

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
6th Day

Thursday, February 11, 1965.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. George J. Trapp (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to welcome to this assembly a visiting group, Mrs. Gillis and her class from Saskatchewan House, an up-grading class. We would welcome you folks here and hope you enjoy your visit to the legislative assembly this afternoon.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I would like to call the attention of the house to the group of students in the east gallery, a group of grade eight students from Herchmer School, led by their vice-principal, Mr. Davidson, and their grade eight teacher, Mr. Meyer. I am sure that all of us express the hope that they will find their stay in the legislative assembly this afternoon of interest and very informative.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

GRANT TO REGINA GENERAL HOSPITAL BOARD

Hon. David Steuart (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an announcement. The government has been negotiating for several months with the Regina General Hospital Board with regard to the need for more beds in this city. During the time many requests for prompt decision have been made. In view of the urgency of the matter, it was felt that an announcement should be made as soon as a decision had been reached. Therefore, I wish to tell the house that the government is prepared to give a grant to Regina General Hospital of up to \$400,000 on receipt of acceptable plans to provide an extension to the existing hospital. This will be an interim measure to alleviate the pressure on hospital service in Regina until a new hospital complex can be built.

This decision has been made because of the urgent need for more beds in the city and because we have been told by the Regina General Hospital Board that they can produce a plan which will come into operation within one year. The grant which the provincial government will give will be according to the formula for grants to base hospitals. Application will also be made to the federal government for maximum grants from that source. We face two difficult problems. First is the urgent need for beds in Regina, the other is the development of an overall hospital complex to serve more adequately the needs of the southern part of the province. We feel by acting promptly on the first problem it will allow planning for the new hospital to be developed in a more orderly fashion.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Guy for an Address-in-Reply, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey).

Mr. Martin P. Pederson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, in resuming the debate this afternoon I would first of all like to associate myself with the welcome that was extended to the two groups who are in attendance in the gallery this afternoon, and to say on behalf of the organization that I represent that we welcome them here and hope that they will enjoy their visit with us.

I want to deal with some matters, Mr. Speaker, that have a direct relationship both to the original motion and to the amendment this afternoon, but before doing so I would like to take just a few moments of my time to draw the attention of this house, to pay a small tribute.

This, perhaps, may be rather unusual for someone in the particular position that I am in, but I feel that it is something that should be done. In the past session of this legislature, a member sat in this legislature who was recognized as the dean of this house. He had served as a member of the legislative assembly for thirty years, and that I have had the good fortune to follow him in this house has, for me a feeling of tremendous satisfaction, and I might add a bit of humility. I am referring to the past member for Arm River, Mr. Herman Danielson.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pederson: — Naturally, as this house knows, I opposed him on every turn in our political affiliation and in many of the policies that he followed, but nevertheless I believe that he made a contribution that will stand in the records for a long, long time. I want to take the opportunity on this day to pay him, not only my own respects for that service, but the respects of this house.

In dealing with the question of the Throne Speech itself, Mr. Speaker, or at least the motion that was presented by the member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy), one of the areas that I would like to deal with first of all is in connection with a statement that he made in reference to the development of northern Saskatchewan. He took it upon himself at that time to make some rather slighting remarks that my party in the last provincial campaign advocated the construction of a railroad in northern Saskatchewan. Now, it may well be that he, in all sincerity, believes that this is nonsense. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that the day will come and come soon, when development in the north will be hinged on the construction of a railroad. I was quite interested to hear the Premier in his address yesterday promise a vastly expanded program of road building in that area. This is entirely in keeping with the thinking and policies of the party that I represent, and I heartily endorse that move. But I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier and his government consider negotiations, perhaps with a major railroad company to look into the feasibility of building in the near future, a line which would service northern Saskatchewan and perhaps lead to a seaport on Hudson Bay. I believe that as far as the transportation of goods is concerned that highways have limitations, and I say that having been in the trucking business myself in years gone by. I realize that the trucking industry plays a tremendous role in our economy. Nevertheless I believe, that for the type of development that we want, we must look seriously to the problem of attempting to encourage railroad companies to build in the north.

Another point that the member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) brought to the attention of this house was the rather peculiar claim that the Liberal party was the only party that had a comprehensive program for the betterment of our native population in the north. Now this, Mr. Speaker, is a long way from the fact. Our party advocated a very comprehensive program of aid in this area, directed primarily towards alleviating some of the immediate and long range problems of our first citizens. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is fair to say that the party that I represent, has been able to establish without dispute, a wonderful record in this regard. In the few years in which the Conservative party was in power in Ottawa, the number of schools that were built in the northern part of, not only Saskatchewan, but across northern Canada, increased many times over. There were also tremendous increases in medical and hospital facilities, employment opportunities, and in housing, something that the party that is represented by these gentlemen opposite, ignored in the years when they were in charge in Ottawa. Our party, as the government in Ottawa, granted the Indians the vote. They recognized our first citizens' right to participate in the government of this nation by elevating one of their leaders to the Senate. These things, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, to establish the fact that our party has given more than lip service to offering solutions to these problems and has, in fact, done something concrete in this direction. And so when I say that our party in Saskatchewan had a comprehensive program, I believe that our record in the past will substantiate our statement that we would have carried them out.

