadership provided by my predecessors, Mr. Valteau, Mr. Sturdy, and Mr. Bentley. I think special mention should be made of Mr. Sturdy, the former cabinet minister from Saskatoon. While he was minister of this department and as a result of his perseverance, the federal government changed their regulations to make federal funds available for hostel accommodation. I am sorry to say that Saskatchewan is still the only province in Canada that has taken advantage of this legislation. I think if all of the provinces were sharing in this program, that life would be much brighter for the elderly people across Canada and I think that there would be improvements made in this program. We have been hoping that the federal government would go still further than they have to date in this particular field, and I am sure that when additional provinces become involved in this particular activity we will make greater progress.

For the financing of the programs with three levels of government involved, the local sponsoring group provides eight per cent of the capital cost, the province gives the 20 per cent and the balance 72 per cent has to be repaid to the federal government. The province also guarantees that the federal authority will not lose on the money advanced for the hostel, and I am happy to say that although we have made sizeable guarantees we have never been asked to make good on any of the guarantees.

Before proceeding with further reference, I would like to thank my colleague, the Minister of Mineral Resources, for making it possible for me to have this opportunity to speak in this debate. He was to have spoken this afternoon, but as a result of the serious charges which were directed toward my department on Friday of last week, my colleague very generously stepped aside and made this time available for me. His friends in the country will understand how deeply he feels on behalf of the municipal secretaries across Saskatchewan who are involved when charges of this nature are directed against municipal governments.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — Members might be interested in noting that of the last five official openings which I have attended as minister, four were in constituencies represented by members opposite. I am referring, of course, to the important events at Swift Current, Herbert, Humboldt, Melville and Whitewood. At the time of the opening of the geriatric centre at Swift Current, the seat of my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Premier Lloyd arranged to have a cabinet meeting in Swift Current to indicate the importance of this event.

The federal government which has a sizeable investment in the new geriatric centre, was represented by Dr. Stanley Haidasz, M.P. parliamentary secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Dr. Haidasz is a medical doctor in the city of Toronto. During his remarks he was kind enough to say and this is an exact quote:

People of this province should be proud, as well as the government should be proud, of taking the initiative and the first place, I would say, in Canada to provide for its people a centre such as this.

Those who had the good fortune to visit the new centre in Swift Current, and those who are familiar with the other facilities in the province, will share the pride of the distinguished visitor we had there. At Herbert, Humboldt, and Melville, I shared the platform with the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Humboldt, and the hon. member for Melville, when projects costing about \$875,000 were officially opened. For these three projects the local communities, raised 80 per cent of the cost, the provincial government making combined grants of about \$175,000. The federal government did not participate in the expenses of any of these.

At Whitewood, in the Moosomin constituency, three levels of government have been involved, municipal, provincial and federal, and the opening was just a few weeks ago.

One of those enjoying the accommodation is a former school teacher who gave up teaching 56 years ago to marry a farmer in the district. The farmer has passed on, she has been living in a non-modern house and she is delighted to be having accommodation in a modern establishment in the community where she has lived for so many years. Incidentally, the rentals she will be paying in Whitewood will be about half of what she would be paying in the city of Regina if she was to find similar accommodation here. In Whitewood she will be among her friends.

When Mr. Valleau became minister of this department in 1944, there were eight facilities in the province with housing accommodation for 464 elderly people. This accommodation was available in Marcellin, Rosthern, Moose Jaw, Regina, Indian Head, Wolseley, Melville and St. Huberts. When I became minister in 1960 the number had increased to 61, and the number accommodated had increased from 464 to 4,060. The provincial government had made construction and maintenance grants totalling \$2,800,000. I should explain that prior to 1944 these eight communities built or acquired these facilities without any aid, assistance, or encouragement from the provincial government. By June of this year there will be 86 facilities with accommodation for 5,437.

During the period that I have been minister, the government will have made additional grants for maintenance and capital construction of more than \$2,000,000. Hon. members might be interested in knowing a bit more about the break-down of these facilities. In Saskatchewan there are 288 municipalities which have become involved in 35 different projects providing accommodation for 2,586 persons. Again, nowhere in Canada have so many municipalities become involved in trying to provide better accommodation for their pioneers.

There are six religious denominations operating 21 projects, which provide accommodation for 1,421. There are seven more projects involving organizations such as the Elks, which provide accommodation for 269. At this time I would like to acknowledge my personal gratitude to the religious organizations in Saskatchewan, which have given such high priority to a very old commandment "Honour Thy Father and Thy Mother". Some of these organizations were active in this field before the provincial construction grants became available in 1953. This information is available in our annual reports. The Roman Catholics have built and are operating facilities which are available for Catholics and non-Catholics. In one of these homes there is a lady who was very prominent in the Eastern Star and she has on her wall a citation she received. She explained that some of her family were a bit concerned about her going into this Catholic home but she said "my own family could never have shown greater consideration, greater kindness, than I have had since coming here."

For the Catholic facilities there have been construction grants totalling about \$320,000. As I said the Catholics, the Lutherans and the Mennonites were all active in this field in Saskatchewan prior to 1944, when this present government was elected. The Lutherans have accommodation for 344. These developments are found in Saskatoon, Melville and Middle Lake. They have accommodation for 344, they received construction and maintenance grants for \$293,000. I might mention that the Roman Catholic homes are at St. Huberts, Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Gravelbourg, Weyburn, Moose Jaw, Ponteix, Domremny and Radville. The Mennonites have accommodation at Domremny, Herbert, Rosthern and Waldheim for 249, grants \$130,000. The Mennonites had considerable accommodation prior to 1944 and a great deal of voluntary work has gone into providing of this type of accommodation. My own church the United Church has accommodation for 242 and have been paid grants totalling \$207,000. The Pentecostal Church has accommodation for 35, and have received grants of \$11,000. Ukrainian-Greek-Orthodox have accommodation for 20. They received provincial grants for \$16,000. In addition the Salvation Army provides accommodation for 123, C.N.I.B. in Saskatoon and Regina, accommodation for 48. At the present time there are 12 projects under construction in various places in the province, negotiations are under way with an additional 38 community organizations.

I would like now to come to the matter which was raised on Friday by the member for Rosthern (D. Boldt). The Star Phoenix, February 15th, I am sure reports the hon. member correctly, the dispatch reads as follows:

Allegation that the NDP was threatening civil servants and social aid recipients was made by Mr. Boldt in a speech, before moving the non-confidence motion.

and then in direct quotes:

right now the party is engaging outside organizers who are demanding campaign funds and membership from government employees and threatening them with loss of their jobs if they don't. 'They are getting desperate'. Even a social aid recipient is threatened with the loss of his cheque if he doesn't support the NDP.

These are very serious charges. They involve persons who are not here to defend themselves. They involve public funds made available through taxes, by federal, provincial and local governments.

Before discussing the charges which involve the Department of Social Welfare, I might mention that the campaign manager for the CCF in the Rosthern district constituency is an uncle of the member for Rosthern. I am sure the hon. member for Rosthern will agree with me when I say there is no ill-will between the uncle and the nephew. The uncle has no axe to grind. The family is highly regarded in the area, and as a matter of fact, two of the uncles were in to see me over the weekend. I think it is a good thing for democracy when people agree to disagree about their political views. It would be a pretty dull world if we all thought alike, and I am sure the hon. member will agree with me that his uncle is a citizen that any person in this province would be pleased to have as an uncle. He is an asset in any community.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — He was a great admirer of J.S. Woodsworth, M.J. Coldwell, T.C. Douglas and Premier Lloyd. He is not receiving any salary for his duties as campaign manager. He drove to Saskatoon at his own expense, at my request, to brief me on these charges. He authorized me to say that if

there are outside organizers collecting funds in the Rosthern constituency, he does not know who there are or where they are, nor does George Guenther, the CCF candidate, nor any CCF member of the Rosthern constituency. Now, I admit that shares in the CCF are a gilt-edged security. But it isn't easy to collect funds for a political party and if the hon. member knows of people who are collecting funds under false pretenses he has a duty to identify them so that appropriate action can be taken against them.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Peter Boldt has authorized me to say that since he became campaign manager, they have collected more than \$2,000 to ensure that Rosthern should elect its first CCF-MLA. As they plan for the 60th anniversary of Saskatchewan and the Centenary for Canada, with such historic places as Batoche and Carleton and Duck Lake, they would like to have a member on this side of the house. I think members on both sides of the house should follow a practice which we have established which the Leader of the Opposition is having some success with, in getting the rank and file of the people in Saskatchewan who believe in their views to support them financially. I think it is a serious reflection on the Liberals of Saskatchewan when their Leader goes down to Ontario and pleads poverty, "Saskatchewan is a depressed area, unless you give us some funds we will never defeat this government". "The poor Liberals in Saskatchewan haven't got an extra dollar to spend."

I am sure that the well known Liberals in Saskatchewan, who are well known in Ontario, resent very much the suggestion that this has to be done, but the uncle of the member for Rosthern has authorized me to say that he hasn't asked anyone to make a larger contribution than he has given himself, and again he is giving his time without any remuneration whatever.

Which brings me to the most serious aspect of the charge: "Even the social aid recipient is threatened with the loss of his cheque if he doesn't support the NDP". I explained last night that social aid is a program shared by federal, provincial and local governments. The municipalities pay approximately seven per cent of the cash costs of social aid, the federal government 38 per cent, provincial government 55 per cent.

The federal government requires the province to make sure that public funds are spent according to the federal, provincial and municipal legislation regulations and by law. The federal government maintains an auditing staff in Regina to make sure on a day-to-day basis that public funds are being properly spent and properly accounted for in the province of Saskatchewan.

There are 800 cities, towns, rural municipalities, and local improvement districts in the province of Saskatchewan — the only way a citizen can get social aid in this province is through this local municipality. Each municipality if it is to issue social aid and apply to the senior governments for reimbursement must appoint a welfare officer. They must sign an agreement with the provincial government to administer the program according to the agreed upon rules and regulations. Of course, if they don't seek reimbursement, if they wanted to pay the 100 per cent themselves, they don't need to sign an agreement. However, I don't now of any municipality in Saskatchewan that is issuing social aid without claiming reimbursement.

Each year I spend two days with senior officials of the my department, with representatives of the SARM and SUMA, to review thee programs. The discussions are most helpful and a number of important changes have been made at the request of local governments.

So, Mr. Speaker, no one can charge that social aid is being issued to drunks, chiselers, deadbeats, or of social aid not being issued to people if they don't support the NDP. No one can make these charges without reflecting on the honour and integrity of all or some of the 800 municipalities in this province and their welfare officers.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — Now, Mr. Speaker, in the Rosthern constituency, there are nine rural municipalities partly or entirely within the constituency. The hon. member (Mr. Boldt) on Friday, didn't say whether this offense had been committed in one or two or all, he didn't say whether this happened in the R.M. of Laird, Duck Lake or Rosthern or Warman or Park. In the Rosthern constituency we find the towns of Vonda, Langham, Rosthern, Duck Lake and the villages of Prud'Homme, Aberdeen, Dalmeny, Alvena, Hague, Hepburn, Laird and Waldhelm. All have councils. All have welfare officials. As things now stand, there are 136 mayors, reeves, councillors, and welfare officers in the Rosthern constituency who have been charged by their member in a chamber where he does not need to prove his charges if he doesn't want to and where they cannot defend themselves.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I did not attack these social welfare officials. I was attacking . . .

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, this isn't a . . .

Mr. Boldt: — . . . NDP organizers . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I don't know the question, the point of privilege, I wish a clarification of your statement.

Mr. Boldt: — I did not attack the officials of social welfare. I was attacking the NDP . . .

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member hasn't challenged the accuracy of the statement which appeared in the Star Phoenix, which was heard in this chamber the other day, and if he wants to apologize later, this will be fine.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there is a mayor, reeve or councillor who would . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! What is your point of privilege?

Mr. Boldt: — The Star Phoenix has quoted exactly what I said, and he is misinterpreting it.

Mr. Speaker: — That is not a point of privilege if this charge was quoted.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, may I repeat, I don't think there is a mayor, reeve, councillor, who would retain for one minute on municipal pay, a welfare officer who is guilty of this offense. I don't believe there is a reeve, councillor, or mayor in the province of Saskatchewan who would approve of social aid being issued on a condition that the recipient agreed to vote as the person issuing social aid directed. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there was a time in Saskatchewan history when this could happen, but it can't happen now, and I hope it will never happen again.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, unless the hon. member will identify those of 136 persons in the Rosthern constituency charged, so that the charges can be investigated and action taken if necessary, I think the only honourable thing that he can do is to apologize at the earliest possible moment.

What about government employees who are threatened with the loss of their jobs? Again, his uncle, the campaign manager, who I'm sure the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) will agree is an honourable gentleman, doesn't know of any civil servants in the Rosthern constituency who have been canvassed — if the honourable members knows, and if he will identify these outsiders who are making the threats the organization wants to know about it. Last night I referred to the role of the civil servant in Saskatchewan in 1964. I mentioned that the Liberal candidate in Regina East, is a member of my staff. There is no province in Canada where civil servants could work five days a week at a job under government pay and work the other two days and nights to defeat the government in office. But Paul Dojack is exercising that freedom and it was this government that made it possible for him to have the freedom.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — I mentioned last night that this legislature passed special legislation after the 1960 election to make it possible for the Liberal member, Mr. Guy, member for Athabaska to continue to teach in northern Saskatchewan and draw his indemnity as a member of the legislature at the same time. No one can question the attitude of this government nor the civil servants. I

mentioned that since I became . . .

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabaska): — On a point of privilege, once again he is inferring that I was a civil servant of this government at one time and that is completely false.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I mentioned last night, since I became minister the daughter of a Liberal candidate joined our staff, and I'm happy to say that no one has offered any objection. This girl was a very distinguished graduate of the University of Saskatchewan. She has been well trained and by personality she is well equipped for this job and I'm sure that no one has asked her for a contribution to the CCF or has her father been asked for a contribution for the CCF. The suggestion that there are people going into the Rosthern constituency making demands of this sort, is certainly very far fetched.

I hope that the hon. member for Rosthern will apologize to this house for having questioned the honour of his uncle, for having questioned the integrity of every mayor, reeve, councillor and welfare official in his constituency and the provincial government employees in the Rosthern constituency. I'm sure they will agree what they enjoy privileges as civil servants in Saskatchewan which are not available to federal government civil servants or the civil servants in any other province in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, you will gather that I will be voting against the amendment moved by the member for Rosthern and voting for the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. J.H. Staveley (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in reply to the speech from the throne so very ably presented in this chamber by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, I would first like to add my voice to those others which have spoken in extending my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion of acceptance. I would like to congratulate those who have spoken before me in this debate, and who made such an excellent contribution to the debate.

I too, Mr. Speaker, will miss those members on both sides of the house who on their own decision and not on the decision of the electors of this province, will not be returning to this chamber as members of the legislature for the next session. I would like to take this opportunity of extending to each and every one of them my best wishes for continued success in their endeavors, best wishes for health, happiness and prosperity throughout the years which lie ahead of them. Each one in his or her own way has made a valuable contribution to the public life of this province and the people of Saskatchewan owe to them a debt of gratitude for the services which they have rendered. I would be very remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not draw to the attention of the members of this legislature the wonderful golden anniversary jubilee year which the city I am so proud to represent in this house celebrated during 1963. During that year the fine people of Weyburn set a standard which has not been equaled by any city in this province. Our celebration activities extended over the entire 12 months of the year and we have received letters, glowing letters, from the length and breadth of Canada, and even beyond, on the hospitality, the courtesy, the friendliness and the efficiency of the Weyburn people.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — This, Mr. Speaker, was truly a magnificent community effort and the finest program of public relations which this province has ever seen.

I am drawing this to the attention of this house for two reasons: First — to give to the people of Weyburn, public recognition for an outstanding achievement; and secondly — to bring to the attention of the government that these similar communities, smaller cities of our province, can and do render a great contribution to the social, economic, and political life of Saskatchewan.

The policies of centralization carried out by this government can only harm these smaller cities and these smaller communities and the province as a whole. I will have something more to say about that later on.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the speech from the throne most intensely, hoping to find something in that speech which would give to the people of our province some relief from excessive taxation – some relief from the huge burden of debt which we are carrying and which has been placed on our shoulders by this government, some practical policies which would even enable the people of this province to remain in Saskatchewan and encourage others to come into our province, but I listened in vain, Mr. Speaker.

I also listened to the hon. member from Regina, (Mr. Whelan) in his speech seconding the motion to adopt the speech from the throne speaking at great length on the leadership given by this government. But I noticed that he did not mention these items which I have mentioned, probably because he realized that his government had failed miserably in these fields.

We cannot have a great province without people. It is very evident on the basis of the government leadership which we have had the past twenty years or rather, possibly I should say the lack of government leadership, that we can only have either the people we need or an NDP government. The governments own figures proved that we cannot have both, Mr. Speaker.

Now before I deal specifically with the throne speech I want to correct an impression prevalent among the members of the government. These people have been trying to create the impression over the length and breadth of this province that this government has been good to the people of Saskatchewan. This is not the truth, Mr. Speaker. What is the picture?

Our province is basically an agricultural province. Those people who live on the farms and the lands and farm the land, know and love their land and their land has been good to these people. These people in turn, Mr. Speaker, have been very good to this government. The truth is just about the opposite to the stories which are being spread by the hon. members across the way. Members of this government talk all of the time about the money they are spending. It does not take brains to spend money – all it takes is money and the more money there is, the easier it is to spend it. And particularly if it is someone else's money.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — The money that this government has to spend is limited only by the depth of the pockets and the purses of the men and women of Saskatchewan, and those pockets and purses are wearing pretty thin, Mr. Speaker, from hands reaching in to extract the money which this government demands by every conceivable method of taxation.

Now for the next few minutes I want to analyze very briefly some of the items contained in the throne speech.

First I note that agriculture, the most important single industry in this province has been given a magnificent 2 1/2 lines in almost four pages of government plans. The reference to plans for agriculture contained in the throne speech is as follows: and I quote:

Legislation will be introduced to authorize a broader program aimed toward the further development of the agricultural industry of the province, including the provision of credit, adjustments in land use and rehabilitations of rural areas.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that one of the best criteria of the attitude of this government towards agriculture is to be found in their administration of the crown lands of this province. It is a condemnation of this government that I find it necessary to bring to the attention of the members of this legislature, once again, and for the third time in as many sessions, the iniquitous and deplorable situations with respect to the allocation of grazing leases.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — I do not wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is so sympathetic to the program which was so clearly outlined by our provincial leader with respect to grazing leases. It is my firm belief, based on personal discussions with the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and on letters over his signature, that so long as he retains his present position, and so long as he retains the present members of his allocation committee,

fair and just allocation of grazing easements will not be made in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — I feel that it is an insult to this legislature, that a minister of the government would condone perjury in public business and it is time that the people of this province know what is going on in the back rooms of this government.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — Mr. Speaker, this situation represents injustices being perpetrated against the people of my constituency and being perpetrated against farmers all over this province.

Now considerable attention was given in the throne speech to the recent Saskatchewan resources conference called by the Industrial Advisory Council, and also to a proposed broader field of activities with respect to SEDCO.

I was rather surprised to hear this, Mr. Speaker, because having to call in some outstanding Saskatchewan free enterprisers to try to save the face of this government and the face of this province is an admission of the failure of the whole socialist conception of a planned economy.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — This must indeed be a bitter pill for this government to swallow. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that these same free enterprisers are prepared to promote a practical policy towards getting into this province the industrial development and the investment capital which has been so sadly lacking up to this time. Because this is truly putting the interests of their province before the interests of a political party — and this is Liberal philosophy, Mr. Speaker.