We advocated, as an example, for the betterment of educational facilities in the north, that the provincial government should consider providing some satellite television stations in the northern part of this province. You may ask what good is that? Well, the answer is very simple. We believe that these should be established to set up adult educational facilities in a form that would be readily understood by many who would have difficulty with the written word. We believe that these facilities could be used to beam "canned" types of programs to the population, demon-

strating new methods for increasing income in such fields as fishing and trapping and of making a livelihood in the northern part of this province.

We believe that there are new processes available to the fishing industry and I commend these to the minister in charge for his investigation, with a view to making use of a great natural commodity to a far greater extent than we are now doing. From what I have observed in northern Saskatchewan in commercial fishing, something like half of the fish caught is either left to rot or thrown away, simply because they are not normally considered table fish. When the former Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Hamilton) who represented my party, was in office in Ottawa, a series of experiments were carried out to develop a machine which would dry raw fish on a very large scale. The crux of the problem in the north has been the transportation of fresh fish. The World Food Organization is crying for dried fish. The latest report I have is that they would buy all that they can get their hands on. All we require in the north to double the yield of fish is to provide centralized sites where facilities are available for the fishermen to have their fish dried on a commercial basis, so that the product can flow into the world markets.

These are types of programs, Mr. Speaker, that I refer to when I say that our party had something concrete and tangible to offer, rather than vague promises of something that has never been spelled out, certainly not that I have seen in print.

When I talk about fish, I am naturally led into something which I was highly critical of the previous administration for failing to take recognition of. That is in connection with the operation of a Fish Marketing Board. It makes no more sense to me, Mr. Speaker, for a government, or a province, to operate a Fish Marketing Board than it does for a province to operate a Wheat Marketing Board. This must be done, Mr. Speaker, on a regional basis, and I was rather amused by my friend from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) for sneering at the proposal that an economic union of the western provinces was not feasible. He certainly should get together with his leader because according to the Leader Post of October 24th of 1964, his leader said:

The idea has many merits and such a council could be highly effective in economic matters of mutual concern.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that not only has the Premier of this province stated in public that he recognizes this as a sound principle, but his counterparts in the province of Alberta and Manitoba have also stated this; and I would suggest that those men and women, who represent this province in this legislature, should keep up with the times and recognize that this is the hope for the future of western Canada. Economic unity in many areas make common sense. I refer to a Western Fishing Marketing Board as just one example of the type of thing that could be carried on in co-operation with our neighboring provinces.

I expect later on, Mr. Speaker, that in the Crown Corporation Meetings some question will arise, I am sure from both sides of the house, in connection with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. This, too, I believe is an area to which serious consideration should be given, the prospect of negotiating with Manitoba and Alberta to integrate our power and gas system. It makes common sense to me that we should be able to tap sources for those areas close to the Alberta gas fields immediately across the border, straight into our transmission system and conversely where we have gas to transmit to them across the border. No longer, Mr. Speaker, is it possible for people in this province or western Canada for that matter, to go on thinking of these provinces as divided by political lines. We are an economic and geographic unit and the business of the people of this province, as in other provinces, is to continue to work towards some type of union insofar as economics are concerned. I would go so far, Mr. Speaker, as to suggest that many of us sitting in this house will live long enough to see the day when serious conversations will take place for the political union of these three western provinces. This, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is the ultimate future of western Canada.

I am appalled at the short-sighted attitude that is taken by some of the members across the floor from me, and I mention this question of economic unity at some length because I believe that many of our programs and many of our alterations in the acts affecting programs in this province, are going to come before this house in this session and in the next two or three years. I think it is necessary for us to bear in mind that we design these programs in such a way as to facili-

tate the cutting down of costs that are inherent in running individual programs in the three provinces.

Now, dealing particularly with various segments of the Throne Speech, and particularly with the remarks made by the Premier yesterday, coming from the constituency of Arm River as I do, I was most disturbed to note that there was only a brief and passing reference, not only in the Throne Speech, but in the Premier's remarks to the question of irrigation. It is quite true that he said that the legislature would be asked to vote funds for the completion of the dam. It is quite true that he said that we would be asked to vote funds for the purchase of land but, Mr. Speaker, much more than this is required. I suggest that the ministers involved have got off on the wrong foot. They have antagonized a large group of people in that area, my friends and neighbors. As recently as last year, various people who were involved in the Hanley by-election made statements which were interpreted by people there as saying, "you will take irrigation whether you like it or not". Now, whether this is precisely what was said is not the point. A tremendous job of public relations must be done now to off-set the antagonism that has been built up by the blundering efforts that have been carried out so far, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the first jobs that must be done is a vast educational program to give farmers in that area an opportunity to find out, first hand, how it works. This is something that I have advocated for years and have tried to bring to the attention of the previous government, without success. I believe, and I think that I know whereof I speak because I farm in that area, that it is absolutely necessary to show these people, in a tangible fashion, just how it works.

The mere suggestion that there are brochures available and so on is not enough. There must be short course schools, preferably in the wintertime, facts and figures, graphs and charts, to give these farmers an opportunity to learn precisely what they are up against. I believe, Mr. Speaker, and I think perhaps the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) will concur with this, that much of the antagonism centres around the fact that they are not quite sure how it is going to work in their own particular area.