Do you remember in the early days of this government with its dreams of a socialist empire — all of the back room boys and all of the members of the brain trust brought into Saskatchewan to do the thinking for the government and to set the government on its road to a bureaucratic state, — where are they now? Those idealistic dreamers who dug this province in deeper and deeper and set it so far behind the rest of Canada. They are gone but they are not forgotten. So now almost after 20 years in power, what do we find in this throne speech just before a general election?

And I quote:

My government considers it essential that the rate of economic expansion in Saskatchewan be encouraged to the maximum possible extent.

This is what we have been telling you for the past 15 years.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — Realizing at long last that your educated theorists have been steering you down the wrong road, you have finally come to your senses and secured the services of some of the finest business brains in the province — Saskatchewan's free enterprisers — to bail you out.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — In those early days when your imported planners were dreaming up what was to be the pitiful story of the box factory, the shoe factory, the woolen mill, and so for the and so on, these Saskatchewan businessmen were going quietly about their own affairs, creating employment by their own business operations, making a success of their own businesses, and making a contribution to the life of their communities and to the economic life of this province.

These are the kind of people that you should have had for the past 20 years. And if SEDCO is a success, which I hope it will be, in attracting industry and investment capital into Saskatchewan, as opposed to the miserable failure of the Industrial Development Office, then you will have to thank free enterprise for saving you and this province from the 20 years of socialist bungling that has been your sorry record in this field up to this time.

I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that things are not in such a mess that these free enterprisers will not be able to salvage something from your mistakes for the people of the province. I also note in the throne speech that your government will be bringing in legislation to provide technical, administrative and financial assistance to some of our Saskatchewan communities. And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this is just another means of exerting government pressure, government influence and government compulsive measures on the people of Saskatchewan. Because if you still believe your former provincial leader you can't help but remember his most favorite statement which I heard him make in Weyburn 30 years ago and which he still is making, I heard him make it on Television just two weeks ago. "He who pays the piper, calls the tune." How many hundreds of time have we heard this? But certainly I know of no group more willing, more eager, or more anxious to call the tune, than the people sitting on your right, Mr. Speaker. The people of this province are getting sick and tired of hearing the same melody after 20 years.

In his major address to the throne speech the hon. premier accused the Leader of the Opposition of making a political speech. Mr. Speaker, half of this speech from the throne is nothing but political propaganda.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — It is just window dressing. For example, in the section dealing with the Family Farm Improvement Program and the Municipal Water Assistance Program, not one word about present or future plans for these programs, just self-praise about what has been done in the past. We are not even going to be asked in this legislature to maintain, let alone expand, these programs. The one thing that I noticed not included in this section, is that after encouraging many of our citizens to purchase well-drilling equipment to operate on a commercial basis and to provide this service, this all-powerful government is getting into the business as competition. This is typical of their "humanity first" programs. Possibly the hon. Minister of Agriculture should read the last bulletin issued by the Saskatchewan Well Drillers Association.

Now with the surplus of about \$20,000,000 last year I was more than disappointed that the government saw fit to increase school grants by only \$5,000,000, particularly when the cost of education is imposing such a heavy burden in our municipal governments. If this increase in school grants does not cover the total increase in school costs for the coming year, then this government is allowing a burden, a financial burden, to be placed on municipalities, both urban and rural, and this can only be met by increased taxes on property, which are already more than many taxpayers can afford to pay. But this is not all of the story and this is not the sorriest part of the story. What are your plans for these young people after they have been educated? If you can find an extra \$5,000,000 of taxpayers money for education for our students you should find \$15,000,000 to provide jobs for them after they are educated.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — Or do you prefer to pay out the \$15,000,000 in social aid or have them leave the province? Because what happens after graduation, Mr. Speaker? These young people, now equipped to face life as young adults, must take their talents and their education elsewhere in order to make a living and to make their contribution to society.

This government has failed our young people miserably. Just when they need help and this only by way of the opportunity to exercise their abilities, you drop them with a dull thud.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the political party forming this government used to brag that they controlled the young vote in this province, and this, of course, was after infiltrating our educational system with their socialist ideology. But they are not bragging today because they know and we know that our young people are leaving the NDP by the hundreds. And I'll tell you why. This government has underestimated the character and the characteristics of our youth. Because these young people are strong, they are healthy, intelligent — they do not want a government that spoon-feeds the, or does their thinking for them. They don't want a government which controls their lives. These young people want to try their wings and if they fall they have the

ability and the courage to get up and go on. And all they want and all they need, Mr. Speaker, is the opportunity to make something of themselves and to live their own lives, and that opportunity has been denied them by this grasping, greedy, power hungry government. You have failed them and they are not going to forget it.

What our people need in this province is a government which will work with them and for them, not on them – and this will be a Liberal government, my friends.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — So, Mr. Speaker, if I may interject just one political note, with the approval of the hon. Premier, I would suggest that the most important issue in the next election is going to be people. Not savings or services, not budgets or bureaucrats, not programs or promises, but it is going to be people. These other things are all secondary. I know that the government members do not like to hear about the lack of people in our province, but I am going to remind them just once again of this situation, in the faint hope that finally the seriousness of the problem might penetrate their senses.

Well, here we are again, Mr. Speaker – in 1944, 836,000, in 1963 – 933,000, an increase of 97,000 people and no one will dispute these figures. But our natural increase by way of births over deaths in that same time amounted to 308,300 people, and we had 54,300 immigrants come into our province from other countries. So our total increase should have been 362,600 instead of the mere 97,000 which we did receive. In other words we have had an actual loss of 265,600 people. Over 250,000 and almost 30 per cent of our total population in this province today.

No government in the world could justify such a deplorable situation after 19 years in office and this government knows it.

Now, last Friday, the Hon. Minister of Industry and Information tried to blame the federal government for our population losses and he accused the Canadian government of discriminating against the western provinces by concentrating heavy industry in Ontario and Quebec. What a flimsy excuse! There might be some direct relationship between our population trend in Saskatchewan as compared to the trend in Ontario as a result of the situation mentioned by the hon. minister, but certainly this would have no bearing on the population trend in the western provinces compared one with another, and the hon. minister is going to have to come up with something a lot better than he has come up with today. Because this is the picture, Mr. Speaker, and I think we all know it because it has been told in this house – that our percentage of increase in population in this province from January 1st, 1944 to October 1st, 1963, was 11.8 per cent.

Now in Manitoba which is a little closer to central Canada, in Manitoba, the increase is 31.5 per cent – almost three times our increase in Saskatchewan. Going to Alberta, farther away from the seat of Canadian government, in Alberta, we find the percentage increase is 75.1 per cent, almost seven times. In British Columbia, the most westerly province in this dominion of Canada, the population increase was 83.3 per cent.

Apparently all of these provinces have been discriminated against by the government of Canada. Saskatchewan must certainly have something that these other provinces do not have.

The Hon. Minister of Industry also, along with others speaking in this debate, commended this government for the low rate of unemployment in our province. Mr. Speaker, how can you have unemployment in our province when you haven't got people? I am very happy that there is so little unemployment among the few people that we have in this province, but certainly this is not surprising in view of the continual exodus of our people from this province to other parts of Canada, under free enterprise governments which provide so much greater opportunities. The hon. minister cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

The only other point which I wish to discuss this afternoon, and which was conspicuous by its absence in the throne speech is the policy of centralization being carried on by this government, and which is such a detriment to the building of a uniformly strong province. We cannot build a province on two or three major cities, Mr. Speaker, and particularly when these smaller communities are being bypassed in order to accomplish this end. A growing concern is arising all over this province about this situation, and I just want to quote two short extracts from the January 10th, 1963 issue of the Regina Leader Post, reporting on a January meeting of the Weyburn City Council and I do quote:

as serious as he has ever been in the council chambers, Mayor Lang issued a stern warning against the centralization practices of senior governments, and asked for the whole hearted support of all of the citizens of Weyburn in an effort to combat this trend.

one other quote:

centralization was not the way in which Saskatchewan was built, Mayor Lang said. When the province was being built, Prince Albert got the penitentiary, Saskatoon got the university, Regina got the legislative buildings, Weyburn and North Battleford got the mental hospitals, Fort Qu'Appelle got the Sanatorium, and Moose Jaw got the flour mills and the railway divisional point. But today, through centralization, only Regina and Saskatoon are benefitting.

The next day the hon. Premier replied to this statement and I have never seen or heard a weaker rebuttal. And I want to quote the January 11th issue of the Leader Post the following day. Mr. Lloyd said:

we are keeping this matter of decentralization in mind and whenever possible we set up outside of Regina and Saskatoon.

Another comment, and this is really a pearl of wisdom, Mr. Speaker.

decentralization has taken place to a considerable extent in this province. Weyburn for example has a large mental hospital.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan hospital was built in Weyburn in 1921; 43 years ago and under a Liberal government. At that time I doubt if very many many of my hon. friends across the way were even old enough to vote. Certainly there was no CCF or NDP. The hon. Premier must have been almost ten years of age when he engineered that bit of decentralization. As a matter of fact a much better illustration of his kind of decentralization was when this government took the Saskatchewan Training School away from Weyburn in 1955 and moved it up to Moose Jaw, one of the so-called major cities of this province. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to analyze some of the items contained in the throne speech this afternoon. Certainly from my analysis I am sure you will realize that I will not be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I first wish to congratulate my desk mate, the member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) on his usual excellent contribution to this assembly and to congratulate all previous speakers in this debate. I wish also to associate myself with those who have extended best wishes to members retiring from this legislature, and to express the hope that they will enjoy happiness in their return to private life.

In the few minutes allotted to me this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some reference to the speech from the throne and to some of the topics which I feel are of concern, particularly to the north-west part of this province. While the speech is a lengthy document, it has failed to inject anything that is new to our deliberations here, and as usual deals with much that is beyond the scope of this legislature.

With the advent of a new federal Liberal government since our last session it is interesting to note the great upsurge of activity by Premier Lloyd and several of his ministers with regard to federal affairs in many areas. With the NDP rapidly fading as a political force here and across Canada, the Premier's desperate attempts to avoid being identified with the various disputes involving organized labor, which resulted in serious delays in the movement of prairie grain overseas, took on added significance. Later while some union affiliates of the NDP were voicing strong opposition to the federal trusteeship imposed upon Hal Banks' empire, Premier Lloyd and national NDP leader T.C. Douglas were strangely silent, by contrast. Then the Premier has the gall to accuse others in this house of attempting to straddle both sides of the fence.

Mr. Speaker, it reminded me of that old quotation from Shakespeare's Caesar – "Why man, he doth bestride this narrow world like a Colossus attempting to over-ride these petty people who would dare oppose him".

The Premier's concern over the Columbia river agreement culminated in a charge by British Columbia's Water Resources Minister, that Mr. Lloyd was attempting to sabotage their plan for political purposes. It was through . . .

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Which side are you on?

Mr. Foley: — . . . no mere coincidence that the Premier spoke to T.C. Douglas in Vancouver to mark the introduction of their direct distance dialing system from Regina. I trust that T.C. Douglas immediately availed himself of the opportunity to point out to the Premier that his interference at this stage in the negotiation of down-stream benefits, coupled with the vain attempts of Saskatchewan's Attorney-General to oppose B.C. legislation outlawing the check-off of union dues for NDP party funds last year, together constituted an unprecedented interference by this government into the economic and political affairs of British Columbia, and a very important reason, Mr. Speaker, why this group of meddlers, who sit on your right, must be replaced by responsible government at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Cass-Beggs has expressed some lack of faith in that clause of the Columbia River Agreement which states and I quote:

Both Canada and the United States have a right to divert water for consumptive uses.

He claims that it doesn't go far enough.

Mr. Speaker, when I examined the new headquarters building of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, which has been described as a architectural show-piece on the one hand, and an economic necessity by Mr. Cass-Beggs on the other, I may be forgiven as to having some doubts as to that gentleman's judgment with regard to many matters affecting the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan. Without arguing for or against the pressing need which this government seemed to feel warranted an expenditure which may approach some \$20,000,000 before this building is finally paid for, I cannot help but visualize the many benefits which might have gone to the hard-pressed taxpayers of this province, had the government exercised more reasonable restraint and modesty in its design and interior decoration.

Several million dollars might have been saved to supplement our rural grid road program to assist the bringing of more rural telephone service to many hundreds of our farm people to bolster our provincial agricultural programs and to extend our northern highway system, had the government been satisfied just to "keep up with the Jones" and not to make an all-out attempt to out-do every other province in Canada, a competition which we can ill-afford at this time with the public debt in this province approaching \$750,000,000.

Mr. Lloyd did not go far enough when he said it would dominate the skyline of our queen city. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the dollars invested in many of the ornamental materials imported from other countries at great cost and the expensive and space consuming architectural designing, will dominate the life-lines of our Saskatchewan people for many decades, already burdened by an every increasing public debt which has exceeded all realistic limits, under twenty years of socialist domination and self-glorification.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to a matter which, while of great concern to all our residents is of special concern to the small businessman and the people along the border areas of our province, and I refer to the unfortunate and completely unwarranted increase made by this government two years ago in the education and health tax, when they raised it from three to five per cent. Millions of dollars of revenue have been lost to this province and hundreds of small businessmen have had to close their doors since the introduction of this increased tax.

The increasing flow of Saskatchewan citizens over our borders into tax-free Alberta and Manitoba to avoid this penalty is understandable. This has placed many of our merchants, fuel and implement dealers, lumber and building supply managers in a completely untenable position, jeopardizing the very future of many of our border communities. Meeting with nearly 100 businessmen at Lashburn last summer the Provincial Treasurer displayed an unbelievable lack of concern, bordering on the arrogant, when asked to take immediate measures to rectify this inequitable situation. Not only did he turn a deaf ear to the requests of many businessmen when they asked him to reduce the tax, but he accused myself of political interference when I suggested that the matter be placed before the royal commission on taxation which was meeting later that fall.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of subsequent surpluses, announced by the Provincial Treasurer of many millions of dollars over expenditures, there is no doubt on this taxation issue alone that the people of Saskatchewan will soundly repudiate the NDP at the polls in June . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Foley: — . . . a fate which they richly merit. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's position and bargaining influence at the recent federal-provincial tax-sharing conferences have deteriorated when he is handicapped by the irresponsible taxation policies of those who sit so precariously on the treasury benches to your right, Mr. Speaker?

In his address to this assembly yesterday, I was surprised that the Minister of Education did not see fit to mention one of the most pressing problems of school administration today: that of a serious shortage of qualified teachers in Saskatchewan. A survey completed in June of 1963, indicated that some 300 Saskatchewan teachers resigned their positions last summer to seek positions outside of our province, an 18 per cent increase over the teacher exodus of only one year ago. A total of 2,277 teachers educated in this province have left and are now teaching in other provinces and this is more than three times greater than the number lost by any other province in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, what does it matter whether we spend millions of dollars on university buildings and new schools, scholarships and bursaries technical and vocational training, if this very unfavorable trend continues? Is it all just a matter of these people seeking a more temperate climate and change in scenery or are the underlying causes of deeper significance? As a result of this continued loss of teachers, an estimated 200 teaching positions in the province are filled at this moment by uncertified teachers, not to mention the many class rooms that have had to be closed and students transported many miles to already overcrowded class rooms in order that their education would not be interrupted.

In all, Mr. Speaker, 1,000 teachers or about 10.7 per cent of our teaching force left the profession last June for a multiplicity of reasons. If our school population continues to increase, we simply must attract increasing numbers of young people into the teaching profession or face even more difficult circumstances in the future.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that during future deliberations at this present session some time will be devoted to ways and means of alleviating this most serious threat to the educational stability of our province.

I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to turn for a moment to a matter of considerable importance to the residents of north-western Saskatchewan and to the economy of our province generally. I refer to the pressing need for a bridge over the north Saskatchewan river between North Battleford and the Alberta border to serve our rapidly expanding tourist trade, to accommodate our valuable grain and livestock areas and provide a strategic link with our vast wild life and recreational areas further north.

For far too many years we in the north-west have had to gear our travel plans to the weather with the present ferry crossings being rendered impassable for weeks at a time during freeze-up and spring thaw, not to mention long delays owing to low water sand bars and peak holiday traffic during summer months. In nearly 100 miles of river between North Battleford and the Alberta border there is not a single bridge, yet in not too many more

miles of river between Lloydminster and Edmonton, there are three bridges with discussions taking place regarding a fourth.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is an intolerable situation demanding immediate attention by the next government of this province. I wish to congratulate representatives of municipal councils, boards of trade, and officials of the many towns and villages from both sides of the river who met recently at St. Walburg and who presented a very excellent brief to the Minister of Highways on behalf of a proposed bridge to be built at the site of the Deer Creek ferry crossing, thus linking no. 3 highway from north of the river to the city of Lloydminster.

The fact that this crossing has the only ferry still operating on a provincial highway, the fact also that the number of vehicle crossings increased by some 60 per cent during the past year from 18,000 crossing in 1962 to nearly 30,000 during 1963, makes this ferry the second busiest in Saskatchewan during the past year. All of these are very powerful arguments for the construction of a bridge at this point.

Representatives have also been made to the department on behalf of a north-south highway, which would, if built, take advantage of existing highways 21, 30, 40 and 26 and involve the construction of a bridge at the present site of the Maidstone ferry. Since the department has the final authority to decide the eventual location, I would urge that engineering surveys be completed immediately on this important project, in order that a site for this bridge can be selected soon.

I can think of no finer project as one means of commemorating both the Diamond Jubilee of our province in 1965 and our centennial as a nation in 1967, and I would hope a new Liberal government would give every sympathetic consideration to this important matter.

I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not bring to the attention of this legislature some of the problems affecting the Indian citizens of Saskatchewan. The speech from the throne makes some mention of consultations with the Indian people and the government of Canada for programs in the field of education and health and for the implementation of grid roads, power and telephone service. This same statement, Mr. Speaker, has been repeated by this government on numerous occasions in the past and has as yet resulted in little or no progress being made in the areas of concern.

Since the province of Saskatchewan has granted to Indian people the right to vote, the right to participate in all of the activities enjoyed by all our citizens, certainly we have also incurred the responsibility to work on behalf of these people. It seems to me that much more could be done than has been done to give these people many of these necessary and badly needed utilities and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that more attention will be paid to the needs of the Indian people during this session of the legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment to some of the current developments that are taking place in the coming election campaign and I refer to the recent nomination in the city of Regina of the former executive-secretary of the Saskatchewan Labour Council, Mr. Smishek, — the introduction as a candidate for the NDP of the individual who just a short year or two ago had to be severely chastised by our Minister of Labour for approving of the actions of the Deputy Minister of Labour in the city of Saskatoon for openly asking the labour movement, as a member of the government, to support the NDP, is disturbing to say the least. Some mention has been made of the other running mate of Mr. Smishek, the mayor for the city of Regina. My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that this worthy gentleman first courted a nomination for the NDP in 1956 and having been unsuccessful at that time, again repeated his actions in 1960. At that time, the former Provincial Treasurer of this province, the hon. C.M. Fines, I understand, ran around this city to make very sure that Mr. Baker would not get the nomination. This was at the time the hon. Minister of Health did in fact get the nomination by other than what might be termed conventional means.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Minister of Public Health): — On a point of privilege, when the hon. member refers to a member in this house, who was not at that moment in his seat, as having got the nomination by other than conventional means he is certainly beyond the border line and that kind of remark is certainly out of order. Certainly, if I said that the member for Arm River got this nomination by other than conventional means I couldn't get away with it and I'm sure the hon. member shouldn't get away with this one.

Mr. Foley: — I think it all relates to our interpretation, it is my understanding that the former Provincial Treasurer went around the city distributing hastily obtained memberships in order to load the convention.

Mr. Blakeney: — On my point of privilege, the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, must be dealt with, and the point of privilege is that the hon. member has inferred that the member here, that the nomination, certainly inference was that he got the nomination by means that weren't very respectable. He says he got them by unconventional means . . .

Mr. Foley: — The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, the NDP did not want Mr. Baker at that time and I am wondering after a double insult of that nature, just what they have offered him to persuade him to run in this election.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Foley: — Surely it must have been a combination of the Premiership and the crown jewels.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Foley: — I think this is a clear indication to the people of Saskatchewan of the desperate measures which the NDP are prepared to take, as they see their star fading in their once unimpeachable strong hold of the city of Regina which was first breached when T.C. Douglas was sent to B.C.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I want to wish the Minister of Labour and Telephones well in his coming retirement. I have always had pleasant relations with the minister with regard to rural telephones in northern Saskatchewan, and even though he has had difficulty in persuading his government to move in this direction nevertheless I wish him well.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that as his retirement approaches, the Minister of Labour in secret councils of the NDP has never for a moment tolerated the union check off for political purposes. I am also confident, Mr. Speaker, that the retiring minister in secret discussions of his party has never for a moment tolerated or approved of the merger of the NDP with the labour unions, thus bringing organized labour bosses into politics for the exploitation of the working people of this province and throughout Canada.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that for certain members who sit on your right, the mild, rather likeable manner of the Minister of Labour was not to their liking and they are now looking forward with great anticipation to some of the antics of the former executive secretary of labour who if putts into practise during the campaign some of the policies which he has attempted to impress upon the working people of this province, we are in for a very interesting time, indeed.

Mr. Speaker, when I understood that the Minister of Mineral Resources was to follow me in this debate it sent my memory back to the last election campaign in the constituency of Turtleford, when I was honored with a visit from the minister, then of natural resources, who has now more unnaturally acquired the mineral department and I thought it might be of interest as we approach this campaign to indicate, Mr. Speaker, what some of us in the rural areas can expect from some of the gentlemen who sit on your right. I quote from the Star Phoenix of February 20th, 1961, where Mr. Kuziak speaking to an audience in my constituency, plainly warned the voters of the Turtleford constituency to send a CCF member to the legislature in Regina if they wanted the best consideration to be given to any requests for road improvements or similar projects in their area in the next four years.

Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard of intimidation and coercion of a worst type than this.

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Mineral Resources): — I deny that statement, the Liberal press put it in. Mr. Speaker, I want him to withdraw such a Liberal phrase, . . . that doesn't mean anything . . .

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the hon. minister has suffered a conversion from his former tendencies. I trust that in the coming campaign he will display the same co-operative spirit where ever he goes and I trust that we can bring about his early retirement from public life.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, he gives us an example what took place in the constituency of Canora, when he took over its jurisdiction, and he lists all of the many benefits, some 40 miles of black-top and I just wish I had time, Mr. Speaker, to have compared some of the benefits which accrue to some of his neighboring constituencies. I gather the implications from his remarks was that his has been much more favorably dealt with and again, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, another shocking admission by a member of the cabinet of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I read an article the other day concerning the long trail of broken promises by the government which sits on your right. I'm not going to take up the time of this legislature with all of them, because I could stand here all afternoon, going over promises that this government has used to mislead many of the people of Saskatchewan. What are some of them? These have been repeated before, but I think they can stand repetition as far as the future of the Liberal Party of this province is concerned. I know that the NDP will not enjoy it. The CCF-NDP said, "We'll shift the bases of taxation, from land to profits of a mortgage company." How have they kept that promise, Mr. Speaker? The CCF said "We'll take the civil service out of politics, abolish patronage, and eliminate graft and inefficiency". What about the actions of some of the past members of this government, too numerous to mention? The CCF said all residents of Saskatchewan will receive adequate medical, surgical and dental, nursing, hospital care without charge. What did they do? How did they keep this promise, Mr. Speaker? Well, all they did was impose four new taxes to finance their so-called free services to the people, introduced several million dollars in new taxes levies to pay for hospitalization and medical care insurance, raised the education tax to 5 per cent, as I have mentioned earlier, a completely unjust, unwarranted, and financially unsound move by the government that sits on your right, to the taxpayers of this province who have paid heavily ever since.

The CCF said "The CCF government will curb the expense accounts of cabinet ministers and bring about substantial curtailment for their salaries". What did they do? What is their record, Mr. Speaker? Increased the number of cabinet ministers from seven to 16, their salaries from \$6,000 to \$10,000 a year, not to mention the sessional indemnities. The provision of cars, with car expenses, retirement pensions, the bill to taxpayers for domestic and foreign travel has become a massive item of public expense. Mr. Speaker, I only mention this because they promised to do otherwise. I am not suggesting for a moment that I am prepared to take public issue with the paying of just and merited salaries to men who serve the public of this or any other province. Someone said "What about the federal ministers?" I only point out the great difference between the CCF-NDP who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, with regard to their promises out of office as opposed to the manner in which they carry those promises out in office.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Foley: — The record is indeed a sorry and shameful one. What did the NDP say in past years? "We'll reduce the public debts and save the province high interest charges currently levied to service the public debt." What is the present situation there, Mr. Speaker? Now, they have made a great play on words with the net debt in this province, I thought for example that maybe during this session, we might be treated to the unusual spectacle of the Premier, bow and arrow in hand, going up to Wascana Lake and attempting to shoot a flaming arrow into a barge which would burn the last remnants of the public net debt of this province as was done in another province not too long ago.

Now, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether it is because the Premier is a notoriously bad shot which could well be the case or whether it is because he was too modest. In his speech the other day when he got the net debt down to some \$7.00 per capita, I don't know why he didn't go all the

way. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, the gross debt in this province, is \$580,000,000, with the interest payments alone over \$20,000,000 per year. Does this sound as if the government on your right, has reduced the public debt and saved the province high interest charges, Mr. Speaker?

The CCF-NDP said "we will tax interest payments to corporations outside the province". Well, I don't know how they have gotten along with the province of Alberta in this type of negotiation because most of these companies are there now, or many of them, but what did they do? They borrowed a large portion of the money which now constitutes the public debt from the United States and made huge annual interest payments to American companies. The CCF said "we will use chemurgy", (I'm not sure what chemurgy is, Mr. Speaker, but I gather it has some reference to petro chemical activities to make tractor fuel, synthetic rubber, plastic, silk stockings and dishes out of low grade wheat.) What did the CCF do? Their record there Mr. Speaker, I needn't go into.

We could mention some of their past experiments, reduction of some of the synthetic materials, Mr. Speaker, synthetic materials via a synthetic government.

A government which really isn't representing the best interest of this province. A government which has tried to put across to the people of this province an illogical and I suggest a synthetic front to try and cover up the manner in which they have exported many of the best human resources and the best brains that we had in this province. The hon. member for Saltcoats, (Mr. J. Snedker) I think covered very capably indeed the tremendous loss of human resources from the province of Saskatchewan. Brains and ability trained by the taxpayers of his province who have been lost to us for all time.

Who is to assess, Mr. Speaker, the tremendous loss to the province of these trained people in the field of health and in the field of education?

I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, they can't get off the hook or get out of this situation by a few ill chosen rude remarks to members of this side of the house. It is ill-becoming of any minister of this province and especially the Minister of Agriculture, who should be in the forefront in activities, both in the speech from the throne and in other major activity in this government. Yesterday, he found it necessary, Mr. Speaker, and I think this was very significant, he found it necessary to protest and say that never at any time had he allowed political consideration to influence his judgment in the allocation of land in this province. The fact that he found it necessary to defend his stand, was significant in my opinion and raises the very simple question – if not him, then who in his department has been responsible for the thousands of letters and complaints which we are receiving from all over the province every day?

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. E. Kramer) has found it necessary to be absent from this assembly for most of the session thus far. Now it raises an interesting question as to what he is doing. You know, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister and I have in the past had some rather interesting differences of opinions. While I don't pretend to know legislative protocol with regard to ministers of the crown, I do know, however, that there have been a few activities with respect to some hon. ministers who sit on your right that raise question in my mind, and I clearly admit, a layman's mind, as far as legal matters are concerned.

I question, Mr. Speaker, the actions of a minister of this crown, a few days after he was named to a cabinet post, appearing in a court in this province on behalf of a candidate of a political party. I question the propriety, Mr. Speaker, while I don't pretend to know, the true state of affairs with regard to the manner which ministers of the crown may participate in private practice.

I question too, Mr. Speaker, the ethics of the hon. Minister of Natural Resources in having the word 'honourable' appearing before his name over the NDP headquarters in the city of North Battleford. I question if this is not an abuse of ministerial privilege. If he is going to be a candidate for this political party then let him address himself with his christian name. It would seem to me, that the addition of the word 'honourable' abuses his position as a cabinet minister, who is after all, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, sworn in to represent the thinking and the welfare of every person in this province, regardless of politics, creed, religion or anything else. I would be interested in hearing some defence of this action on the part of a minister of the crown.

I wish the hon. minister was here today because I have the privilege of representing one of the most important wildlife areas of our province and an area to which every year I invite all hon. members to come up and participate in some of our bountiful fish and game resources. But an area too, Mr. Speaker, where I suggest that more concern must be expressed in this legislature about the welfare of our moose and deer herds which Divine Providence has given us. I just wish to raise one point. In recent years with the advent of more modern means of transportation and communication, I suggest that there are some abuses in the unrestricted use of aircraft over our north during game season.

There is more and more of it, Mr. Speaker. I realize that this is a difficult matter to control, that it will require the co-operation of the federal Department of Transport, as well as the Conservation Branch of the DNR and other bodies. But I feel very sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that sportsmen who make use of low flying aircraft to help to spot game and thus gain some advantage over their counterparts who are prepared to walk for days in the conventional manner to get their game, are not being sporting, and this is a practice which I believe should be controlled and stopped.

Our own local fish and game branch have suggested that a height restriction be placed on aircraft and that they be required to fly directly airfield to airfield, without deviation during the big game season unless they have permission from game authorities. Now the hon. Provincial Treasurer is just as familiar with this problem as I am, and I would urge game resources officials in this province to give this matter their attention.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have said something about the abundant living which those gentlemen across the way have enjoyed under this government, I would liked to have said something too, about rail line abandonment, which is of great concern to the rural areas of my constituency as well as to those of many hon. members, however, I understand that with the motion before this assembly, we will have an opportunity in the days ahead to make representation on behalf of the rural people affected by rail line abandonment. I would like to have said something too this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, about the continuing and critical dental shortage in this province, a shortage of dentists, to express satisfaction at the continued policy of dental bursaries in this province which I note, according to recent press reports, and from the speech from the throne, will make available the services of some 50 dentists for the people of this province this year.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, little change, little improvement has taken place in the supply of dentist for Saskatchewan in the past year. There is still only one dentist for every 5,000 people of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that all but about 20 of those dentists live in the cities and the next four largest towns of this province, indicates the tremendous problems for the rural people of Saskatchewan. The situation hasn't changed a bit in years and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the next government of this province, which I am confident will be a Liberal government, can take action in this very important field.

The present amendment moved by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) is a timely one, and I regret the manner in which a minister of a crown saw fit to bring personalities into his remarks concerning the hon. member's statements of last day to the extent that he did. I regret this type of thing, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Rosthern is a serious and thoughtful representative of the people of his constituency and a man who represents the thinking of a great many more people in this province, than those members who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Foley: — I suggest that it would far more become the minister of the crown to seek into some of the problems raised rather than be so quick to suggest that all is well. This old spirit of infallibility keeps rising in the ranks of those opposite, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, since the policies by Your Honour's advisors have resulted in a heavy and continued exodus of people from Saskatchewan, since they have retarded industrial development and placed excessive taxation on the remaining residents of this province, I wholeheartedly support the amendment moved by the hon. member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) and I think I have left no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that I will vote against the motion.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member takes his seat, would he permit a question? I wonder if the hon. member would advise me whether he was making any reference to me when he was referring to a court appearance by a cabinet minister.

Mr. Foley: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the appearance I have in mind.

Mr. Blakeney: — May I then, Mr. Speaker, rise on a point of privilege and advise the hon. member that since I have been sworn in as a cabinet minister, I have at no time appeared in any court on behalf of any client, and I want to advise the hon. member that if he is thinking about a particular court appearance during the month of July, 1960, when I appeared in North Battleford on behalf of an individual with respect to an election recount, I would advise the hon. member that although I was elected as a member of the legislature at this time I was not sworn in as a cabinet minister until August, 1960, and accordingly I would point out to the hon. member that at no time since being a cabinet minister did I appear as counsel on behalf of any client.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, if I have erred in my information, I regret it.

On the other hand, I think it was well known at that time that Mr. Blakeney had been named to the cabinet as Minister of Education. The newspapers of that time referred to him as such.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I want to take this opportunity first of congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address in reply. I want to say that both did an excellent job in analyzing His Honour's speech, in expressing their views on the program that was enunciated within that speech. I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to the two veteran members of this house who have announced that they will not stand for re-election. I want to say they contributed much over the past 20 years to make Saskatchewan a better place to live.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Mr. Williams will not be forgotten by the thousands of working friends that he has in this city and in the province, for giving his leadership in placing on the statute books of Saskatchewan, no doubt, the finest labour legislation in the dominion of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — I want to pay tribute to the members of the opposition who are not going to seek re-election. I believe that each in his own way has contributed considerably to the good and welfare of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute in advance to approximately half of the members sitting to the left of you, who are not going to return after the next election.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Now before I go into the main talk, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go into the details of why I believe half of them are not going to be re-elected, I know that the Leader of the Opposition and practically every member of the opposition has spent a good portion of his speech telling us how weak the CCF-NDP party is, and how well they are going to take the next election and they told that to us back in 1952, 1956, 1960, they are building up their courage again and as the Leader of the Opposition after spending 20 or 30 minutes telling how weak the CCF is all over, then for the next 20 or 30 minutes he was appealing and screaming "Wolf, Wolf, Wolf, you Conservatives and Social Creditors, come to the rescue because the CCF wolf is going to destroy us".

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, I will leave it up to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and I know they will do the right thing when the next election rolls around.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Before I go into my prepared talk, I want to reply to a few of the statements that were made in this house this afternoon. The hon. members for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) talked about the golden anniversary of the city of Weyburn and I want to say that I attended and I saw the mayor and the aldermen, and the MLA boast that day when we were down, of the accomplishments of the city of Weyburn, of the new industries that came into that city and now he comes into this house and he belittles the industrial development in the province and even his own city. Then he makes a statement, he says, “I’ve been listening for the past few days in vain to see some relief in taxation but I fail to see any reduction”. Mr. Speaker, this is probably the first government in the dominion of Canada over the past few years that has reduced taxation for the people of the province to the tune of \$5,000,000. The medicare and hospital taxes have been reduced by \$20.00 per family or \$10.00 for single, for the total of over \$5,000,00. Why don’t they give credit where credit is due? Only the other day, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Russ Brown, Minister of Power, announced the power rate reduction which is a reduction to the tune of \$2,350,000, yet he says he’s been looking in vain, he couldn’t see it. There is also a provision of \$5,000,000 increase towards the contribution to education. I see that he did realize that educational costs are rising and here I want to remind the house again that costs of all commodities and all services started rising in the dominion of Canada since 1946 when the federal Liberal government lifted price controls. All commodities and taxes skyrocketed in every province of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, both of them, the Liberals as well as the Conservatives in federal elections since 1946 have promised that if the costs rise too rapidly they will bring back price controls, but we don’t see it, and therefore, I say, that all rising taxes, including school taxes, municipal taxes, provincial taxes, are a result of the still skyrocketing costs of all commodities in the dominion of Canada.

I want to say too, that I will later have something more to say on the taxation problem and the taxes within this province.

The hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) I’m very glad to know where his party stands on the water needs of this province and the water needs of all of Western Canada. Here, Mr. Speaker, is another member who has condemned the fine power building in this city and I do recall other condemnations of buildings within this city by previous members. I remember when they were very critical and called it the white elephant, they Canada Life building that was purchased by the Insurance Office but they don’t talk about it anymore, they used to call it the \$240,000 white elephant, this building today is not doubt worth \$1,000,000.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, if this minister is not prepared to quote me exactly then I would prefer that he not make any reference.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! I think the minister is answering the previous participants in the debate as I have listened to it this afternoon.

Mr. Foley: — On a point of privilege again, I simply took issue with unwarranted and unnecessary expenses in this construction of the building, not of the necessity of the building for the economic life of this province.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, he is still condemning the erection of that building and spending money wastefully there. This is exactly the kind of condemnation that was carried on against the insurance building and then later on, I remember we built the museum at a cost of \$1,000,000 and we heard year after year in the legislature, and on the hustings, them criticizing the \$1,000,000 white elephant that has a crow and a gopher inside. Remember the time, but this too boomeranged, and I’m going to tell you that the condemnation of the power building is going to boomerang against the Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — The first paragraph, Mr. Speaker, of His Honour's speech points to the year just ended, 1963, and he says that his year will be remembered long. The most buoyant and prosperous year in our history. His Honour's speech and the members, may I say of this house, attribute to the buoyancy and the prosperity to two main factors: First – the agricultural industry, aided by Divine Providence, directed in and assisted by the Department of Agriculture to where the agricultural production, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in our history has exceeded \$1,000,000,000, following may I say, 1962 which was also a very good productive year; and secondly – the rapidly expanding general industrial economy of the province, where in the past few years, this non-agricultural production has been surpassing agricultural wealth production. But in this particular year has also reached a record production exceeding \$1,000,000,000. I know that the Leader of the Opposition participating in this debate, stated and I'm going to quote him, he said – "The past year has probably been the most prosperous year Saskatchewan has ever had".

Mr. Speaker, he is not sure whether it is prosperous or not, he even thinks maybe it is stagnant, and I want to say that he continued that later on. Now as I stated before in this house and I'm going to remind the hon. members that every time I make some statement that I like to back it up with some authority. Yes and therefore, I'm going to quote from Time Magazine of September 27th, 1963, which gives evidence to support this prosperity. I know that this is a right wing magazine, may I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that Time Magazine had to say, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

Quickly, what is the richest province in Canada? A fortnight ago, the answer would have been Ontario as usual but for the next 12 months in terms of personal income per capita, the correct answer would most likely be the traditionally have-not province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, now the Leader of the Opposition, continued and he asked the house the question "Why is it so prosperous?" and he gave the usual reasons why Saskatchewan in 1963 is so prosperous: First – we had a bumper crop, well, it is a wonder that he gave the farmers credit; secondly – the major factor and the credit he gives to the Liberal government in Ottawa which sold the wheat – not the Wheat Board but the Liberal government; and thirdly – he gave credit again to the dominion government in Canada because they paid a little more for the wheat, therefore, he gave the farmers a little bit of credit and then doubled the credit to the Liberal party.

Mr. Speaker, I say what political nonsense! The bumper crop, the bumper crop, Mr. Speaker, came and was harvested in the fall of 1963, I don't think it affected the economy of Saskatchewan too much. Certainly, with a certain amount of optimism because there was a crop coming up, and at that time, the sales were announced to Russia, but even that sale as far as the cash is concerned is not going to take effect until towards the end of that year, and in 1964. Therefore, I say that the economy, the booming economy in Saskatchewan is a result mainly of the industrialization within the province of Saskatchewan.

I want to point out to those two credits that he gave the Liberal Party, they are absolutely ridiculous and dishonest and I'm going to quote again from an authority, the hon. Mitchell Sharp who called such statements dishonest and he gave credit for the sales and increased price of wheat to the Canadian Wheat Board.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — To the Canadian Wheat Board, a board that I would want to again remind the house that the Liberals down through the years opposed its organization. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the other members that participated from the opposition in the debate mimicked the same kind of irresponsible statements as the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, anyone who is at all reasonable and unbiased realizes that the prosperous year just ended could not be effected too much by the bumper crop of the same year. Mr. Speaker, I want to be honest, it was effected by the exceptionally good crop of 1962, it was effected by the long term diversification of the agricultural economy. It was effected by the increased community pastures, by the increased record cattle sales, by the increased mixed farming operations within the province.