I am very sympathetic to that fear. These are mostly men who have built up farms for themselves. Many of them have reached the age of forty, fifty-five or sixty and who have no desire to sell their farms even though the price may be considered a fair one by the government. It would deprive them, primarily, of any type of a pension. After all, a farmer who spends his lifetime building up a farm regards the work that he has invested as a pension for the future when he has finally got it paid for, and goodness knows many of us have a hard time doing that. This is his method. And the mere purchase of the original asset does in fact remove this asset of keeping a farm from him.

Now, I have noticed too, Mr. Speaker, that there was a mention made of new parks being created in the province, and this too, I feel, is commendable. I believe that it is a wonderful thing and that we should be spending more time on preparing for the greater amount of leisure time that will be available to people and I only hope that in the estimates, when they come in for the department, there will be provision made for a new park on the east side of the Diefenbaker Dam which will rise on the site of the South Saskatchewan River Dam.

An Hon. Member: — Where's that?

Mr. Pederson: — Well, I would suggest that if you don't know, you can come on up to Outlook and Loreburn and we will show you where the Diefenbaker Dam is. Now, I wanted to deal for a moment, too, this afternoon with the subject of economic development.

I noticed in the press last night an announcement that a new potash mine will be established at St. Lazare in Manitoba. I have been waiting all day, listening to the news, to see which of the Liberals or NDP are going to claim this one. All I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is to please let a Conservative government claim this little fellow. We have not been able to claim any so far and we would kind of like to get in on the pie for a change.

I wanted to deal with this in particular, this question of economic development because I was quite surprised in the Throne Speech that very little by way of concrete proposals were spelled out to fulfil the promise made by the Liberal party of providing 80,000 new jobs, and in

particular where we are going to find 20,000 in the next four year. I want to be fair to them, they said four years, in the field of manufacturing.

Now the figures that I find in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics indicate that there is going to be a gradual decline in employment due to automation. I was quite surprised that these people have not spelled out concrete proposals to illustrate in what areas, at any rate, they plan on finding these jobs. It is quite true they are talking about the potash mines but this is not going to account for 20,000 jobs. So far, about the only activity that I have seen in this field is advertisements that appear periodically in the newspapers of this nation trying to hire industrial consultants.

I was rather amused, Mr. Speaker, to find perhaps these people were in a bigger hurry than they thought. Now I am not suggesting that the Liberal party placed this advertisement, but it is quite significant that similar advertisements appeared in the Financial Post of May 16th, which was some days before the Liberals took office. All the advertisements that are similar and placed by other provincial governments carry the provincial government crests. This one did not, but the Manitoba and Alberta governments are in here and this one merely says a western Canadian province, advertising for a Chief Development Executive. I wonder just how much of a hurry they were in, and if this is the reason for placing this advertisement. I think it is very commendable that they got on the ball before they actually took office. I wish that they would carry that out and press that even further and get together a group of people who are experts in the field of development and get them to devise policies that will in fact bring industry in this province.

I am sure that the Premier and his party have found, since taking office, that it is much easier to say that they will bring in industry than it is actually to get it. I hope something concrete will be proposed at a later date in this session that will spell out for us, in greater detail, just where all of this industry is going to come from.

Then, Mr. Speaker, another point in the Throne Speech that disturbed me was only brief passing reference to the question of tax reduction. Now yesterday, the Premier touched on various things that he said would be included. But in view of the fact that the Liberal party in the campaign and the by-election made tremendous play on the use of purple gas for farmers and on the question of reduction of the sales tax, I am surprised that these were not spelled out in the Throne Speech. They saw fit to mention that they are going to build another place to lock up women at Prince Albert, but they certainly didn't think it was important enough to mention these other items. I was pleased to hear that the Premier included this in his remarks yesterday.

Now I have not had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, being a single member and limited in the amount of things that I can cover, of reading the interim report of the Johnson Commission. This was a type of commission that I frankly admit our party supported wholeheartedly. We in fact advocated such a commission, perhaps not on quite the same lines as was set down, but I believe that it was necessary, not simply because of the previous party that was in power, but as a necessary move by any government taking office, after an administration had been in office for twenty years. I believe that a certain amount of build-up has occurred, a certain amount of civil service taken on that perhaps was not necessary, and that expenditures were made that were not necessary. From what I have seen of the report so far, Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are many recommendations in that report that could be well commended to the government. I hope that some of the questions dealing with automobiles will be given a hard look by the government and that they will make some concrete moves as they say they have already done.

I was disturbed by one particular aspect of it, and this is something of which I and the party opposite who now form the government, were very critical of the previous regime, and that is the question of a Cabinet press office and the dissemination of news by a group of people who were civil servants. We were very critical and I know the Liberal party was and yet on page two of the report I found this statement:

A cabinet press office which places the dissemination of hard political news close to the source provides the outlet transmitting the basic policy questions and decisions to the press.