Mr. Speaker, again I'm going to repeat that most of all this prosperity of 1963 was caused by the general industrial boom and the diversification of the economy within the province. I know that the Liberal leader and his cohorts have hoped, they have dreamt, they have preached stagnation, so long that they are not capable of facing facts. They are not capable in taking some pride in the dynamic economic progress all around us. I'm going to refer to other authorities, further away on our prosperity, and the reasons for it. I'm going to quote from the Financial Post of February 8th, 1963, just the other day and I want to say that it had this to say for the prosperous Saskatchewan economy and I'm going to read from this article it says:

Good crops and the big Russian wheat sale are contributing factors but the main pitch is in industrial development.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — I want to read a little further, Mr. Speaker, in this particular report, it says:

But what is mainly helping the government is the success of some of its industrial development programs. Biggest impact is the major industry such as the Potash Mine at Esterhazy and Belle Plaine, but smaller industries also, are growing and the government is adapting to industrial developments.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that here is a financial newspaper, I believe, fairly reporting to its investment readers, I want to say that this should warm the blood of any Saskatchewanite. One should feel proud of the acknowledgements coming from other parts of Canada on our extraordinary industrial growth. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure that thousands of our people do feel that pride, but, of course, not the group to the left of you, not even some individuals of our local press. The Liberals, may I say, Mr. Speaker, over the years have so smeared, belittled, and maligned their province's economic accomplishments that I believe they prefer to go to oblivion rather than truthfully admit facts that no reasonable person could deny.

The local press has usually gone along with the Liberal propaganda of belittling the province's economic accomplishments or any admission that may put the government in unfavorable light. Lately, I want to point out, that the press has come all out to the rescue of the Liberal Party. May I say by bolstering it with editorials because the Liberal debaters they must believe have proven themselves weak in the legislature. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that on February 11th, the hon. Russ Brown announced a \$2,350,000 cut in power rates for the residential, the farm, the commercial and the industrial users of Saskatchewan. The Leader Post I want to point out had it in its evening edition on the front page, but in a type relegated to third place. The press believed for example this sinking of a ship in the Australian waters was far more important Saskatchewan news, than the power rate reduction of over \$2,000,000 that was going to affect many families in Saskatchewan, and will have the effect of encouraging further the industrial development in this province. Then I took a look at the morning issue of February 12th, you know the evening issue comes out fairly late in the evening and it is only circulated, I understand, in the city of Regina, the morning issue goes out into the country and so the morning issue of February 12th, the news was relegated to the 17th page, way at the back. I'm just wondering how many people realized that the power rate cut was news on the front page in Regina for only a very, very short time. Now I want to say that if this is not iron curtain tactics, I would like to know what is.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, if power rates had been reduced by a Liberal government, there is no doubt that it would have had special editions and the headlines would have been in red ink. I would, therefore, appeal to the powers in the Leader Post that are responsible for high-lighting news, to be a little more considerate of their own readers in Regina and in the province.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Since, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking about power and power rates and the hydro development was mentioned in the speech from the throne, I want to remind the hon. members opposite, that although they may be belittling the power reduction, I do not want them to forget that power rates in Saskatchewan at one time were considerably more than twice as high as they are at the present time. In 1944, when everything was cheap, Mr. Speaker, the power commission of the Liberal government had a rate of, a maximum rate of 15¢ per kilowatt hour, and a minimum rate of 4¢ per kilowatt hour. We through the years have reduced power rates to where the maximum today is 8¢ and Mr. Speaker, the minimum is 1¢ equal to the lowest rate, equal to Manitoba's lowest rate, and is somewhat lower than Alberta which is 1½¢. I would, therefore, appeal to the Liberals to be fair and honest and sometimes give credit where credit is due. I want to say that the power corporation has done an outstanding job of bringing power and gas to so many people of Saskatchewan at such fair and reasonable rates. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to refer again to the lifting of price control. Since the lifting of price controls by the federal government in 1946, we know that all goods and services have doubled, have tripled, have quadrupled, except power rates in Saskatchewan; they have gone down more than 50 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to point to another aspect of the power corporation, and that is natural gas. Natural gas has provided fuel to hundreds and thousands of users in the province of Saskatchewan and I know that this again has reduced their fuel bill by approximately 50 per cent. These again, Mr. Speaker, are facts that nobody can deny.

Mr. Speaker, I'm again going to bring more evidence from further away places on our prosperity and some of the reasons for this prosperity. This time I'm going to go to Ottawa, I'm going to call upon an authority none other than the Liberal government of the dominion of Canada in Ottawa.

You know, Mr. Speaker, last fall the federal government passed a bill and incorporated an area development agency; an agency very similar to SEDCO here in the province of Saskatchewan to help and encourage industry in the depressed areas of Canada. The Prime Minister of Canada stated. The Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts in this house speaking of a similar area, there is no doubt they would call it areas of stagnation, wouldn't they? Mr. Speaker, it was rumoured after the 1962 federal election, that because the Liberals were completely wiped out in Saskatchewan that they were going to use the Leader of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan as a special advisor to Ottawa on Saskatchewan, on Saskatchewan's economic and its financial needs.

An Hon. Member: — You can do a lot better than that.

Mr. Kuziak: —I see, Mr. Speaker, the federal area development agency has been organized and an announcement has already been made that the agency is going to spend millions of dollars for tax incentives and other assistance to assist industries in establishing themselves in the depressed areas or the stagnant areas of the dominion of Canada. The federal Saskatchewan has announced lately that there are depressed or economically stagnant areas in every province of Canada, except Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, the federal government, therefore, says, "Saskatchewan in all its areas has the best planned, evenly distributed prosperity and industrial development in all of Canada".

Mr. Speaker, this is what they must say because there are no depressed areas in Saskatchewan but the Liberal Leader here in the province of Saskatchewan, and his cohorts, repeat over and over again, that Saskatchewan is all stagnant, it is all a depressed area.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, only one has the courage to applaud. Now, I want to make this statement, Mr. Speaker, that either the Liberals of Ottawa or the Liberals of Saskatchewan are propagandizing a deliberate diabolical falsehood. It can't be anything else. I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, how it is that a political party which professes to be responsible could have got themselves into such a position; where one section, the federal Liberals profess one view and the provincial Liberals on the same matter profess the very opposite.

I'm wondering is it because of the economic advisor from Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that has created that mess? Again, may I repeat with the federal government coming to the assistance of the depressed areas throughout the dominion of Canada, we in Saskatchewan are being taxed again for the federal Liberal government to subsidize industrial building in all the provinces of Canada, except Saskatchewan, and when I say again, Mr. Speaker, I mean again, because the first time they did that was during the war.

Remember the second world war, the federal government helped build hundreds of war industries in every province of Canada but some way or other, overlooked Saskatchewan. I want to point out again, Mr. Speaker, that at that particular time in the history of this country, we had a Liberal government in Ottawa, and we had a Liberal government in the province. Now they are repeating the same thing, we have a Liberal government in Ottawa, and an economic advisor in Saskatchewan advising them.

I'm going to go back to why I believe that we have the growing and prosperous economy in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I believe that an excellent barometer in the prosperity of the economy of any province is the personal income per capita. I know that the Liberals at times like to compare Saskatchewan with Alberta and British Columbia and I see that in 1962 we were fourth highest in Canada as far as personal income per capita was concerned.

We, in Saskatchewan had \$1,690, a few dollars higher than Alberta. But, Mr. Speaker, why don't the members opposite say make a comparison with some of the Liberal provinces in Canada. I'm going to show a comparison for the personal income per capita with some of the Liberal provinces in Canada.

Newfoundland in 1962 was the lowest in all the dominion of Canada with \$972. I'm hoping that the hon. member for Milestone is listening to this. The third lowest is New Brunswick, another Liberal province, and Liberal Quebec is the fifth lowest in the dominion of Canada. In other words, as far as personal income per capita was concerned in 1962, Saskatchewan was fourth, the Liberal provinces of Canada were down at the bottom of this economic ladder.

Now let's take a look at 1963. In 1963 our per capita income is going to be the second highest in the dominion of Canada and maybe could even be first. The hon. member for Milestone the other day tried to point out that it was mainly due to the agricultural production, and I am sure that it is to some extent but it is also due to the \$1,000,000,000 of wealth produced by the industry or the non-agricultural production in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Milestone): — Mr. Chris Higginbotham . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — No, it wasn't Chris Higginbotham, this was a report on western Canada and not on Saskatchewan. The magazine was reporting on the economic conditions on the Canadian prairies, and now I am going to quote from that article. It says:

Billion dollar year. The most impressive statistics of all from Saskatchewan, which produced sixty-three per cent of Canada's largest best quality and most successfully sold wheat crop in history. It is now the only province with neither federally depressed areas nor winter works projects. Winter unemployment is an negligible two per cent, (it says and I know it is below one now) with the second highest per capita income in Canada; \$1,920 to Ontario's \$2,000. Saskatchewan has turned in an unprecedented \$1,000,000,000 year on four different fronts. One – agriculture; two – non-agriculture commodity production; three – personal income; four – retail sales.

Mr. Speaker, even the Time very anti-leftish, picks Saskatchewan as the province of Canada, and gives credit to agriculture in reaching the \$1,000,000,000 of wealth production. It also gives credit to the non-agriculture or industrial sector of reaching a record \$1,000,000,000 of wealth production.

Mr. Speaker, my one time sitting mate, rose in the legislature to speak. I'm going to tell you I felt sorry for him. He did look so lost, so forlorn, so unwanted even on that side of the house. I want to say that he got up in a sort of a bravado manner and he mimicked the very utterings of the opposition leader, which was absolutely, Mr. Speaker, the very opposite to what he used to expound over here in such superfluous English language.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, in his speech he mentioned something about investment capital being down in Saskatchewan. So now, I am going to talk about investment capital. What is the truth on investment capital in Saskatchewan? Again, I am going to refer the house to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures. In 1948 these figures showed that in terms of private and public investment per capita, Saskatchewan ranked sixth among the provinces of Canada. Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, Manitoba, and even Quebec were ahead of us. In the 1962 statistics we had reached third place in Canada with only British Columbia and Alberta being ahead of us. In 1963, according to the Hon. Mitchell Sharp, Liberal Minister of Trade and Commerce, latest figures on 1963 outlook he says "Saskatchewan is still in third place, but has improved its position, it is 13 per cent about the per capita average in Canada". The hon. member for Milestone asked "how do we compare on investment capital with Alberta and Manitoba?" Well, according to the Hon. Mitchell Sharp's figures not too bad. We are higher than Manitoba but we are lower than Alberta. Why did he not ask the question "How do we compare with the Liberal provinces of Canada where they apply Liberal policy to investment?" Yes, and get those figures. I want the point out that our per capita investment is almost twice as high as the Liberal provinces of New Brunswick. It is over \$20 per capita higher than the Liberal province of Newfoundland, and it is some \$170 per capita higher than the Liberal province of Quebec. Again, the Liberal provinces with Liberal policies are down on the bottom of the investment ladder of Canada.

The Leader of the Opposition in his speech referred to the construction industry and tried to belittle Saskatchewan's value of construction. Last year in this same debate, Mr. Speaker, I used DBS figures and showed that only Alberta and Manitoba had a higher and faster growing construction industry, but even this lead was narrowing in favor of Saskatchewan. Now I checked the DBS figures for 1962 over 1961 and I see that Manitoba's construction industry from 1961 to 1962 increased by only 1/3rd of one per cent. Saskatchewan's increased by five per cent, Alberta's actually dropped by seven per cent. In other words, that favorable lead, we are catching up very rapidly.

I want to now put the opposition and the editorial writer of the Leader Post straight on some of their fabricated charges of high taxes in Saskatchewan as compared to some of the other provinces in Canada, and I want to touch on taxes in the province.

Mr. Speaker, again I am going to point out that we levy four major taxes in the province of Saskatchewan on our citizens: one – the hospital and medical taxes or premium; two – the gasoline and diesel tax; three — the automobile and truck licenses; and four – the hospital and education tax or sales tax. I am going to have a few words to say about each one of these.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to again make the statement that taxes in every province of the dominion of Canada have gone up and up and up over the years and they have been going up since 1946 when price controls were lifted. I am going to repeat again if you are going to blame anybody for the rise in taxes, then blame the people that allowed taxes to rise. I am going to come back to the hospital and medical care taxes, and I have already stated a while ago what happened here. I remember in the 1960 election that I campaigned in and I got elected on, I made the statement that after the election you will see a \$48 hospital premium plus a \$48 medical premium when we bring in medicare. That is the figure I was elected on, \$96 and I pointed out to my people all over that it would cheap. That it would be cheaper than medical care costs under the M.S.I. or some of these other schemes in Saskatchewan or some of the other provinces of Canada.

The people were happy and I got elected on \$96 but when it came down for us in the city here or in Regina to levy that tax we only levied \$72. We didn't put on a \$48 medical levy we only put on \$24 or half of that – \$72 altogether. Then this year this was reduced by \$20 and it has gone down to \$52. Mr. Speaker, this tax, if it is a tax, is less than anything they charge for hospitalization only in some of the Liberal provinces in the dominion of Canada. It is far less than medicare costs in some of the provinces of Canada where they have group services or M.S.I. or something very similar to what we have in the province.

How do we stack up on this as compared to say, the federal Liberal government which was only elected in April. I remember prior to their election in April, the federal Liberals promised to reduce taxes if they were elected federally. You know the Liberal Party is always very, very generous when they are in the opposition. When they get over on the government side, my God, be careful.

Mr. Speaker, they got elected in April of last year and instead of reducing taxes federally they slapped on a 11 per cent sales tax on all building materials. Then, of course, you remember the howl that was raised throughout the whole of the dominion of Canada, and then they said, "Oh, well, we will ease it a little bit on the Canadian people, we will reduce it down to 4 per cent at the present time and on March 31st, 1964 got to 8 per cent and then on December 31st, 1964, it is going to go to 11 per cent. We will try to kind of ease it into the people of the dominion of Canada.

Then, Mr. Speaker, they went further and they put on another two per cent on the income tax. Mr. Speaker, we reduce taxes, let us not forget it. Our hospital and medicare taxes, I'm going to repeat, the premiums are the lowest in the dominion of Canada, bar none.

Now let's go to the next heavy source of revenue for this province, and that is gasoline and diesel taxes. And you know the Leader of the Opposition, even in this debate, got up and he said "Do you know that the gasoline taxes under this socialist government has gone up from 7 to 14¢, double". This is right, it has gone up double. Saskatchewan gasoline tax is 14¢ but I want to point this out that we are third lowest gasoline tax paying province in Canada, only Alberta and British Columbia are less than we are. Manitoba is the same as we are, but let us take a look at some of the Liberal provinces of Canada, where Liberal policies of taxation are. If we take a look at the Liberal provinces of Canada, the gasoline tax has gone up in Newfoundland to 19¢, in Conservative Nova Scotia – 19¢, you know Conservative and Liberal provinces are neck to neck, the highest in the dominion of Canada. The next province, second highest in Canada, is Liberal New Brunswick with 18¢ and Quebec, not too bad, they are only one cent higher than we are, but they are higher.

Now let's take a look at diesel fuel. In Saskatchewan our diesel tax on a gallon is 17¢, in Newfoundland it is 19¢, let's take a look at Nova Scotia 27¢, a Conservative province, 10¢ higher than we are. Then we go to New Brunswick, a Liberal province, 23¢, 6¢ higher than Saskatchewan. Quebec, a Liberal province, 21¢, 4¢ higher. Mr. Speaker, I wonder who has high taxes in the dominion of Canada.

May I repeat again that in the second source of major taxation within this province we are one of the lowest in the dominion of Canada.

Now I go on to the third heavy taxation, and that is automobile and truck licenses, and let us look how we compare. You all know that in the province of Saskatchewan, the Chevy, Ford or Dodge license plates costs \$15. The lowest license plate in all of the dominion of Canada. Who are the highest in Canada, well, I am going to tell you who they are, Liberal Quebec has the highest, with Liberal New Brunswick, the two out of three Liberal provinces are the highest in Canada, the license plate for a Chev, Ford, Dodge, is \$32, over a hundred per cent higher than Saskatchewan.

And they have the gall to talk about taxes.

Ontario is third highest with \$25. Now I suppose I better say something about trucks. Particularly farm trucks, and I am going to compare the farm trucks to the licenses charged in Alberta and Saskatchewan. A 5,000 pound gross weight truck, which I believe is the regular 1/2 ton farm truck, in Saskatchewan the license is \$10, in Manitoba it is \$12.50, which is 25 per cent higher, in Alberta it is \$15 or 50 per cent higher, in Alberta it is \$15 or 50 per cent higher. One of the large farm trucks say a 14,000 gross lb. weight, in Saskatchewan the license costs \$20, in Manitoba it is \$32.50 or 62 1/2 per cent higher, in Alberta it is \$35 or 75 per cent higher. I notice that farm tractors are even licensed in Alberta and in Liberal Quebec.

May I then repeat as far as the third major source of taxes for the provincial government, that is licenses on automobiles and trucks, and farm trucks, we are the lowest in the dominion of Canada, and the highest provinces are the Liberal provinces.

Next, the hospitalization and education tax or the sales tax and I want to give a comparison of how we compare with some of the other provinces of the dominion of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the house that this tax was first levied in the province of Saskatchewan by a Liberal government and on twice as many goods as we are levying at the present time, let us not forget that.

Second, I want to point out that we are not the only ones who have that kind of a tax in the dominion of Canada., Eight out of the ten provinces of Canada levy a sales tax and again the highest sales tax levied in the dominion of Canada is in the province of Quebec, where they have a 4 per cent provincial levy and a 2 per cent municipal levy, or 6 per cent and they do not pay any medicare costs on behalf of their people out of this.

I want to point out that for years the province of British Columbia has been levying a five per cent sales tax on more goods than the province of Saskatchewan is levying and out of that levy they do not provide any payment of medicare expenses on behalf of their people.

The Liberal province of Newfoundland levies a 5 per cent, therefore, when the Leader of the Opposition speaks in this house and on the hustings, that if he ever gets elected he will reduce sales tax, he better advise Quebec, and advise Newfoundland, and advise New Brunswick how to reduce taxes . . .

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Better tell John . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — I see that I haven't too much time, I wonder if I could call this 5:30.

The Assembly took recess at 5:30 p.m. until 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, when 5:30 was called, I had just put the opposition straight, I believe, where Saskatchewan stood on the taxation problem, particularly in comparison with the Liberal provinces of the rest of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, since so many of the opposition, including E.N.D. of the Leader Post, have bandied about population figures, I want to have something to say about population too.

I have, Mr. Speaker, checked the DBS population figures of Saskatchewan, from 1932 to 1963, and no matter what figures you may pick out, you cannot get the population loss for 1945 to 1963 to amount to anything beyond 200,000 loss of population, taking in the net migration loss and the loss of the natural increase. In fact the figure stands at 200,311. But both the opposition and the editorial in the Leader Post have given a quotation of 250,000, in fact the statement was made during the two decades of CCF rule, more than 250,000 persons left Saskatchewan to reside elsewhere. I suppose as a good Liberal, he exaggerated the figure by only 50,000 people. It could be that he probably counted all the people that died during the twenty years and threw them in for good measure.

I want to point out that the Liberals refused to point out that during the time they were in power, for example, 1932-1944, twelve years, they had actually driven out of the province of Saskatchewan, a figure of 251,061 people. In one year, in 1942, they lost 60,000 people out of Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: — You are all wet . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Kuziak: — I would like to point out that the Liberal government prior to 1944, was losing population in the province at an average rate of 20,000 per year

An Hon. Member: — . . . armed services . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — Yes they were going and not coming back either.

An Hon. Member: — Where were you in 1944 . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — I want to say this, that anybody who was paled, should not blame, for example, this government even for the loss for the first couple of years even after we took over. The loss prior to that had been so great, but I do want to point out that by 1946, two years after taking over, we had stemmed the loss of the census population.

Now after the war, Mr. Speaker, with rapid agriculture mechanization, with cost-price squeeze, with actually the better opportunities of employment in the industrial areas of Canada, the agricultural population did drop very drastically and I want to say it dropped drastically in every province in Canada, in every state of the United States, in fact, in every progressive country in the world. The provinces, states, our countries, I want to point with the largest percentage of agricultural population, had the largest and most rapidly dropping population. All agricultural areas of Canada and the United States lost their population rapidly and this population flocked into the industrial areas of Canada and the United States. I remember a year ago the Leader of the Opposition talked about visiting Germany and he spoke in glowing terms of the German economic situation and how rapidly it came back after the war. Well, I want to read a quotation on the German boom, and the loss of agricultural areas within the German economy, just the same as we lost farmers, as nay province or any state in this country lost rural population, and I am going to quote from the Financial Post dated May 4th, 1963, and it is headlined —

German Boom Kaput

The biggest obstacle to economic integration and trade liberalization is still protecting European farmers against cheap imports of agricultural products, but there are fewer and fewer farmers to protect. From 1954 to 1961 the numbers of persons employed in farming in the six common market countries diminished by 3,200,000 people. Labour shortages and rises in wages in industry are given as reasons for this mass migration from the farms to the factories. In Germany 985,000 farm workers gave up farming. In France, 1,061,000 gave up farming. In Italy 993,000 gave up farming during the seven year period.

Saskatchewan wasn't the only one that suffered due to mechanization and a rapid industrialization of a country or nation. The same thing has happened in other countries in the world. The number of farm workers are dropping in each and every industrially progressive nation in the world. The faster the nation industrializes and wages increase, the faster has been the drop in farm and rural population.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we had no industrial areas in Saskatchewan prior to 1944. Our economy then was 80 per cent agriculture and approximately 20 per cent nonagricultural. When our farm workers in those days left the province, they left to go in to the industrial areas of Canada and we didn't have any at that time in Saskatchewan, they went elsewhere. That was the time that we lost the population within the province.

I want to point this out, Mr. Speaker, you could not industrialize a state or a province overnight. Industry must have power, and I want to point out that it took this government time to build this power. The sinews of industrial might. I want to point out to this house, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party on every turn opposed the borrowing of money, opposed the building up of this Power Giant . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McCarthy: — They still do . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — They opposed the building of the Boundary Dam, they opposed the building of the Queen Elizabeth plant, the Squaw Rapids plant, they and their federal Liberal Party opposed the building of the South Saskatchewan River Dam . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Dreamer . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — Yes, before you can have industrial diversification of the economy, you have to have power. We did it.

Oil, gas, potash, all these industries came in after the development of power. By 1947, Mr. Speaker, three years after we were elected, we stifled for the first time the actual population losses in Saskatchewan. In 1936 we had actually dropped to our lowest figure for population of 832,700. Since then due to industrial development, due to the diversification of our economy, we have reached a point where now our nonagricultural production has been surpassing agricultural production.

Our rural population if it is leaving now, and it is still leaving, it is going to the industrial areas in this province and not anywhere else. Our population, Mr. Speaker, has recovered and in fact has gone over the peak of 931,500 which was established back in 1936. Our population is now, according to the latest figures, 936,000, the highest we have ever had in the history of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, we are not satisfied with our population increases . . .

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Hoorah for you!

Mr. Kuziak: — Yes, and may I inform you that our increase has been more than any other comparable agricultural area in Canada and the United States. A place where you can compare our areas is North and South Dakota, and if you check over the last five years our population has been increasing more rapidly than the population of North Dakota or South Dakota.

An Hon. Member: — Do you believe that?

Mr. Kuziak: — Now again, may I refer the house to a quotation that I believe I have given here a year ago, and I am going to repeat it again . . .

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — You haven't said anything that you . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — This was taken out of the Leader Post dated January 5th, 1963, and I am going to quote: The Leader Post pointed out —

Regina is growing faster than some people think (yes, than some of you people think) the editorial went on and it said and I quote:

dealing with percentage growth of all cities in Canada, including metropolitan areas, Calgary is placed first, the records say Calgary's population was 96.5 greater in 1961 than it was 10 years earlier. Edmonton was second with an increase of 90.8 per cent followed by Saskatoon's of 79.3 per cent and Regina fourth in the dominion of Canada with 57.3 per cent. Toronto, Ontario, was fifth, Sudbury, sixth, Ottawa, seventh, Kitchener, eighth, and Montreal, ninth.

Farm population is decreasing but the cities and towns are increasing and it is the industrialization in this province. Alberta and Saskatchewan cities again, Mr. Speaker, are on top of the whole heap. Why do people always belittle and smear their own province and its accomplishments. Saskatchewan's cities, may I repeat again, are in third and fourth place as far as population increases is concerned in the dominion of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at how we compare with some of the other provinces of Canada lately, as far as urban population increases are concerned. It is the urban areas that industries locate in, and where industries have been locating within this province.

For the period 1956 to 1961, the last five years, in urban areas of over 5,000 population, here are the DBS figures. Alberta has had the highest increase in these particular areas of any province in Canada, an increase of 26.2 per cent. Saskatchewan came second with 21.2 per cent, Ontario third with 20.5 per cent. The Canadian average is 16 per cent, and where are the Liberal provinces of Canada again, down at the bottom of the heap.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that I have tried my level best to give an intelligent exposé of the many issues. I have done it with the hopes that I could straighten out some of the misinformation that has emanated from the group to the left of you, but I realize it is hopeless.

I will support the motion and will vote against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — In my opening remarks Sir, I wish first of all to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion in reply. Both the member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) and his colleague from Regina (Mr. Whelan) proved to us that they had carried out extensive research and worked hard in the preparation of their speeches. These personal contributions measured up to the best I have heard in this house in the last 12 years that I have had the honour to sit here. I think all members in this house have benefitted to a great extent from the material that has been presented to us. I think that the facts are very challenging and have provided material for a good debate. The two members should be very proud of a job well done.

To the Hon. C.C. Williams who has indicated his retirement from the cabinet, I add my words of sincere good wishes for health and happiness in the days ahead.

Another friend and colleague who is leaving us to retire is the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Stone). He has over the years served the people of Saskatchewan well and has been a good example to all members in this house, in his devotion to duty particularly. To him and to all the other members who may be retiring and who will not be in this house in the future I would like to extend my personal best wishes for a good life ahead.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I refer to the notes that I have prepared for today I would like to answer some of the points that I have heard in this debate in the last day or two. I would like to point out to the hon. member for Weyburn, who is not here at the present time, that for the first time in years I have seen the Liberal Party appealing to the young element in this province. It is only a few years ago when I was in this house, at a time when we were bringing in the vote for the young people of 18 years and over, and at that time, hon. members opposite called them chocolate boys, and popcorn eaters, and they said they didn't have enough brains to go and vote. Now, I say to all hon. members on the other side who would not like to get their vote, that if they do vote for the Liberals then they will be proving what the other members have been saying in the past about them.

I was very much disappointed in the appeal to the civil servants asking they give their vote to the Liberal Party at the next election. I was disappointed because I know something about the kind of treatment that the civil servants have had in the past. If there ever has been any threat to any civil servant in this country of Canada of ours it has been in this province of Saskatchewan under the Liberal Party some years ago. We were very much concerned, we in the CCF, back in the early days, twenty years ago, that this kind of thing do not continue, and I would like to refer you, Mr. Speaker, to an article in the Commonwealth of August 16th, 1944.

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabaska): — 1944 . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Yes, 1944, I don't mind going back that far, as a matter of fact, (we might have to go back further) now the paragraph I would like to read to you is this:

CCF supporters, Mr. Douglas has said, had not worked for ten years for the purpose of putting Liberal heelers out just to put CCF heelers in. Instead the government has moved up efficient employees to take the place of unqualified political appointees, and each case where this was done it saved the taxpayers salary. Shortly, Mr. Douglas said, a civil service commission will be set up to take charge of appointments promotions and dismissals and I could go on and on . . .

but the matter is very clear to us, there has been a civil service commission set up. Active for a number of years, it is independent of politics, has selected people for the civil service for their ability and so I can say at this time that I am very proud, and I think it is fair and truthful to say that we have the very best civil service in Canada because of this kind of policy.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Berezowsky: — I cannot at this time help but remind the hon. members when they say and assure the civil service that they will not be dismissed. It is only four or five or six years ago, when the hon. member for Moosomin and his Liberal Party at that time, had a Liberal program in which they said they would get rid of half the civil service . . .

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member has told a deliberate lie and I ask for him to withdraw it.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is out of order when he says that anybody in this house has told a deliberate lie. He should withdraw those words.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. This program of that particular Liberal Party is available to the members of this house and the statement which he made is not according to the facts and I ask that he withdraw them.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, before asking the hon. member to withdraw that, I think it is right and proper that the hon. member for Moosomin should withdraw the quite improper words that he used.

Mr. Speaker: — I think it would facilitate matters if the hon. member would withdraw the words that he used, and rephrase it.

Mr. McDonald: — What other words could be use. The record is available and the member refused to use them.

Mr. Speaker: — I think that the member for Moosomin, is well aware that to use the words that anyone is “deliberately lying” is unparliamentary and I would ask that he withdraw.

Mr. McDonald: — If it is true and it offends the hon. speaker, I would be glad to withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I don’t think we can accept a qualified withdrawal, I think the member is well aware of that.

Mr. McDonald: — I have asked to have the hon. member withdraw his statement which is untrue. If you are prepared to do so then I am certainly prepared to withdraw mine.

Mr. Speaker: — But I am asking you to withdraw the way you phrased your statement and rephrase it.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I say that the statement that was made by the hon. member is not the facts, and is no statement, and if my demand that he withdraw it hurts his pride, well I will be very glad to withdraw it.

Mr. Berezowsky: — It doesn't hurt my pride, Mr. Speaker, I know quite well that there was that kind of information disseminated in their campaign, and if I am wrong I apologize to the hon. gentleman . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! The member for Moosomin takes objection to a statement that the member for Cumberland made and I would ask him to withdraw the statement . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I am glad to withdraw. Now, Mr. Speaker, something that he cannot say that I have to withdraw is the official statement as presented in this house, some years ago, . . .

An Hon. Member: — When . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — I have it here. It is an order of the legislative assembly, dated February 29th, 1936, on the motion of Mr. Williams and the request was for the names, addresses, nature of employment and salaries at retirement of all persons in the employ of the Saskatchewan government or any department of government or any commission of the government, either inside or outside services on July 19th, 1934, who are not now in the employ of the government, together with the reasons in each case for leaving the government employ, whether by death, voluntary resignation, forced resignation, dismissal, retirement on a pension, or otherwise, and I don't need to go on with that, it was signed by the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Ewart.

An Hon. Member: — Give us the date . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — I gave them the date, Mr. Speaker, February 29th, 1936, and Mr. Speaker, here is a list of the people who worked for the previous government, which happened to be a Conservative government. These civil servants were forced to resign or were dismissed and I counted the number that were fired or dismissed, actually 286 in the period of one year, and I understand the rest, 300 of them, had to resign or otherwise they would have not got their superannuation. Now then our hon. members ask for support from the civil servants, whether we go back to 1944 when they were in power, or 1934, or any other time, Sir, the records are there to prove who were the friends of the civil servants and who are their enemies. Let them make me withdraw that one!

I would like to point out at this time that I have been a member for twelve years and that my only consideration has been to try and serve the people of my constituency and of this province well. What I intend to say today is in all sincerity for the betterment of good government and for the good living of the people of Saskatchewan.

However, before I do that, I would like to see some of the people who don't agree with good government go elsewhere if they are not satisfied, I noticed in today's paper that they are looking for a new leader for Ontario Liberals, a number one political market, and I would suggest to the member for Milestone, who is so upset about the election in Regina, that here is an opportunity for him to become a Leader of the Ontario Liberal party.

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Milestone): — Many thanks for the . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate the members in this house who have spoken on this debate. Surprisingly there seems to be more purpose in their arguments than I have previously heard from the opposition. It could be that the opposition is grabbing at straws to save themselves if that were possible, that is from complete annihilation at the polls this year or next year or whenever the election comes.

Yes, I think it was unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition referred to all the irrefutable facts placed on record by the mover and the seconder of the motion. Remember, Sir, that he said and referred to their remarks as "pretentious poppycock". Such a statement, Sir, means he denies the social reforms that are evident in our society everywhere, the developments,

the progress, the prosperity that surrounds us on every side. These facts to him are “pretentious poppycock”. The progress, the industrialization, the amenities and the services demanded and available to our people are here, and they are here to stay, and are not just visions or “pretentious poppycock” as has been said.

I think he wasn’t completely blind because he has finally admitted that there were some gains and progress in his province, but these were natural gains, said he, and would have come with any kind of government. These were not the result of CCF government policy, and CCF legislation, said he, all of which has been parroted in the last few days by his followers in this house, Sir.

Liberals opposite have said, Sir, that the reason for our prosperity is the good crops that have brought forth revenues for governments locally and federally. Now is this partly true, no one is going to deny that, no one is going to deny the hand of Providence for our good crops, or the value thereof. We say this, Mr. Speaker, first of all we must not deny the hand of Providence for the good crops and also the hand of the Wheat Board of Canada which has been able to sell our wheat to countries who need our wheat. This kind of policy as you know has been advocated by the CCF for a number of years. Finally it was adopted by the Conservative government in Ottawa so I think I can say and join with other members of this house, to say thanks to all those that are responsible. But I would say this, selling wheat itself is not progress, Sir, and the road to a good life is not by just selling wheat. Prosperity and buoyant revenues are only a means to an end. They make it possible to do great things, of course, because of the revenues. But our progress, Mr. Speaker, started when the CCF were first elected 20 years ago. Security began with the first Farm Security Act, freedom came when we enacted the free cancer service, the future began to shine bright when we began to build schools in outlying areas and brought in school cost equalization for the purpose of financing. The same thing happened to municipalities. They were freed from the heavy burden when we brought in an equalization program and rid road grants to municipalities.

I would say prosperity began when we started to collect royalties from mining and oil companies and mineral taxes from the C.P.R. and other railway companies which my hon. friends for the last few days said they would like to forego. When they refer to high taxes, and if you question them and corner them, they always admit that they are concerned with taxes that corporations pay, royalties that corporations pay and not the taxes that people pay to school districts and to municipalities. I have on record, Sir, in Hansard last year, when the Leader of the Opposition said “When we get into power, we’ll see to it that we give corporations a ten year tax free holiday”, and my people when they heard about this asked “And who’s going to pay the taxes, if we do not get a fair share from the corporations, who after all make the profits at our expense, and are able to pay their fair share?” I would like to add – the good life in our province began when we put people ahead of profits and established marketing agencies for fishermen and for trappers. When we enlarged the operations of power and telephone corporations bringing in microwave and modernity into our Saskatchewan community, that is when the sun began to shine brighter for all of us.

Freedom and a good life, Sir, came to people in my constituency when we turned over the trapping areas that had been sold by the Liberal governments to private corporations, and you will recall, Sir, the two deals in particular, the Hudson Bay Company, some 15 townships which I referred to on previous occasions, and about seven townships to Tom Lamb. My people are very happy to have been able to have a government that returned this trapping area, this hunting area back to them and the future broke when this government began to build roads into sporting and resource areas of the north, to places like LaRonge, to Creighton, to Buffalo Narrows, to Cumberland House, to Island Falls, and other communities. Security and a good life became assured with the recognition of human rights in this province not only for white people but for natives. These are the facts my hon. friends opposite have forgotten or deliberately ignored. These are the facts their leader has referred to as “pretentious poppycock” Sir.

I would not want to think that hon. members opposite mean badly. I don’t think so at all, but I really cannot help thinking that they don’t mean anything at all. They have told us about their philosophy, “Responsible Enterprise” said they, or I could say “Practical Liberalism” – or whatever that may mean, or something of that nature. This is something beyond anyone’s understanding’ it has not been explained to this house. The new Liberal platform, Sir, has taken 20 years to produce and has produced a monster – a blank – no new ideas, nothing at all! If there is, I would like to hear them.

Now I think the hon. members opposite, Sir, should be honest and not deceive the people of Saskatchewan. If they have a platform of more than nothing, then they need not go begging for votes from Conservatives and other. If they had something in their platform, then they might find some support from some people. But promising to reduce taxes, particularly for corporations and for those who pay income tax, is a promise they cannot keep, if at the same time they tell people that services would not be reduced, as a matter of fact, they said the services would be increased. Any child knows that if the penny is not there then the candy cannot be paid for.

May I remind my hon. friends, Sir, that they have no more magic in their platform than had Mr. Pearson, when he slid into Ottawa with his minority. Mr. Pearson requiring money for pensions, increased taxes, Mr. Pearson needing money for other purposes, slapped on an eleven per cent tax on the Canadian people. Orthodox methods produce orthodox results, and the Thatcherites are not magicians and cannot get away with bamboozling the public by trying to stage a dream which happens to be a comedy and not a serious play at all.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the question of leadership. We have had our leader attacked in this house in the last few days, and everyone knows there are critical times in a nation's or province's history. Contemporarily we have had men worth listening to of all political faiths. Men like Winston Churchill, President Kennedy and our own Premier Woodrow Lloyd of whom I'm sure we are very proud. People and the press who know, not the CCF press I'm referring to, but in Canada, who know how to judge men by historical criteria and what they have contributed to their country – have done just that, and have given credit to our leader here in Saskatchewan, and we should be proud to give recognition to such leaders. But our friends opposite would rather besmirch and be insensitive to the truth, and so they try like K.K.K. to tar and feather a man who is dedicated to the people of this province and who is ready to serve the public well. Fortunately, this does not come from the public, Mr. Speaker, but from frustrated and insecure politicians, from certain men who are broken down by ambition or by demanding and threatening elements in our society. Such persons want to be in their glory on the winning side and so because of their weakness they abandon principles and join reactionaries only to find themselves even more frustrated and defeated politicians. This is usually the end of the rope for refugees, Sir.

Personally I am very concerned with laws and particularly written laws. Good laws are enacted by good governments and a society can always be proud and stirred when it knows that it is guided by good written laws. I really believe that our national life, provincial life, depends on good written laws, and this government has recognized this basic principal and has enacted many such laws to which I can and do refer. We have the Bill of Rights; the Farm Security Act; our Hospitalization Act and our Medical Care Act and many others. Our municipal acts, our school acts and such amendments to The Secondary School Act mentioned in the throne speech, will add to the process of democracy. They must be good and fair laws, if we are really to have democracy, not only provincially but in local government. We must have laws to protect labour and big business, laws to protect farmers, and these are all necessary for good government and to safeguard freedoms in our contemporary society. At this time I would just like to read a very short paragraph, Sir, from a book which is called *Essential Lippman*, page 74, where he refers to the present situation in our Western society and I hope you can catch the idea in this paragraph, Sir, he says:

Western freedom will not survive just because it is a noble ideal in the age we live in. It will survive if, and I think only if, if we could take freedom down with us into the hurly-burly competition and conflict and prove that a free society can make itself a good society.