Now I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary to have someone who is trained in this work to pass on information releases that have to come out of government, but what I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is that in this assembly on what had existed previously, that these same people are not now being transferred and hidden in other departments and that in fact we will see a greater propaganda machine built than what existed in the past. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the government will give serious consideration to keeping such a group in the open where there can be no charge of political bias in the releasing of news. I know this perhaps is very difficult to do when you are the government, perhaps very tempting to use this method of getting news of your party before the public, of the great things that you have done, but I would respectfully ask them to try and refrain from that type of thing because, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that ultimately it is most destructive.

One final item, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to deal with in view of the fact that my time is short this afternoon, and that is in connection with the establishment of the proposed Indian and Metis branch. I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, in watching the press, that the Indian people themselves had expressed tremendous concern over this policy, segregating them from the rest of the province, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is no more reasonable to segregate these people into one department than to set up a department for Norwegians. It may be that some of us Norwegians need a special department, but on the other hand, I don't think that it is the type of action that will help promote ultimate unity of our people. I would suggest that there are other methods of providing special assistance to these people who are our first citizens. If they feel that the native population do require, and I believe they do, considerably more assistance and more administrative effort, I suggest that it would be better to set up some type of an interdepartmental committee of senior officials to accelerate existing provincial services to Indians, and on top of that, an educational program to let them know what is available. I found in travelling in this province many of them are not aware of what is available to them, either by way of educational facilities or employment opportunities. This requires an educational program to let them know what exists, rather than setting them aside as a group of people who are different to the rest of us.

I maintain that, Mr. Speaker, we are all Canadians, and it does not make any difference whether our ancestry is Norwegian, Indian, English, or even Scotch, with deference to my Scotch friends. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this type of action is not consistent with that theory that is advocated by the counterpart of all political parties in this house on the national level — the spirit of national unity. We must strive on this level to avoid taking steps that will create a further division in this nation, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, the members who sit opposite, who represent the party and the government in this province, must be more aware than anyone of the problems attendant on disunity in this nation. I make a plea, Mr. Speaker, that they give very careful consideration before making a tangible move in setting up this new department.

Mr. Speaker, I have several other items that I would have liked to have dealt with this afternoon, but I have agreed to give away on the question of time and I will deal with those matters at a later date.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — I would like to ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Pederson: — Certainly.

An Hon. Member: — Did you at any time advocate political unity of the prairie provinces?

Mr. Pederson: — Yes Sir, I most certainly did and if you were listen-you would have heard that I did it again this afternoon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, in entering this debate I would first like to congratulate you, Sir, on your elevation to this very important position of Speaker. I think you have been doing an admirable job and we certainly do wish you well in this very important job.

I would like to also congratulate those who were elected in the recent election and offer a special word of welcome to the lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — I would like to congratulate the lady member on her maiden speech. She said some things of course with which I cannot agree, particularly her idea of the role of government, but I did feel that her speech was very well delivered, that it was sincere and it contained some very constructive suggestions, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, it was a very welcome change from the hysterical diatribe that we had to listen to from the mover of the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been following with interest, and in some cases with a good deal of alarm, some of the actions and the public statements made by government members as they took office. I have also noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Conservatives has said today and before today, that he would like to do away with Saskatchewan as such and amalgamate it with the western provinces. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I think I can well understand how the hon. gentleman feels; he feels very lonely in this house and he would dearly love to get some of those good Tories from Manitoba to join him and give him mental and moral support. But I find it a little more difficult to understand the hon. Premier's suggestion that if Quebec should withdraw from confederation, he might have to take Saskatchewan into the United States. As if he could, Mr. Speaker! You know, this statement drew headlines all across Canada, not all complimentary, I might say, and I found an awfully interesting article in the Commentator, written by James M. Minifie, and I thought the hon. Premier would like to hear this statement. It is headed: "No Welcome Mat for New Members to the United States".

Premier Thatcher and anybody else is talking through his hat if he says Canadian provinces could in a pinch join the United States. From time to time Canadian politicians or men in the public eye, are moved to say, and if things don't go the way we want them to, we'll have to consider joining the United States. The latest announcement of this kind was attributed to Premier Ross Thatcher of Saskatchewan, and disattributed to him by Hammy McDonald, his predecessor in the liberal leadership.

Let us look for a moment at this easy assumption that a Canadian province, and in this instance Saskatchewan, would be welcomed into the American Union. It is not quite as simple as all that. It takes two to strike a bargain, and congress in the past has never been too anxious to meet new states half way. Most accessions of new territory or admission of territories into statehood had been sturdily resisted by Congress. Texas was turned down at first, and only admitted subsequently by one vote. Alaska and Hawaii were knocking on the door for a couple of decades, Saskatchewan might be kept shivering on the doorstep for many years.

and then he says:

Admission if could be had, would be on the United States terms and they would hurt.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that even with the able assistance of his pal, the Governor of Montana, Saskatchewan would be out of luck. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I hope for a long time to keep my address, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — I also found an interesting article from the Toronto Star of April 23rd. It is headed: "Thatcher — Sweet Taste of Revenge". Now I am only going to quote one paragraph, although I would like to quote it all, because this paragraph helps me to understand the irresponsible statements in this house and on the hustings of the hon. Premier. This article is sort of a biography of the Premier of today, and contains certain references from a friend. Here is what the friend says:

I remember Ross telling me the secrets of politics. He used to speak on almost every subject in the council and he said this, "You don't have to know much about a subject, just speak loud and long and make sure you get your name in the paper".