It is not enough to just be free, if you are going to have a good society as I referred to, you must have good laws and that is the purpose of legislatures and I think this legislature can be proud for making laws of that kind for the last 20 years.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, we have heard in this house from the people opposite, who call themselves ostentatiously Liberal, that they would remove these laws for good governing of social services. They have said "We will remove politics out of medicare. We will remove politics out of insurance." But, Mr. Speaker, if health and education and protection and security should fall into the hands of irresponsible committees and not elected representatives, if they should fall into the hands of the demanding power elements in our society or groups of enterprises, be they private insurance companies, be they professional associations or be they any other private groups, then we will have begun to lose our freedom and become slaves of powerful tyrants. I would like the members opposite to just think about that very seriously.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, this is what the Liberal Party offers the people of Saskatchewan with their so-called “responsible enterprise”. That is a new term for free enterprise and I call it “irresponsible enterprise”, Sir, a sell-out, a betrayal of principles and of people by experts opposite who have much experience in this field as the record shows only too well. I appeal to the true Liberals in this house and to the Liberals everywhere in Saskatchewan to shake off these lackeys of the “Establishment”, renegades from honour and parasites of our society. Only the, the true Liberals can save the party and offer something positive to the people of this province, but I’m afraid it is a little too late, and that the death knell has rung its last toll, and all that is left is the interment and no amount of money can bring the dead back to life. This is the end of an era, their leader said, the Liberal leader, and I agree, and I think, Mr. Speaker, I think that people of Saskatchewan agree that this is the end of the Liberal party.

Now this government, Mr. Speaker has the courage to not only legislate well, but to bring in beneficial enterprises. The building of power sites such as Squaw Rapids Dam has increased the Power Corporation’s debt, as well all know, not the net debt but the debt of the people of Saskatchewan for a corporation, and I need not explain the implications. But because of this increased debt, we have been able to cut the price of electrical energy and as we grow bigger and bigger, we will find that we will get electricity cheaper and cheaper. The reduction is welcomed I am sure by all the beneficiaries, be they farmers, businessmen, or just plain citizens. This fact alone should smarten up the opposition making it clear that when they criticize our corporation debt, our gross debt, then they are barking up the wrong tree if they are trying to get votes, Mr. Speaker.

Our government gives priority to the people. We have continued policies of aiding the needy, our surpluses have been used for the education, for the building of schools, and only recently we completed a school in Cumberland House of which we are very proud and for which I wish to thank the Minister of Education because these people needed a good school and they got it. I am sure that other communities will get the same consideration because of our philosophy and our thinking that direction.

We have developed fodder and pasture projects, we have built good roads into our hinterland and thousands of other excellent purposes for the conservation of land, water and wildlife resources. We have cut taxes, but I would rather see that the money be spent for projects such as these which are of value to the people of this province rather than just cut taxes.

I do not think at this time that anybody in Saskatchewan can say that they are taxed heavily. As a matter of fact, I agree with the minister who spoke before me, that the people of Saskatchewan are the lowest taxed people in Canada if we take all taxes into consideration. It struck me just now, that we save on insurance premiums about \$11,000,000 a year for the people of this province and if you take it on a per capita basis it means we have reduced taxes for the people of Saskatchewan by \$11.00 per capita. This is a payment that they don’t have to make, in other words it is a saving in expenses. Consider that people save by having a good government. We have returned the monies that we have collected to municipalities in grants of one kind or another, and much has been said about that: for social aid; for good roads; for seeding down right of way; for bus routes and for paying a large share of the cost of education. This year as it has been pointed out in the throne speech there will be an extra \$5,000,000 more or so for that purpose to keep school taxes down.

Surely, my friends opposite would not have us return to the old days of the ox and the horse, to the old days of Liberal rule. Surely, they don’t mean that, Sir. Surely, they would not turn back the clock on progress to the days of Jimmy Gardiner and the windmills of his day. Surely, not that.

The throne speech is directed towards human needs as I have said and as it should be. The proposed increases for education and for other purposes which we have to consider before the session is through are going to be welcomed by the people of this province. That is why I think when people from outside come into this province and see the development and the progress that we have here, they often say, that they are surprised. They generally agree that Saskatchewan is the best province in Canada to live in.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Maybe there are places, Sir, that you can make more money, but I'm doubtful about that after hearing the statistics that the minister gave us this evening. I go along with many other people, knowing that there, is a bright future for this province, I think it is a province of provinces and we are very proud to be living here. I think that the Leader of the Opposition has conceded the point, however, he and his Liberals would like to be at the head of the government, instead of being in the opposition. He would like to have all this glory that the province today has and which belongs to the people of Saskatchewan and to this government. I think that is really what they want and so they make the kind of irresponsible statements that we have heard from them from time to time.

Why shouldn't the Saskatchewan people have confidence in this government? We did not give away for free the mineral resources of this province to corporate powers as they did, or as Liberals now do in Quebec and Newfoundland and in other Liberal provinces. I recall, speaking in this house during my first or second term, I mentioned the big steal in Quebec and Newfoundland. The iron ore that was there was sold out practically for nothing to the mining companies at one cent a ton, I pointed out how unfair it was that the people who staked this property were able to get seven times as much, or seven cents a ton. On top of that, these Liberal governments put a ceiling on top of the amount of royalties they could collect. I think in Quebec it was \$80,000. On 10,000,000 tons, yes, they couldn't collect any more than \$80,000 in royalties! We don't do things like that in this province, we believe that the resources of this province of Saskatchewan belong to the people of Saskatchewan and we the people are entitled to a fair share of these royalties. This is the difference between us and the hon. members who sit to the left of you, Sir. They would give away all the resources that we have in this province for free and the record is very clear because when they were in power they did not collect royalties or when they did, it did not amount to peanuts. An hon. member interrupts and says they didn't have any wells. Mr. Speaker, in 1944, and prior to that time. Well, there was a mine in my constituency and from the time this mine commenced operating and producing ore, from 1928 until 1944, they collected I think less than \$600,000. We now collect anywhere from a \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000 a year from the same company. That is the comparison, Sir. There is the reason why today by having corporations pay their fair share for the exploitation of resources that belong to the people, we obtain revenues today with which to build good schools, to build roads and to bring prosperity to this province. It isn't just the fact that we have had a good wheat crop that has made us prosperous as I have said.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Berezowsky: — My experience with the hon. members opposite has been with the member from Prince Albert (D.G. Steuart) and members opposite generally, that they only know about four words, stagnation! yes that, High Taxes! compulsion and free enterprise! I don't want to go into all this because I think that they themselves don't believe what they say to be true. I know they don't believe it, but they feel that they can bamboozle the people of Saskatchewan to really believe that there is something to these generalities. I recall quite well, in a by-election a year ago, a little over a year ago now, in Prince Albert, when we heard these words. Compulsion, Stagnation, High Taxes, propaganda paid for with the money that the Liberal Party received from certain people. But when the hon. members, when the politicians were cornered about "Compulsion" here is the kind of thing they said. "Well, we are referring to the compulsion against implement dealers. These people have to buy licenses and they have to keep so much stock of repairs on hand, and it shouldn't be so". According to them, we should have an implement agent on every corner in every village and if a farmer bought a combine worth \$10,000 or \$8,000 and needed some repairs then if he went to one of these dealers he could not be able to buy repairs because dealers wouldn't have to keep any repairs and didn't have to be licensed.

Implement dealers told me and they told the hon. member from Prince Albert and others, that they wanted our kind of legislation. I have never met a farmer yet, who hasn't said that he wants this kind of legislation. After all if you are going to have laws, or order, and for good government, and so the people will have some kind of security it means these laws must be obeyed and surely the hon. members in this house sitting opposite believe as I do that when laws are passed they should be obeyed and if they are good laws then they should not generalize by crying compulsion, because every law has to have come compulsion in it to be effective. This is the kind of propaganda they tell the fishermen in the north when fishermen organize themselves at a lake deciding to sell fish to either a private company or to a co-operative, or when the majority has decided what to do with these fish, my friends opposite say to the minority, "Well, look at this socialist government, they force you to sell the fish to whom the majority has decided to sell". Now I don't know what kind of thinking that can be, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to refer to what the hon. member from Milestone, (Mr. Erb) said the other day. I recall that he made a vicious attack against co-operative clinics and doctors who came to this country from Great Britain, and some of those who work in these clinics. I think this is a shameful exhibition against these fine doctors and against our fine Saskatchewan people, who had the vision and the determination to organize themselves to assure that health services would be possible for them.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Berezowsky: — These demagogues opposite only think of their own selfish interests and forget that people have rights too. Not only as members of a society but rights as individuals to have their own clinics, their own doctors who should have hospital privileges in the hospitals built by the people. People have a right as free men to organize for their own good and no self-appointed dictator like the member from Milestone can deny them that right.

I have been talking about laws. Just imagine if you had the Liberal Party in power, with that kind of philosophy, saying that people did not have the right to organize co-operative or community clinics, they would pass a law, and they would be first rate dictators in this country. Hon. members know very well what he said, and if he didn't say it, he insinuated it. It was very clear to all of us and to all the people that heard him speak, what he meant.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of a hospital board, I agree with the member from Regina that this government should legislate according to the recommendations of the Commissioner, Mr. Justice Mervyn Woods. The Commissioner has made very careful studies and wise recommendations. My colleagues on the board, not all of them, but most of them, on the Victoria Union Hospital Board have on different occasions indicated their unhappiness with present regulations. This is what they say "Who are we laymen to decide whether an applicant doctor should be given privileges or not? We must abide by recommendations of the medical advisory committee on these matters because they are the people who can and should properly and without prejudice made recommendations". Hospital board members know there is prejudice and I know there is prejudice, and it has been admitted that it is prejudice by Doctor Barootes and other doctors of Saskatchewan. There is prejudice in Prince Albert. Yes, there is! I could tell you stories that would make your hair stand on end as to what has happened, and naturally so, because individual doctors are often threatened by newcomers who are going to compete in the professional field with them. The hon. member from Milestone need not slur British or other doctors who for philosophical reasons and not for economic reasons decide to serve the public in diagnosing and curing ailments.

Mr. Erb: — Mr. Speaker, I did not slur any doctor in my speech, I slurred no doctor . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Many of our Canadian doctors go to Britain to train and improve themselves further. This would indicate that the training in the old world has merit and value. Why then, slur doctors who are trained in England and in Europe and come to serve the public in our province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Erb: — Mr. Speaker, I repeat I did not slur the doctors.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, the record will show what the hon. member said. I would like to suggest to the government to go further with Hospital Standards legislation than what is suggested. Presently members of hospital boards are nominated by councils of villages, municipalities, towns and cities and they sit, they make decisions and they are not responsible to anyone; I know I am not, neither to the public nor to the municipality, only to the hospital standards and regulations. But it seems sometimes that these people on these boards are responsible to the medical profession by force of circumstances, and that is a bad situation. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, these boards and members should be required to report and account to the parent body who nominate them or appoint them and act in serious matters, be it capital construction or policy only upon approval of the municipality who put them there. I think it is a most dangerous situation when millions of dollars are being spent on the say so of a few people so nominated. I think it is dangerous and vicious when policies such as extra charges against patients are adopted without the approval of municipalities, and that is

what we have in the city of Prince Albert at one of the hospitals. I think it is a dangerous situation when boards fail to act responsibly in approving medical staff members, but only act as rubber stamps to the locally established medical advisory committee. I think it is dangerous and a sinister condition when the profession is allowed to have an exclusive club in our hospitals at the full expense of the paying public, and the public has nothing to say about it.

Mr. Speaker, I must add at this time that community clinic doctors continue to be harassed at every turn and denied hospital privileges in some institutions that we the people build, maintain and support. Freedom of practice in hospitals by community doctors is a farce. They haven't got it and from time to time to my personal knowledge community clinic doctors have been summoned by pernicious special committees for investigation and so-called discipline, instead of being disciplined by the College of Physicians. These are the kind of things that are happening and that is why I mention them in this house.

This, Sir, is a s-called free country, and the member from Saltcoats, (Mr. Snedker) (he is not here now, he is coming in) he should take note of these things when he talks about socialism and about freedom and about democracy.

May I mention that community clinic doctors in my town have been anxious to meet with the College of Physicians and Surgeons to democratically discuss the problems that should be discussed between them reasonably and with open minds. Though these doctors, like other such medical men, pay heavily into the coffers of the college through annual license fees, (sometimes twice a year) yet they are denied that right so far and I would suggest that is may be wise for a committee of the legislature to meet with the community clinic doctors so that this legislature may get the true picture of this alleged harassment and also to consider if the licensing by the university or some other independent body would not be more in line with written or unwritten bill of rights.

I realize, of course, Sir, that some hon. members opposite would not go for these suggestions, especially the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) who so viciously attacked, as I said, the community clinics and the doctors associated with these clinics. I, of course, realize that community clinics are an economic challenge against private clinics and may affect the exploitation of young capable doctors who work for wages for such private clinics, but as my hon. friends opposite have said, this a free country and there must be free competition and so if beginners can do better financially in community clinics than they would in private clinics then there should be no complaint by anyone who believes in free enterprise, or what they call responsible enterprise.

To explain what I mean just a little more clearly to hon. members, may I say that I know of a very capable young doctor, who is working in a private clinic for the sum of \$6,000 a year in a town in Alberta, and I know that if he came into our Prince Albert clinic, that he would get considerably more pay for his services than he is getting in these other clinics.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Why doesn't he came here?

Mr. Berezowsky: — It seems to me, Sir, that this may be the main reason for the harassment of community clinic doctors. The refusal of medical committees to recommend hospital privileges to first-rate doctors, simply, it seems to me it is a threat that private clinics are afraid of, that they will make less money with competition from community clinics.

But, Mr. Speaker, just as no one can stop the sun from shining each day, so will no one be able to stop the progress of universal medicine in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we have to face new values, lets be serious about this business of politics, and legislature, and I say we must face new values and go forward. The late Dr. H.M. Coady, former Director of St. Francis-Xavier University is quoted to have said, I am going to quote this article to you: This is what he says –

We have no desire to create a nation of shopkeepers, whose only thoughts run to groceries and to dividends, we want our people to look into the sun and into the hearts of the flowers, and into the hearts of their fellow man. We want them to live, to love, to play,

and to pray with all their being. We want them to be men, whole men, eager to explore all the avenues of life and to attain perfection in all their faculties. Life for them shall not be in terms of merchandising but in terms of all that is good and beautiful, be it economic, political, social, cultural or spiritual. They are the heirs of all the ages and of all the riches yet concealed. All the findings of science and philosophy are theirs. All the creations of art and literature are for them. If they are wise they will create the instruments to obtain them. They will usher in the new day by attending to the blessings of the old. They will use what they have to secure what they have not.

All, all we have to do, Mr. Speaker, and my friends, is to follow this kind of advice to build a province above all provinces and a nation above all nations. The time now is to continue building a good society, and it will take time to achieve the goal and the proposal becomes clear to all of us. Such standards and such audits have only begun, and I would welcome and plead that we all take steps to bring about these political and economic objectives, namely, the goal of new values in our society.

At this time I would like to bring some of the problems to the attention of the government which I find in my constituency, I might not have another opportunity.

I would like to see some answers that will satisfy the public concerned. I have as hon. members know a considerable area of hard rock country, pre-Cambrian, as we often referred to it. I agree with all members in this house, with the opposition and with the members on this side that we need more development in mining. I know and I think no one will deny the fact that Saskatchewan, being in the heart of Canada, has problems of transportation and distances from railhead, but I do think that now is the time to start some kind of program which will encourage prospectors and mining people to do a little more than they have done in the past. In talking not so long ago to the manager of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, he pointed out to me that most of the large deposits in Canada have been found, there may be a few more, and from now on the smaller deposits of commercial value are going to be found by the prospectors, and if that is the case, Sir, then I think this legislature should take a good look towards enacting or bringing about some sort of program that is going to encourage this kind of development in our province.

Some suggestions I would like to make are based on some of the practices we have followed in other departments. I think that a prospector, if he staked claims, and after say a provincial geologist has examined his claims, and the indications are that there is a chance to find an ore body, and if this prospector does work of any kind that he should be assisted to do some development work. I know in my own case, many years ago, I spent hundreds, nay, thousands of dollars, trying to find deposits. I am interested to see extensive developments in Saskatchewan, but most prospectors don't get anything back, yet, if you compare say a man with a pasture lease, if he puts up fences, if he digs wells, and so forth, and somebody later on comes along, at least this man is compensated for these improvements he put up. Why can't we follow some kind of program like that for these people that are trying to find mines.

I am only referring to properties that have real potential, areas that have been approved by our geologists. I am not saying we should pay for blasting a bunch of granite or anything like that, but I do think that we have some areas where indications are good, and that we should encourage prospectors, either by paying a fair share of the cost of this kind of development, or a guarantee somehow to them that in event they couldn't hold on to the claim and these claims are later restaked, and they make a mine, that they will benefit somewhat from their original find. It would be fair treatment for the prospectors and it would be a good thing for the province.

I would like to suggest another policy for the north and for other parts of Saskatchewan, where we have local improvement districts. When the Liberals were in power in this province of Saskatchewan, many of the people were so hard up they abandoned homestead land and many of these lands are today under lease to adjacent farmers. I think it would be a good thing whereby we would have a policy to do more breaking than we are doing now and I wish to thank the Minister of Municipal Affairs for the program that he has. It is a good program. The only thing I am saying, Sir, is that in my opinion, this kind of program doesn't go far enough. Instead of breaking

say, 125 acres in this day and age of automation and of larger farms, I think we should have a program of assistance to the extent of about 300 acres for each farmer and in that way these quarter sections, be they submarginal or good lands, could be cleared and broken and brought into production or as an alternative the departments of government concerned, could provide sufficient money to do the breaking and clearing so that these lands could be put into production. Or alternatively again, I would suggest, that possibly the Department of Municipal Affairs, with the understanding that the Local Improvement Branch could turn over these lands to the Department of Agriculture to qualify under the program that we have now with the Department of Agriculture, which is not limited in acreage, according to my understanding, in breaking and clearing projects.

Reference is made in the throne speech to northern housing and to other northern needs, and I would say on behalf of the people of my constituency and part of the constituency of Athabaska which I had to adopt (because the member for Athabaska was too busy with other things), I wish to thank the government for carrying on housing programs. I think they started a year ago with a few houses and the program now, according to the throne speech, will be about 100 houses a year. This means we will have a 1,000 houses in a very short time, I hope that the needs of the people will be met in the very near future, and many people have asked me to thank the government for its concern. They don't want paternalism, they like the way we are doing it. They can go ahead and cut lumber at cost, which is about \$7.50M, and if the family hasn't got the money to pay for the lumber they need to build this house, or to help build his house, then they can do some work to produce more lumber, in other words, pay with kind. Logging and hauling is the responsibility of the residents. The department must, of course, provide sawmills and some technical operators and planners and carpenters to show how these houses should be built well.

I think the overall program of the Northern Administration District is now an excellent one, a very good program, and I am glad that it is being broadened, and that in the near future good living quarters will be the pleasure of all northern people, wherever they may be, and I think good homes are a step to better life, a more dignified life, and I am all for the program that the government proposes to carry out.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot find words to explain how proud the people are who have built some of these homes. I know when I was down in Molonosa this fall, this being in my constituency, I met two men, two of my constituents. Their houses weren't high class but they were just as proud as if a new born baby had come into the family and natives love babies, so you can see what I mean.

I think at this time I could also thank the interdepartmental committee that has brought various departments together for the many recommendations that have been made to the government. I would suggest to the government and the executive council that these recommendations are very good in my opinion, and I hope the government will carry them through.

Now, Sir, all of us are aware of the existing problems on Indian reserves, which in some respects are not any different than outside the reserves. The things that I have seen, say at Loon Lake reserve, I see them in Prince Albert every day, I mentioned at one time a similar happening at La Ronge where children were starved and fainted from malnutrition yet this was denied by the hon. member for Athabaska at that time who was a principal of this school. I haven't taken it back because after checking I was told that this did happen, but whether it happened there or anywhere else, the fact remains that there are some bad situations. There are still people who cannot read nor write. There is still malnutrition, as I have said, and some starvation. There is still segregation – very shameful – I have seen it, and I could give you many examples, however, I am glad to see that appropriate action is being taken by the Department of Indian Affairs, who are doing a good job under numerous restrictions and are trying to get a program of adult education going.

I think this government in co-operation with the Department of Indian Affairs can do a great many things. Let me suggest some – the Department of Highways contracted out a section of road in my constituency to the native people at Montreal Lake. I understand it is costing slightly more, Mr. Minister, but the job is tremendous. You are taking people off relief rolls, you are giving them dignity and the cost is as I said very little more than if it had been done otherwise.

I think this is the kind of thing that we must do more of. I would like to see the people on the reserves have the same kind of privileges and opportunities to get assistance, whether it be social aid, educational, or other privileges that are available to the rest of the people of this province and of Canada. In other words, I would like to say this, that though natives should not lose any of the provisions of their treaties, (that is the commitment of the government of Canada) yet they should gain all the rights and privileges that we can offer them, so they can be equal citizens and not second rate citizens. I ask myself this, "How can we possibly continue as we have been doing, segregating a segment of our contemporary society, some 150,000 people in Canada, 25,000 people in Saskatchewan". Mr. Speaker, I have worked very closely with the native people and believe me they behave the same as other human beings do and they have the same problems and I think the same answers would pertain to solve their problems.

I can also say that people I have met, many people of Saskatchewan, are very happy to see the savings that have been made in the operation of crown corporations being returned to them. The reduction in power rates is commendable. But I do hope these reductions are not made, (the minister is not here) at the expense of any possible projects. There are a number of areas in Saskatchewan where we have resorts to where we should bring power, and I think particularly of one resort in my constituency at Candle Lake. There are some 300 cottages and I am sure by co-operation between the Department of Natural Resources and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, a power project, desired, feasible and worthwhile, could be built.

Mr. Speaker, Candle Lake is one of the finest family outing and sport lakes in Saskatchewan. It is not too far away from the cities of Saskatoon, Prince Albert and Regina. Many people come there. We have hundreds of cabins as I have said, one of the finest lodges, probably the finest, for tourists, a good area for fishing, hunting and for recreation. Beautiful lakes, beautiful country. The roads now connect it with the Hanson Lake Road, and I invite all members to spend their free time in our beautiful country.

We have everything one could look for which you cannot find many thousands of miles away. So I suggest to all Saskatchewan people to enjoy the gifts of nature in our beautiful province and in my constituency. I repeat amenities such as power are a responsibility to that area which should be accepted without delay for the improved comfort of the thousands of people who come there and for the hundreds that have cottages and for the tens of dozens that live there.

At this time I would also like to commend the Minister of Municipal Affairs for recent amendments to the L.I.D. Act, allowing for setting up of telephone companies in local improvement districts. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, at this time today at Paddockwood they are celebrating the opening of the first rural telephone company in a Local Improvement District, number 9,590. I was invited to be there but I thought my responsibility was to be here, so I sent them congratulations from the government, that is all of us here, and from myself, for a good system which would bring them joy and pleasure in the future.

Certainly the commencement of the resources roads to Cumberland and to Pelican Narrows enroute to Island Falls is another bouquet for the people of the north. Over 2,000 local people will be able to associate more freely with the rest of us in Saskatchewan when these roads are built and new lakes, and new mines and good forest and wildlife resource areas will be open to Saskatchewan people. May I extend to the government and to the Minister of Natural Resources in particular our thanks for these worthwhile projects, and the thanks of the people. I know it took a lot of work and a lot of persuasion of the people in Ottawa to agree to these programs and I say that the minister and all those who have been responsible in some way for its achievement, will have the satisfaction of being known in the future as builders of not only Saskatchewan but builders of Canada.

All these things I have mentioned are progressive steps and forward goals. To some extent they bring people closer together – there is possibly more centralization than we had years ago, as some hon. members opposite have mentioned and always decry. Some of this centralization is good. In some areas we have decentralized and we decentralize because it is good. This is all for the good life and for good government and for a good future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning I believe that the highest purpose of government is to obtain the highest achievement of the potential of human resources. The development of our natural resources is only secondary, but important, and a real government should see that the

waste of either is prevented. This, and according to my belief, the health, the education, the development of as perfect a human being as is possible must be the first goal of any government and certainly of this government of Saskatchewan.

Anything less than the best that society through its government is prepared to do is a betrayal of the responsibilities of office which each of us has had foisted upon us, and it doesn't matter which side of the house we sit on, and which we very knowingly accepted when we accepted nomination for the job.

I have often said that governments are instruments of human welfare in this house. I have had no reason to change my mind and I return I am sure that is the course that I will follow as far as I am concerned, that I am a servant of the people who elected me. The only regret I shall ever have, is if I discover, according to my conscience, I may not have done my best to achieve the purpose, or that the groups of members who are my colleagues and the government have done less than they could have done, and so I can say, Mr. Speaker, because the government is doing just the best that can be possibly done, I shall not support the amendment, but I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabaska): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I would like to add my best wishes to those members who have already spoken and to those who are retiring from public life voluntarily on both sides of the house. Their contributions that they have made will certainly be missed in the future.

I would also like to add my sympathy to those members on your right, Mr. Speaker, who through forced retirement will not be back after the next provincial election. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that it was necessary publicly to correct one of the statements made by the Minister of Social Welfare, however, when one deliberately infers and leaves false impressions, it becomes necessary to do so. His statement last night that I was a civil servant of this government was wrong as he well knows and his statement that an act was specifically amended to allow me to sit in this legislature was also contrary to the facts, because if it was illegal and wrong for me to sit before the amendment was passed by the legislative assembly in session of 1961, it was also wrong for anyone, who was a holder of bonds, stocks, or government securities, who entered into a contract with Saskatchewan Government Insurance, or received a claim from the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Board, it was wrong for those who entered into contracts under The Family Farm Improvement Act, or received compensation under The Game Act, or held a lease or permit under The Provincial Parks or Forestry Act, because those people were also specifically mentioned in the amendment that was brought in to The Legislative Act at that time.

It was also true, of course, that my position was perhaps made clear by this act, but certainly it was not passed for my benefit alone, or to show the beneficence of this government to Liberal opposition members.

I would also imagine that the people of Saskatoon that the hon. minister represents, and of the province who were listening to the radio broadcast this afternoon, would think that the minister would think that the work of his department, when there are many problems present there would be far more important than wasting air time telling about the membership drive and the political work of the NDP organizers and campaign managers across the northern part of this province.

I am sure that they will think twice before voting and supporting a minister of the crown who spend more time in political hay than he would in dealing with the matters concerning his department.

Now, I was pleased that the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) recognized at last in his speech that the government is twenty years too late in the development of our northern resources, and I can assure him as well as all the members opposite that a new Liberal government after the next election will give it their immediate attention.

I was surprised, however, at the statement made by the same member in regard to the treatment of civil servants, and I think he mentioned that he adopted part of my constituency, and I can assure him that that began back in 1952, when he was a civil servant himself, and also a candidate for the CCF, because he toured the north telling all members in his department

and in other government departments that a vote for the CCF was looked upon with great favor by the government, and left the inference that unless that vote was forthcoming, their jobs would be in jeopardy.

He still does this as do other members opposite, and if the truth were known the only reason why the civil servants in this province today are free from discrimination under the NDP is because a Liberal government back in 1872 introduced the secret ballot into our parliamentary system.

An Hon. Member: — Was he a relative of yours?

Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — Shame . . .

Mr. Guy: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of this address. I want to congratulate them particularly for their consistencies. Their approach was consistent with the approach of very mover and seconder of the past 19 years as they attempted to justify programs of the socialists by comparing Saskatchewan, 1964, with the depression years of 1930 and the war years of the 1940's.

Now no one will deny that Saskatchewan like all other provinces in Canada has seen significant changes take place in the last twenty years. But I am sure also that the people of this province are no different than the people of all the other provinces of Canada where they are concerned with the progress of their province in two main respects: The progress they are making in comparison with their neighboring provinces with a similar economy; and the progress they are making in developing their resources, human and economic, to their full potential.

This is the measuring stick which governments must use today, and when we use that measure in Saskatchewan, it is apparent we are falling far behind in both regards.

The people of the province will who in a few short months that they are not content to measure their progress with relating the present with the past, but they want an administration that will live in the present and plan for the future.

That this is certainly a pre-election address is clearly shown by the attempt to provide a little bit for a lot of people and I was pleased to see that there was a little bit promised for my area, but I am not going to come too excited and I am not going to comment upon the broad terms that existed in the address from the throne, because until they are facts, instead of election fiction, the people of my area will not fall for this political attempt to gain their support.

Now I was pleased to note that the throne speech contained limited reference to our Indian population. I have been hoping that some of the government members would in their speeches outline what the province is prepared to do on behalf of our Indian people.

During my first session in this legislature, I spent considerable time outlining the problems of our Indian people as they existed and some suggestions for solving them. I do not intend to repeat what I said then, it is enough to say that for the most part, these problems still exist and during the past few years the provincial government and the federal Conservative government, have only made a token effort to understand and solve the problems that do exist and I submit further, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason that the Indians were mentioned in this year's throne speech is because it is an election year and again they want their support.

I followed with interest the federal-provincial conference last fall, when the problems of Canada's first citizens were discussed and particularly the suggestion by Saskatchewan's Premier, that control of Indian affairs should be taken over by the provinces, and I'm going to comment further on this a little later on. I also followed at this time, with regret and revulsion, the attempts of certain members opposite to gain publicity to further their own political ends from an unfortunate incident that occurred among our Indian people. I am sure that all members in this house and all the people of this province were saddened to hear of the death of an Indian child on a reserve in north-western Saskatchewan during the Christmas season, but thank heavens, Mr. Speaker, no everyone jumped in their cars to race to the scene of the tragedy bent on making political hay out of this event. Before any professional statements could be made regarding the death, two government MLA's turned doctors were shouting across the length and breadth of this province that the child had died of malnutrition and many more were likely to do so. The doctor in charge of the case said this was not necessarily so, but this didn't silence the two doctor MLA's who because

of the number two to one thought they could shout the medical practitioner down. A post-mortem and a coroners jury subsequently found that the statements of the MLA's were completely false and that the death was caused by virus pneumonia . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, this is not true . . .

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

Mr. Guy: — Now not only is he the doctor in charge, but also the coroner's jury. During the next few days government members fired up an over imaginative press, blamed the Indian Affairs Department, they blamed the Indian and Northern Health Services and they blamed the Indian mothers themselves for neglecting their children. The provincial Conservative leader, not to be outdone in an attempt to gain cheap political advantage, blamed the provincial government.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I take objection, at no time did the two government members concerned and I speak for myself make an attack against . . .

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

Mr. Guy: — It is also worthy to note that although those members opposite were so concerned out on the hustings, you might say, and pledged the people from that area that there would be a full provincial inquiry that tonight he spoke for one hour and he said we know there are bad conditions but the Indian Department is doing a good job. Now if that doesn't prove the point that that trip into that part of the province was for nothing more than political expediency, and completely against what you might say, common sense, there could be no other interpretation of the actions in that regard.

Now, I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is worthy to note, that during these frenzied days, at no time did the Liberal Party take any part in these accusations, because we were aware that attempts to gain cheap political advantages, cheap publicity at the expense of our Indian friends will only compound and not solve the problem.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Guy: — We know that serious problems do exist, just as we know that we are all — federal, provincial and municipal governments, and individuals, past and present, individually and collectively — to blame for the state of our Indian citizens today. It was amazing to see the show of concern of this government over the existing conditions that brought about the tragedy on an Indian reservation, while at the same time, they are almost totally blind to far worse conditions that exist amongst our Metis people. Surely we are not naïve enough to suggest that cases of child neglect by Metis and white parents never occur to the point where serious health and social illness develop.

Mr. Speaker, the government opposite should hang their heads in shame, in view of many of the conditions that exist among our Metis population. Yet, as I said, we don't hear the government MLA's suggesting legislative inquiries into the condition surrounding these people for whom the government must accept full responsibility. I can show you Metis families in the northern part of this province who are much worse off under this government than the Treaty Indians in the same area who are administered by the Indian Affairs Department. The government opposite must accept a good part of the blame for the economic and social conditions which are a root of most of the Metis and Treaty Indian problems that exist today.

They have had 20 years to develop our industries so jobs would be available for our Indian and Metis people who can no longer make a living off the land, but there are fewer jobs available today than there were 20 years ago. Until there are jobs available for these people their attempts to educate and train them will bear little fruit. They have had 20 years to provide better living standards such as homes, power, telephones, but only in the past two or three years has any start been made. They have had 20 years to work out an agreement with the federal government to provide health and welfare services to Indians, yet Indians are still not eligible for supplementary old age pension, blind allowances and many others. Yet during

these 20 years, this government has not been shy in collecting royalties and fees for fur and fish, for collecting game licenses, automobile licenses, gasoline and other taxes from these people. It has been a question of taking as much as they can and giving as little as possible. The record of the Conservative government in Ottawa was no better. For five years they promised and for five years they reneged. One is not surprised that little was done when one considers the general lack of sympathy and understanding the Conservative leaders have shown towards our Indian friends.

The Saskatchewan provincial leader was quick to blame liquor for the major causes of neglect of Indian children. Subsequently he relegated our Indian to the role of second class citizens when he described the natives as people unable to adapt as yet to the moderate use of a commodity as destructive as liquor. I would suggest that if Mr. Pederson would check the court records for any given day he will find that there a lot of white people who have been unable to adapt to the moderate use of this commodity. It isn't a weakness common to Indians alone. This inferred suggestion, that Indians should not have equal rights with other Saskatchewan people, is hardly worthy of a Saskatchewan political leader who is aspiring to the role of Premier.

A similar attitude by a Saskatchewan Conservative Senator when he was recorded in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix April 27th, 1961, as saying that Indians in Saskatchewan deliberately give their children some thing to cause fever so that they can take their children and leave them at the hospitals so they can have a day in town. This attitude shows that the Conservatives both provincial and federal have little faith in the quality and integrity of our Indian friends, and should they ever form a government they would be beyond doubt continuing policies that would keep our Indian as a second class citizen.

Now I would be remiss if I were not to point out this time for the records of this house that all major strides in helping the Canadian Indian has come under a Liberal government in Ottawa. Old age pensions, family allowances, health services, housing programs, education, scholarships, revisions of the Indian Act and so on, were all made possible for Indians by Liberal administration and in the last five months alone, Mr. Speaker, more has been done by the new Liberal government in Ottawa than during the whole five years of conservative administration. These advances include a \$10.00 increase in old age pension, which is a tremendous benefit to our Indian people, a new health program for reserves to allay some of the conditions which we previously mentioned. They set up a claims commission to hear grievances of Indian bands in regards to their treaty rights. They organized an Indian research program extending over a three year period to assess the participation of Indians in the social and the economic life of our country and to gather the knowledge needed for future programs to promote their welfare and progress in the field of economic development, education, band councils and self government.

They have increased the number of educational scholarships to the point where no Indian child today needs to go without an education because of lack of funds. They have increased the winter works program on the reserves when the provincial programs have not proven adequate. Finally they organized the first conference with the United States government on Indian Affairs and problems common to both countries. I am sure you will all agree that this is a good record for less than a year in office.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Guy: — I can also assure the Indian people of this province that when we form a Liberal government after the election, that we will do more in 20 months than he NDP did in 20 years.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Guy: — A Liberal government in Saskatchewan would not be prepared to stand idly by and watch our Indian friends lose their initiative, independence, and identity by subjecting them to a policy of social aid, handouts and personal control. We have a program aimed at helping the Indians to help themselves become a integral part of our economic and social environment, we will encourage them to hold their heads high as they work side by side with their white brothers in jobs which they have been specially trained for and which will be made available by a Liberal industrial and resource development program.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Guy: — We will hire Indians in civil service and crown corporations, where they will gain knowledge and understanding of the white man's system of government. We will further assist the Indian to play his rightful role in our society by giving him representation on each commission or other body appointed to make regulations respecting hunting, fishing, trapping and other affairs affecting our Indian people.

We will insure that Indians receive their rightful consideration as the first inhabitants of the land, in hunting, fishing and other special privileges in provincial parks. We will alleviate existing crowded conditions on reserves where possible, by using crown lands to enlarge existing reserves and create additional ones. We will fulfill our responsibilities through agreement with the federal government to improve health, welfare, educational and other services, we will also work closely with the federal government in adopting a system of decentralization of administration whereby band councils will assume more authority in the carrying out of their needs.

The Liberal Party is aware that there is no simple answer to the problems of our Indian people, but we are prepared to institute programs which will first of all be in keeping with the dignity of the Indians, and will maintain their traditional rights, until such time as the Indian people themselves working closely with federal and provincial, and municipal authorities will agree on a new system of administration.

Before closing I would like to comment briefly on the dominion-provincial conference and the proposal of our Premier that was placed before it regarding the change in Indian jurisdiction. Because another conference in this regard will be held shortly, perhaps too much should not be said at this time because at the present time there are many sides to the question of Indian administration. One would be jumping to conclusions to give an unqualified yes or not in favor of Mr. Lloyd's suggestion. I believe that eventually control of Indian affairs will come to the province, but I don't believe that the time is yet upon us when this move can be or should be made completely.

Before contemplating such a move, several facts must be taken into consideration. First and foremost this move must have the support of the Indian people. Now it is true that the Premier gave his assurance that such a move could only be made after consultation with the Indians, but I suggest that this is not enough. We remember this government consulted with the doctors over the medicare and then they did just the opposite to the doctors' wishes. This could happen to the Indians as well. The request for complete control while having the federal government maintain financial responsibility is not logical. Control must lie within the body controlling the purse or else inefficiency and waste would result. In fact I was told by a government employee that if the provincial government had full control of the Indian affairs they would immediately put 85 social workers on the reserves. I wouldn't doubt it. This would be an opportunity to put 85 of their political organizers in the reserves to campaign and work among the Indian people. The federal affairs employee said if we could afford 25 social workers, we would be able to do the job. This government's record in regard to assisting the Metis as I have already pointed out, is not an enviable one, and so would the Indians fare any better. Their record is also one of regimentation and restriction on the minority groups which must be avoided at all costs. I would suggest that perhaps the first step that should be taken to set up a provincial committee or Department of Indian Affairs, who through co-operation with the Federal Indian Affairs Department would have no difficulty in making provincial programs available to the Indians on an equal basis. This would shorten the lines of communication between the Indian and their authority, and would permit more provincial and municipal participation.

It is still important that final control be vested in the federal government to protect the Indians rights and to see that there is a solid financial base to work from. At present when not enough money is available, it is most important that federal provincial and municipal governments are all contributing a share to the additional and extended programs of assistance, that are needed immediately to alleviate the conditions as they exist today.

We will be watching with great interest the discussions that will be forthcoming when provincial premiers and federal authorities again discuss Indian affairs and I'm sure I speak for all on this side of the house when I say it is our sincere hope that decisions will be made which will result in closer provincial and federal agreement and programs to benefit our Indian brothers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken long enough at this particular time, there are one or two other comments I want to make in regard to my constituency, but I'll leave that for the budget debate. I think it is quite . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Privilege, the hon. member imputed motives on my trip to Loon Lake, and I would like him to withdraw that. I did not know of any case, I was there to visit my family for Christmas, and I just happened to run into this situation, I would like him to withdraw, as I don't think it is fair to me that he has suggested the motive.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Guy: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no intentions of imputing any motives. I know what happened. I am quite capable of assessing the reasons for those actions, particularly in view of what has happened since that time and, therefore, we will leave the matter rest.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I don't care what the hon. member thinks, the fact is I had no motive to go to Loon Lake, I went there for a visit, and I wish he would . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Guy: — I will support the amendment and Ill oppose the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the speech from the throne, and I'll try to make my remarks as short as possible. I want to congratulate them for giving a very good display of ability in presenting, in describing the speech from the throne.

I want to first say a few words about my constituency. First of all, I want to thank the local governments in my constituency who have co-operated really well with the senior government and a great deal of results have come out of it.