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier has not changed a bit in his ideas. For example, speaking in Toronto, he said this:

After twenty years of socialism, Saskatchewan is just as dependent on wheat as ever.

What nonsense, Mr. Speaker; his own speech from the throne contradicts this, and I am quoting:

1964 has been a year of signal importance to our province, for it has seen the people enjoy their remarkable degree of economic growth, chiefly in the field of industry.

Now add to this the figures given on Tuesday by the Acting Leader of the Opposition and, you will realize, that as far as the Premier is concerned, facts just do not mean a thing. Then speaking in Montana and also in British Columbia, he said this:

Under twenty years of socialism the province has stood still.

Had stood still. Again nonsense! And he issues a terrible warning about the mess in Saskatchewan after twenty years of Socialism. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look for a minute at this so-called mess. In those years that he is talking about, we achieved here in Saskatchewan what is recognized as the best health care program on this continent. Starting from almost nothing we built . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — . . . an excellent highway system across the province, we spent millions of dollars on good grid road network, we electrified rural Saskatchewan, brought natural gas to all the cities and many towns and thus removed the road block to industry. We assisted in bringing sewer and water to towns and thousands of farms, we experienced unprecedented development in oil and potash and industrial development, we helped materially to replace worn out one-room schools and have now modern and well equipped schools across the length and width of the province. We provided interest-free loans and scholarships to assist young people to further their education. We also achieved the highest per capita hospital bed capacity in Canada and, Mr. Speaker, never in our history has Saskatchewan economy been as buoyant as in the last few years. Revenues are at an all time high and Saskatchewan's net debt position is at an all time low, so if this is what the hon. Premier calls a mess, Mr. Speaker, I say let us have a lot more of it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — Then speaking in Moose Jaw recently, he said this — and this is astounding, he said his government will attempt to rid the province of its image as a cultural waste land. A cultural waste land, no less. What a slap in the face to Saskatchewan people who are one of the most culturally minded people in Canada! Now where has the hon. Premier been all this time, when these cultural activities are going on? I would like to know.

Saskatchewan has produced young people who have risen to the

top, to fame in drama, music, art and handicrafts. We have been in the forefront of Canadian drama festivals and musical festivals. We have an excellent children's' theatre, children's' concert association and some of the best symphony orchestras in Canada and also a multitude of cultural activities. Almost every community in Saskatchewan is active in every phase of the arts and they will not appreciate being called a cultural wasteland. I am glad of course, that the government is going to increase the grant to the Saskatchewan Arts' Board, but I would like to ask the hon. Premier 'who set up this Arts' Board in the first place?' The first one in Canada, Mr. Speaker. It was the CCF government.

Here is another statement that is rather intriguing. In a television interview with Doug Collins in British Columbia and speaking on the five year royalty free period of oil companies digging deep wells, Mr. Collins asked this question:

Collins: What happens if you get another Leduc find? You won't get any royalties.

Thatcher: Oh yes we will. On the first three wells, there will be no royalties. On the next hundred, there will be the same royalties as ever.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was very surprised with that statement. I had not seen any such thing in the regulations, and I wondered if I was mistaken and I didn't want to be wrong so I 'phoned the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), and I asked him specifically if the five year royalty period applied to all the deep wells, and he assured me that it did. I think the hon. Premier owes an explanation of this statement to this house and why he made it, just before the Hanley by-election.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, there are some things in the speech for which I wish to give the government credit. I am glad they are going to admit colored margarine. I have always thought this color ban on margarine was a lot of nonsense, and I am particularly pleased with the announcement that they are going to build a women's' jail. It is something I have advocated in this legislature for a long time and I think it is long over due and I hope you proceed immediately.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — I am also glad that the government will increase pensions for civil servants and teachers who retired when pensions were low. With the increased cost of living, this increase is well justified, as is a proposed increase on minimum wages. I was very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, to hear no announcement of a base hospital in Regina and I had hoped it was an oversight. I was glad to hear the hon. Minister's statement today and when the statement is clarified a bit more, I hope to have a lot more to say on this subject.

I wish now, Mr. Speaker, in my remaining time to turn to the Department of Social Welfare. In turning to this department, Mr. Speaker, and its new minister (Mr. Boldt), frankly I must say I have been appalled, although I shouldn't have been surprised when I remembered some of the utterance of this minister in the past. It has always seemed to me that he has shown lack of sympathy and understanding and any sensitivity towards the needs and problems of the less fortunate people of this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan had a reputation of being one of the most progressive, best administered and the best motivated Department of Welfare in this country. I have talked to social workers and volunteers from all parts of Canada and there was always the highest praise for Saskatchewan's welfare program. But in the few short months, Mr. Speaker, the present minister has been doing his best to ruin this image and if he continues in his present manner, Saskatchewan will soon be at the bottom of the heap, not at the top. Take a look at his record, Mr. Speaker. First he is going to put social aid recipients to work for relief. He received a cold shoulder at Ottawa and elsewhere and after a barrage of criticism, he said he was misunderstood. He really intended that they should receive the going wage and I was so glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker, and then Embury House — out of the blue, this minister announced that Embury House would be closed. Now Embury House is a home for children with serious mental and emotional problems. These were sick children many of whom had come through terrible experiences and were very badly damaged. But without consulting the superintendent, Mr. Gray, a man who is capable and

dedicated and giving his life to try to rehabilitate these children at an early age, perhaps the only age this could be accomplished, and apparently without studying the case histories and the background of these children committed to the home by the courts, he announces the home will be closed. Why? He looked at only one thing, the money involved. It cost too much, so out it goes and what happens to the children? I am afraid he closed his eyes to this side of the ledger. The social consequences of this callous act may live to haunt this minister. Again, after vigorous public protest from all across this province and beyond our borders, the minister said he intended to build a new and better place in Moose Jaw. Now there was no mention of this in the Speech from the Throne. I do hope that government intends to live up to this promise but how long will it take? If the minister had any such intentions, why didn't he say so before announcing the closing of Embury House, and why didn't he wait until the new quarters were built?

Now the next thing, he is abolishing the division of services for the aged and has dispensed with the services of Miss Lola Wilson, one of the most knowledgeable persons in the field of Geriatrics in the Dominion of Canada. She has gone to other fields to continue this type of work and we have lost her to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, by closing Embury House and doing away with this excellent program for senior citizens, the government has saved just enough to build two miles of black top highway. Now which, I ask, Mr. Speaker, is more important, two miles of black top or care for sick children and elderly people? This was not a saving, Mr. Speaker, this was a tragedy.

This is not all. He is threatening and harassing municipal officers and social aid officers throughout this province and trying get them to scrounge and chisel as much as they can from already minimum schedules of social assistance. I have been told that he is suggesting that a maximum allowance for social aid in cities be set at \$200 a month, regardless of the size of the families, and 150 in some areas. Now just how can he expect a family of six or eight or more to live on that amount of money? He should try it himself. The latest request to Regina and other cities is they cut down on the food allowance of larger families. The food allowance, no less! Now I am proud of our Regina City Council that they turned this down flat and I understand that Moose Jaw and Saskatoon did the same. But next I read in the Press that the minister may force the cities to obey. I guess he thought better of that and decided he might get more than he bargained for, but the next announcement he makes is that he will review the agreements with the cities and probably charge a larger share of the social aid costs to municipalities, which is a backhand way of trying to force his requests. He states and I quote:

We continue to be concerned however, that city government pay only seven per cent of the social welfare costs while senior government pay 93 per cent. It is always easier to be generous with funds when another government is responsible for providing these funds.

What an insult, Mr. Speaker, to those who are doing a very conscientious job in administering social welfare, and who know a great deal more about local social problems than does the hon. minister. At a time when Saskatchewan is in its most prosperous period of history, and in spite of the continually rising cost of living, Mr. Speaker, this minister is determined to cut down on the food allowance for children and, in general, the living standards of the most unfortunate group in our province. While President Johnson is campaigning for a war on poverty in United States, the Liberal Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) in Saskatchewan, is waging a war on the poor and there is a great difference, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — I think it should be remembered that social aid schedules already allow for reductions in food and clothing for larger families and since that time the cost of living has gone up, but now the Minister asks for further cuts, a reduction of \$7 for families of four, \$12 for families of five, and \$17 for families of six, plus a further reduction of \$5 per person for families of more than six. Now, Mr. Speaker, when you are assessing a social aid allowance, you look at the whole thing not just at one item, and you will find that the food budget is really the

only place where there is any flexibility at all to meet the emergencies that arise in every family. A stove burner gives out, a washing machine needs repairs, or a pair of shoes wear out before the quarterly clothing allowance arrives, or a child comes home from school needing 25 cents for some school project, in which all the children are participating. Should these children be denied and segregated from the rest? If by good management, and careful buying, the mother can save a little bit out of the food allowance or somewhere else to look after these things, I say more power to her.

What are the arguments advanced by the minister for his actions? First he states that it was agreed that the youth allowance for students sixteen to eighteen years be excluded from family resources and so some additional income is being received but Mr. Speaker, by the very fact that he mentions this at all and gives it as a reason for a cut, is evidence that he is including, not excluding this amount in his thinking as it was agreed. And secondly, he says he has heard a number of complaints and criticisms that it is not profitable for larger families to go off relief because it is more than the breadwinner can earn. What an argument! If the only job a man can get does not pay a sufficient amount to support his family, naturally he is not going to be anxious to take that job and let his family be ill-clad, ill-housed and undernourished, and can you blame him?

In our economy, the rate of pay is based on the going wage for the job, not on the needs of the family. Many social aid recipients can qualify only for jobs that pay a minimum wage which was never intended to support a family, and can't, but surely, Mr. Speaker, the answer is not to cut these peoples' assistance to a substandard allowance but rather to encourage them to take jobs on the understanding that the government will subsidize the family to bring the amount to at least . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — . . . a little more than what he would receive on social aid. At least then he would be partly supporting himself. This is the way to encourage him, not by penalizing his family. I would agree, Mr. Speaker, that if jobs are available within the mental and physical capacity of employable persons, steady employment is much healthier both for the individual and the family concerned and for society.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our welfare officers recognize this very well, and are doing their very best to encourage and assist their clients to get off social aid and into employment, and I know from experience that this is true of the city of Regina, and I certainly resented the statement of the hon. Premier in his criticism of our Regina office.