As far as the rural and the urban municipalities, they have benefitted by the grid roads, sewer and water programs and many of the programs of this government. I want to say that at all times the co-operation was at a high level, and I also want to make mention of some of the things that have happened, we always take a few championships in that constituency and if it is not an oratory contest, or something else, I want to bring to the attention of this house at this time that the volleyball girls of Yellow Creek have taken the provincial championship and the volleyball boys, the high school boys, from Kinistino, have also taken the championship for 1963 for the province, and besides the championships, I want to say, that they usually give us a very good account of themselves by winning several scholarships. I also want to make mention that during the session they do make a few trips to the legislature and they do bring quite a few children to visit the capital city. Now this is due to co-operation of their home and school, the school unit and the parents as a whole. And, Mr. Speaker, I have every reason to be proud to represent the constituency of Kinistino, they work so well.

Now I would like to say a few words — I'm going to be very brief in my remarks — about the retiring members of this legislature. I think that the work, the experience that I have had in five years, the work is very interesting, and knowing the members personally I know that they have contributed their best. They will have nothing but pleasant memories, I am sure that the members on this side of the house, will remember the 20 years or several years that they have spent there as years that were worthwhile living.

First of all, I want to go back to my constituency, and talk about the regional parks board that is being set up. The people in my constituency have started organizing the local governing groups to institute a parks board, for the development of three lakes: Wakaw Lake, Dixon Lake and Fishing Lake. Now with the co-operation of the Department of Natural Resources, which will undoubtedly help to the tune of 60 per cent as they have done with other regional parks, and I think that we can make our constituency into one of the nicest recreational areas of this province, and I certainly invite the people of this house to visit Wakaw Lake, Poplar Beach, Bonne Madone Beach,

and Fishing Lake, because they are one of the good fishing areas of the area.

Now in speaking about the different departments I want to congratulate the Minister of Highways, the Hon. C.C. Willis for the wonderful program that he has carried out. When we see our province with 75 per cent of its driving done on dust-free roads, I think it is an achievement and I don't think we have to talk very long about our highways, the only thing we have to do is get out on the road and drive and we can see for ourselves.

Now as far as the grid road program is concerned, I must say that we are quite proud of that too, but I want to remind the members opposite, that when the CCF government suggested a grid road program, the Liberal party said it was too costly and they had tried it out and it had not worked. Now in order to prove this I want to quote from a paper – I see some shake their heads about it, the speech by Jimmy Gardiner at Dysart, Saskatchewan. The hon. J.G. Gardiner, federal Minister of Agriculture said her Thursday night, and I quote:

A large school unit and the grid road plan had been tried before the CCF administration came into power in Saskatchewan and had failed.

Mr. Gardiner was speaking to 300 people, — I don't know where they could get that many now – in the town 40 mile north-east of Regina on behalf of Lloyd Crawford, Liberal candidate for Touchwood constituency.

To listen to them talking you would think nothing ever happened in Saskatchewan until you got a CCF government. Liberal administration had laid the ground work for highways, power and telephone systems and tried the larger school unit and the municipal grid road system, Mr. Gardiner said, the latter too had been abandoned, he continued, because they had proven too costly and unworkable.

Now this was the former Minister of Agriculture and no doubt he was the mouthpiece of the Liberal party at that time.

Well, now when we spoke about power, I can remember when I went to school – the school teacher would get up and pull down one of the maps of Canada, and first of all he asked us why do we have no industry in Saskatchewan? Well, we were all trained to answer that here you have Niagara Falls, and you have a fall of so many hundreds of feet, and you can develop cheap power and over here you have got iron mines and here you are close to the markets of the world. You will never have industry in Saskatchewan because you have no power, you have no mines, all you have to be contented here with is farming. Now this summer, we saw the opening of Squaw Rapids, we've got the Saskatchewan River Dam well on its way. The power building that was criticized, well this year we hear criticism from one member, it has cut down quite a bit. Now through my constituency, there is a line from Squaw Rapids, I can remember when we talked about rural electrification, they said the "windmill", that is very short, but now there is a row of towers going from end of my constituency to the other end. There is the power line from Squaw Rapids to Saskatoon, branching at Beatty to Prince Albert, and every time I see those towers, it makes me think of Jimmy's windmills, but there is one thing that is quite different about them, they do not depend on the wind to have electricity charged in them.

I also want to make mention of the sewer and water program that has benefited many towns in the province and my constituency has really benefited from it. Every town has sewer and water and some of the villages also, and if it had not been for the co-operation of the senior government and the local government this would not have been possible.

As far as the Agriculture Department is concerned we have also benefited by our ag. rep service. And when I hear the members opposite talk about civil service, I want to tell them that we have a secretary for the ag. rep in my constituency, who is on the Liberal executive, and I can assure you he is not worried about losing his job.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Thibault: — I am certainly proud to be with a group that can do this. When the list was shown here a while ago, what happened to the civil service when a Liberal government got in, I don't know whether their attitude has changed, I hope it has.

Mr. F. Foley (Turtleford): — What happened when you got in? In 1945 . . .

Mr. Thibault: — The civil service commission was set up. Will that suit you? Now . . .

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — After they fired . . .

Mr. Thibault: — I want to compliment the Premier for setting up — I'm going to change this subject a bit — setting up the expropriation committee this summer. I want to say that I must compliment all the members of both sides of the house, the Liberal members, and the CCF members who served on this committee. I want to say that all the way through the committee, the member for Maple Creek, (Mr. Cameron) the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) and the member for Weyburn, (Mr. Staveley), contributed all they had and so did the members on this side, which was composed of Mr. Walker (Attorney-General), the Ho. Mr. Willis, Minister of Highways, Mr. Thurston, (Lumsden) and the member for Regina (Mr. Whelan) and myself. Our staff was very capable in the person of Mr. Sandstrom, Mr. Griffin, and Mr. Koester being their secretary, who did a magnificent job. I'm not going to talk about the report because we will be dealing with it later on. After sitting on the committee for thirty days I came to some conclusions. I thought it was making very good use of members of the legislature. Sometimes when I sit back here and listen to the heckling and bickering that goes on, I often wonder what a waste of time. I think the time of this committee was well spent and I certainly think that a lot of our problems, rather than try to tear them apart in here and not get the best out of them, if they were referred to committees of the legislature, that a lot of this unnecessary wrangling would be done away with, and I think that the public rights board recommended in this report merits a lot of study.

I think the idea of an ombudsman also would be something to think about in our day and age, when governments and their relations with citizens are becoming more and more involved. However, once again I want to say that I am quite happy for having served on this committee, and I want to say once again that the members of both sides of the house co-operated one hundred per cent.

I would like to mention a few words about the Woods Commission. I think that the recommendations should be considered and should be gone ahead with. I am pleased that something is mentioned about the hospital privileges. I had believed that in 1947 that we had done away with the price tag on hospital beds and hospitalization, but in 1963 and 1964, we find that if a patient had a doctor that did not suit the Thatcherites, they were denied a hospital bed with the results (no listen here gentlemen, I don't interrupt too much, I would like to be left alone too.) so now you see that it is known that in some areas, even women had to have their babies at home because the doctor did not have privileges. Now this to me is one of the greatest displays of barbaric souls in civilized bodies. That is the best description that I can give to it.

I would like to talk about these hospital privileges and prove that some thing should be done about them. We had a doctor in Melfort who was harassed about his privileges until finally he got himself a job in England . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I'm sorry I must interrupt you at this time under standing order 30, paragraph 3, I must pose the question on the amendment.

The question being put on the amendment it was negated on the following recorded division:

Yeas – 16

Messieurs

Klein	McFarlane	Coderre
McCarthy	Gardiner	MacDougall
Barrie	Foley	Snedker
McDonald	Guy	Gallagher
Danielson	Horsman	Erb
Cameron		

Nays – 28

Messieurs

Johnson	Meakes	Semchuk
Williams	Thurston	Perkins
Brown	Wood	Thiessen
Brockelbank	Davies	Snyder
Walker	Nicholson	Stevens
Nollet	Stone	Dahlman
Kuziak	Thibault	Kluzak
Cooper (Mrs.)	Berezowsky	Peterson
Sturm (Mrs.)	Michayluk	Broten
Willis		

Mr. Thibault: — I was just going to refer to the harassment of a doctor who finally had to find a job elsewhere. Dr. Dayan came from England and he went back to England, rather than to continue to face what he was continuously subjugated to.

Dr. Dayan, and I am quoting from a letter here, from the secretary of the municipality of Kinistino:

Dr. Dayan is now a consultant casualty surgeon in south Shields Manageable Committee Health Organization which serves several hospitals in the industrial area of South Shields. He is in full charge of his own surgical department, has his own surgical nursing staff, and his duties are associated with the population of about 180,000 people.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Thibault: — Yesterday when I heard the remarks from the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) it sort of answered a question and I often wondered why he never wanted to go back and face his executive in Milestone. After the remarks he made about these doctors and clinics, and British doctors, then I could understand why and I think that he will also get his answer in the city of Regina without any doubt.

I want to say that medical care was born in this province and it was born in spite of all the preventative measures that the Thatcherites could think of, and I warn the people of Saskatchewan that about the worst thing they can do is to give this medicare baby to the Thatcherites for adoption. Heaven only knows what will happen to it. It wouldn't make sense to give a child for adoption to people that didn't want him, and I don't think it makes any more sense to give this medicare baby over to the Thatcherites in this case. Now I want to read a few things, I don't know whether the Liberals have had a change of mind, but from the Ottawa Journal, here the Liberals, of January 25th, the Liberals in Ontario want a plan like in Saskatchewan. Now in British Columbia they passed a Medical Care Act in 1936, chapter 23, and it was never proclaimed, mind you they passed this act

after they had a favorable plebiscite that was held in British Columbia in favor of medicare. They never proclaimed it because the medical association of British Columbia said they would not work under it. Now, mind you, it is almost 30 years, a CCF government would not wait 30 years, things have to be done just a little quicker than that.

Now another instance where they talked about politics in medicine, I would like to quote from the Star Phoenix, November 6, 1961:

Defeat for the CCF seen in stand taken by doctors

It might be the quickest way to defeat the CCF government if the doctors kept their promise not to have anything to do with the proposed state control medicare plan, Dave Boldt, M.L.A. Rosthern, said Friday afternoon in addressing a reorganization meeting of the Rosthern Liberal federal constituency association in Saskatoon.

that was November 6, 1961, so even before we were talking about the medical plan, that was the attitude of the Liberal party before medicare. They have had many of the other provinces to prove themselves in and when they come into here and say we will do something, they make me think of that little scrub bull I had, they say "me to" . . .

Mr. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member a question? I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! You know what the rules are. If the member will permit a question he will take his seat. The member hasn't signified he is prepared to answer a question.

Mr. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — I think he is in breach of The Pure-Bred Sires Act, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Thibault: — Well, I just wanted to throw a little humor in this meeting. Now I would like to make reference to the speech that was delivered just the other day by the member, Hammy McDonald, wherever he comes from, I'll take a guess that it is Moosomin. I want to compliment him. He did a very good job with his speech down at the cafeteria to the university students. He brought me back to 1961 when I listened to his speech, you know I had spent nine weeks in the hospital, saw two days of my seeding, and during that summer all I saw of the outside world was what I could read in the papers and what I could look at through the window, and right through the summer I read in the papers of the worst drought that we had in history. Now, it was amazing how people didn't have a smile anymore, and during that time not able to do anything, I sat and read. I want to say that I read a magazine that said between 30 and 40,000,000 people a year die of starvation in the world. Then I read a book by Dr. Tom Dooley, entitled Deliver Us From Evil and he was a missionary doctor in Viet Nam, and on several occasions he referred and said "to send his hungry people food and not guns" he said "the American guns had killed many of the Viet Nameese people" so it was quite a contrast. The book said Deliver Us From Evil. Send them food and not guns said Dr. Tom Dooley.

Then after all this when about eight weeks had gone by, the crops were so bad that the newspapers said the churches on Sunday will have a day of prayer, all the churches are going to pray for rain. For years we sat on surpluses of food. This is the thing that bothered me. With all this lying in front of you and locked up and not seeing the outside world, then a sister came in and said "What are you doing" and I said this world is funny, we have 40,000,000 people dying of starvation a year, we are sitting on food surpluses. Dr. Tom Dooley tells us to send these hungry people food and not guns and next Sunday we are going to pray for rain and you know something, Sister, I don't believe it is going to rain.

When I heard across the way and on this side of the house a few days ago that we should thank Providence for the big crop we got in 1963, I say the best prayer this nation has ever offered was to make available our surplus foods to the hungry nations of the world and if we got a big crop and if we believe in Divine Providence that is the only logical reason that we did get such an abundant crop.

Now we also said that the Wheat Board should get the credit for the sales of our wheat, but I want to remind the members that we got a Wheat Board only after we got rid of a Liberal government, it was done by a Conservative government, give the devil his due.

Now when we wanted to sell grain to the Iron Curtain countries, we were called subversive, yet Alvin came along and he pulled a log jam out and let the surplus run out, and the members opposite now call it good business. When we wanted a Wheat Board we had to get rid of the Liberals; when we wanted to sell our wheat to the so-called enemy we had to get rid of the Liberals; when we wanted to get the Saskatchewan River Dam, before we could get any action on it, we had to get rid of the Liberals; when we wanted roads to resources we had to get rid of the Liberals; when we wanted federal assistance to hospitals, get rid of the Liberals again. Now I am going to warn the people of Saskatchewan if you don't want to lose those railroads you better get rid of those Liberals in Ottawa.

Now I am not going to be very long, there is only 10 minutes left. We are going to be given a job in the next few months or maybe in a year, the people of the province are going to have to elect a Premier. Now you have two persons to choose from, on one hand you have a man who has desecrated our parliamentary institution and I don't have to tell you how, he didn't want to abide by the rules of the house and he had to be ejected from this house. Now on the other hand . . .

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that is unparliamentary to impute motives of that type, he should spell them out.

Mr. Thibault: — Well, listen, if you are complaining about my notes, I am going to tell you something, I am not reading my speech, that is something you did. We watched you all the way through and you read and read, and for a school teacher, you read it poorly at that.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Thibault: — Now, I want to say on the other hand that we have a man who has upheld the dignity of government. He has been recognized as “man of the year”, he is “citizen of the year”, he has piloted his ship of state while there was mutiny all about him and I am referring to the Thatcherites and I am sure that when the people of this province will choose a Premier to represent us, to look after our affairs for the next four years, I have no doubt in my mind who their choice will be, and this is why I am so humorous and you, no doubt, see by my remarks that I am going to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, with the few minutes left at my disposal I won't have time to deal with matters at length that I had hoped to, or with the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources and the hon. Minister of Agriculture, but I wanted to suggest first that the first thing the Minister of Agriculture do, is go into the Kinistino seat and see if he can find the “scrub bull” as it absolutely contravenes the Pure Bred Sire Act.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main topics of the debate emanating from the other side of the house up until the present time has been - - the so-called amalgamation of the Liberal Party with the conservative Party. I want to say as representative from the south-east part of the province that I am here tonight, I have been here over the last eight years because I have had the support of those types of people and I want to say also that the reason we have so many members from the eastern part of Saskatchewan and the southern part of Saskatchewan is because people who think in a free way of life have banded together to defeat the NDP.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, where the lines are drawn in this forthcoming election. The members of the government have been castigating us for seeking conservative support, for seeking social Credit support and support of all those who seek a free way of life. But I picked up this evening's paper and what did I see. February 19th, 1964, page 13,

Support Promised

A spokesman for the 17th Saskatchewan provincial convention of the Communist Party of Canada, said Monday at the close of the convention, his party would spare no effort to have the CCF-NDP government returned to the province in the forthcoming election. He suggested both parties with the help of the trade unions and farm organizations should combine to defeat the Liberal party. He said the Community Party will nominate at least one candidate in the election.

I picked up the Kamsack Times, I see they are already at work. That is the Kamsack Times, February 13th, 1964 under the advertising columns,

Attention Pelly, Saskatchewan and District

A mass meeting at Pelly hall will be held on February 17th at 8 p.m. National leader of the Communist Party of Canada, Leslie Marks, will speak, everybody welcome.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, and as far as the people on this side of the house are concerned, the party lines are drawn. They are starting out in the constituency represented by one of the most sincere members in this house, a man who has served the province and his people well, and I refer to, of course, Mr. J. Barrie, the member from Pelly, who sit on this side of the house.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of thing, we on this side of the house are going to have to face and are going to have to fight as we have done in the past, in the election ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to deal at great length with the population figures presented by members on the other side of the house, because I picked up tonight's paper and the DBS refutes all the statements made by all the members on the other side of the house and with your permission I am just going to read this:

DBS estimated Canada's population on January 1st, this year rose to 19,102,000, an increase of 335,000 or 1.8 per cent since January 1st, 1963. The increase since July 1st, 1963 was one per cent. Among the provinces the largest numerical growths in the months since January 1st, 1963, was in Ontario, a growth of two per cent, Quebec was next with an increase of 1.7 per cent, other provinces and their percentage increases were, British Columbia 2.1 per cent, Alberta 1.9 per cent, Nova Scotia and Manitoba 1.7 and 1.4 per cent.

The only province lower than Saskatchewan was the little province of New Brunswick with .4 per cent.

So, Mr. Speaker, since 1946, Alberta's population had increased, in comparison to ours, some 500,000 heads; Manitoba the same population as ours in 1946, today 20,000 people ahead of us; B.C. is even greater, in 1946 it was practically even with Saskatchewan, today 800,000 people more than we have. So, the Minister of Agriculture got up in this house two days ago and he said "We are losing people off the farms at a rate of 1,000 families per year." The minister said that the reason for this was the cost price squeeze. The Minister of Mineral Resources this afternoon said it wasn't the cost of price squeeze, it was mechanization, and so on the other side of the house, we have various opinions on what is happening in this province at the present time.

I want for a few minutes to take issue with some of the statements made by the Minister of Agriculture. He castigated members on this side of the house because they dared to present a constructive program to the people of this province, in contrast to theirs over the past 20 years. I need not remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the CCF-NDP, or whatever they want to be called, have never been a party that is a friend of the farmer. He tried to make us, on this side of the house believe that they were giving loans to young farmers, tried to make us believe that the present system of the Family Farm Credit Corporation was doing a wonderful job, but here in a few brief moments, I want to compare it with the results of the province of Manitoba and the

province of Saskatchewan, and see how they compare. In the province of Saskatchewan up until the present time, since the loan went into operation, we have had some 420 loans, but since 1961, since the start of Alberta's program – Provincial Farm Credit Corporation – 2,150 loans have been made at a total of \$17,500,000. In Saskatchewan, as I say, some 591 loans have been made with a total of about \$6,130,000. In Manitoba, the same period of time, a total of some \$14,600,000 have been loaned. so I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of the claims made by the Minister of Agriculture, it is abundantly clear, that the Family Farm Credit Loans are not serving any useful purpose in Saskatchewan.

I want to take issue with what the Minister said in regard to the dairy industries.

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to call the member's attention to the time, if he could find a break . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — Before he left us, he said the dairy industry was expanding in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. I want to give you the true facts of the dairy industry in Saskatchewan under this government they have continued to drive more and more people out of that industry in this province, and what is the record, if he checks his own Department of Agriculture report, he will find that milk produced is the lowest since 1957, that is produced in the last year under review. Factory products for milk are down, farm butter production is down, farm home butter produced and consumed in the home is down. Fluid sales of milk are down, total production of creamery butter is down by well over 1,000,000. The attitude of this government to the dairy industry is driving more and more farmers out of business every year. So here is only one instance which points out the fact that the dairy industry is a party of the thousand farmers per year who are being driven off their farms by this government.

Mr. Speaker, because my time is up, and because I didn't have the time to bring the points up that I would have card to in this debate, it is abundantly clear that I will not be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 p.m.