Mr. Speaker, there are people who are unemployable under any circumstances and many who cannot find gainful employment, and certainly there should be a floor beneath which no family should be allowed to fall. That floor, Mr. Speaker, should be generous enough to ensure that all of our children and their parents are properly nourished, decently clothed, and adequately housed.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment and I will not support the motion.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — I am glad to be here today . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — I must confess that there were some times during the last twelve months that I had some doubts as to whether I would be here. Before turning to the remarks of the hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and considering the contents of the Speech from the Throne, I would like to first of all extend congratulations. First of all I would like to congratulate the thirty-one new members who have been elected since last March and I want to say that I wish them all the satisfactions which public service can give, and they are many.

I want to say that I have confidence that they come here with full respect for the traditions of the legislature, and I am sure that when they are here they will try to improve the public esteem for the legislative process. I should warn them, however, that in patterning their

conduct, they ought not try to emulate too closely the occasional display which we sometimes see of excessive partisanship from some of the senior members here, and I do not exclude myself from that group.

I want to congratulate the new ministers. I think we may exchange some harsh words in the future, but today I want to say that I hope they have as much personal satisfaction as they can derive from their elevation to the rank of "Right Trusty and Well-Beloved Advisers to Her Majesty in the right of Saskatchewan." I am sure that the honeymoon of their career has commenced to dim a little. I promise them that before the session is over they will feel more like veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Premier, although he is not in his seat, I want to congratulate him on achieving the highest position of honor which is within the gift of the people of Saskatchewan to confer. Without intending any disrespect to him or any lack of appreciation for his other manifest qualities, I would like to attribute his success last April to the hard work which he has put into his job as party leader. No one can detract from the industry of the Leader of the Government.

Last, but not least, Mr. Speaker, I want to add to the congratulations which have been extended to you, Sir. I am confident that you will join the long line of distinguished Speakers who have occupied the chair of this house.

It is sometimes said that the persons chosen to occupy Speaker's Chair in this assembly are people who are either on their way up or on their way down in the councils of their party. I want to say that I dissent most strongly from that view. I hope that your sojourn here will not be regarded by you, or by anyone else, as a stepping stone to other honors or other positions. I want to say that there is no position within the gift of this house as high or as dignified as that which you have been chosen to occupy. Even the Premier himself must suffer occasional slings or arrows but the Speakership is immune from criticism. We may occasionally dissent from some of your rulings but if we do dissent from them, it is not because of any lack of honor or respect which we hold for you but rather because of the respect which we hold for the traditions of the Speakership and the rules of the house.

Before taking up the burden of my remarks, I want to say I appreciate the suggestion of the mover of the Address-In-Reply, the hon. the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy), who invited me to say a few words about the by-election that was held recently in Hanley constituency.

First of all I want to thank all hon. members on both sides of the house who came up to Hanley to help me out, one way or the other.

An Hon. Member: — Help you in.

Mr. Walker: — I also want to thank the hundreds of people from all over Canada who contributed, who wrote letters of encouragement to our campaign office. After the election, my wife and I received literally bushels of congratulatory letters and cards from people in all walks of life, in all parts of Canada, indeed, in all parts of North America and from beyond the borders of North America — Hawaii, British Guinea, United Kingdom — and other places as far away.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — The theme of their messages, the burden of their messages, was to ask me to thank the people of Hanley constituency for the fine Christmas present which Hanley had given to progressive minded people everywhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the member for Hanley and as a private member of this house, I hope that I may on occasion be able to express the views of the people of Hanley and I hope that the people of Saskatchewan may find that I am expressing their views about important public questions that arise here. I hope that I can offer some useful and constructive suggestions to the government and by my criticism and advice which I shall freely proffer, that I can help them to achieve some improvement in the administration of government policies.

It is too soon, Mr. Speaker, for us to make any assessment of the record of the government. Presumably the people of Saskatchewan will have three more years to judge this government and to examine its record, that is assuming, of course, that the Premier can come to some accommodation and agreement with his caucus as to whom he shall appoint to the vacant position in the Cabinet. I think the government should last another four years. He finds himself in the position of being unable to quarrel with more than two or three of his Cabinet or Caucus colleagues at any one time. Indeed I think this is perhaps the chief strength of the present government in the view of most of the people of Saskatchewan.

This government must seek always to avoid party policy which might antagonize any two or more members whether of the Cabinet or of the Caucus. Any three members of the party opposite by the exercise of their vote may thwart the actions of the government. So in a strictly literal sense, the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to hold every member of that party opposite responsible and accountable for every act which that government does. Judging by some of the tendencies of the government during the past six months or so, I think the people of Saskatchewan will derive a great deal of comfort from the knowledge that this government must act almost unanimously or not act at all. In the eyes of the people of Saskatchewan, perhaps the greatest strength of the government opposite is its numerical weakness.

When the present government took office they found the affairs of the province of Saskatchewan in better shape than were found by any previous government being elected in this country. The taxpayers did not have to find a single red cent to pay interest on the public debt. The only interest that had to be paid on the debts of Saskatchewan were quite properly and legitimately borne by the self-liquidating provincial enterprises that had been established over the past twenty years or so.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker, the lady member from Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) has reviewed some of the excellent programs that were introduced by the previous government. This present government has now got the benefit of those programs. I would like, before going on to examine some of those programs, and before examining the Speech from the Throne, deal with a reference which was made by the Premier the day before yesterday.

The Premier is reported in the local newspaper as accusing the CCF government of having stolen files before leaving office. Well, and . . .

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — . . . somebody over on the other side is applauding. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if he knows it or not, but ministers' files are the property of the ministers. Government documents are filed with the Deputy Ministers and with the staff of the department and not in the ministers' files, and I think that all the ministers took their personal files in exactly the same way as the Leader of the Opposition did when he moved out of his quarters in this building, last May.

Previous ministers and previous governments have taken their files. Indeed, when the CCF government came to office, there were no documents in any minister's office with the exception of a writ from the bailiff, or a demand from the federal Liberal government that the province pay some tens of millions of dollars on relief indebtedness that had been incurred for seed grain earlier during the depression. So the Premier has not demonstrated or given any evidence whatever of any government property that was removed by the departing ministers and if he has any such information I think it is his duty to investigate the matter further and to take some action on it, and not merely to flaunt it in this house in vague and insinuating innuendos for political purposes.

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, did not stop there. He purported to quote from a letter and the Saskatoon Star Phoenix reports what was said and this paragon of truth, the Star Phoenix, on February 10th reports:

the letter included one in which Mr. Woolam advocated a general program of cash and liquor distribution on reserves to win votes.

Now, presumably this is a fair report of what the Premier says, because he did not disclaim any responsibility for those words. Now what are the

facts? Well, the Premier was asked to table any letter which he said he had to that effect. He tabled a document which he claims, apparently, is a letter. This is not an original document at all. It is a photograph of a carbon copy of something which resembles a letter only to the extent that it has a date at the top of it.

Hon. R.W. Thatcher: — . . . Pretty weak . . .

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, what does this document actually say? Does it say what the Premier alleged it said? Well, Mr. Speaker, it deals with three subjects. "It seems to me", the alleged letter says "that there are three main problem areas . . . and the third one, the problem of ice cream cones for votes is a big one. A general program of cash and liquor distribution on reserves would have a large appeal."

Now that is not the same as saying that Mr. Woolam advocated a general program of "cash and liquor distribution on reserves" to win votes.

An Hon. Member: — What does it say . . .

Mr. Walker: — Well, I will tell you what it says, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what it says.

The Premier took those words out of context and he deliberately, he did it deliberately to mislead the press and the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Let me read the rest of the documents. Just let me read the rest of the documents.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Pretty weak . . .

Mr. Walker: — It says on the third point, and it was the third point that I just quoted:

the problem of ice cream cones for votes is a big one, a general program of cash and liquor distribution on reserves would have a large appeal.

That is the third point — it goes on to say and this part was not read by the Premier, nor quoted in the press:

On the third point I should say that the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians Executive, have agreed with me that it would be desirable this winter for them to interview key persons in each of the three political organizations, either separately or together with a view to impressing on each party their concern that all party workers assist them in a program of teaching good democratic habits to Indian people.

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . liquor . . .

Mr. Walker: — Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker that this gentleman was concerned about the things which the Liberal party were doing on our Indian reserves.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Paragon of virtues.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, just a moment, the letter goes on . . .

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabaska): — They do this in Athabaska all the time . . .

Mr. Walker: — . . . it not only says that he and the Indians are con-

cerned about this business of treating on the reserves. It says:

I tested this idea out on

whom do you think? — Well, the person you would naturally go to first

Ross Thatcher, and suggested to him that such an informal gathering might prove beneficial to all concerned.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, that this was a bare-faced and blatant attempt to mislead this house into suggesting that this . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Pretty weak . . .

Mr. Walker: — . . . that Mr. Woollam had advocated treating of Indians. What he had expressed was concern. He said this is a problem area and effort should be made to prevent abuse.

An Hon. Member: — . . . read that statement . . .

Mr. Walker: — And so the next paragraph says:

A program of Federation of Saskatchewan Indian discussions with political leaders on this subject could be complimented by publicity through the Indian Outlook or by a program with Band councils, which would involve Indian leaders themselves in working against such unfair influence upon the Indian voters.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, this was a low and contemptible attempt, Mr. Speaker, on the part of one who has been associated with parliamentary traditions now for over twenty years, to try to take away from the people of Saskatchewan the right to consider what was the real issue raised that day, — the question of the price of wheat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — And, of course, Mr. Speaker, this is not new. One would have thought, "Well, let's have another look at the document". The press report in the Star Phoenix, that paragon of virtue and accuracy stated:

the Premier said the letters were signed by Mr. Woollam.

That is a quote from the Star Phoenix. Mr. Speaker, either the Premier mislead this house or he did not file the document which he was purporting to be reading from, because the document he filed is not signed by Ray Woollam. If the Premier said it was, he misrepresented the facts to this house, and if the Star Phoenix misquoted the Premier he should have got up and objected.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, most civil servants, or ministers, or MLA's sign carbon copies, but this was a carbon copy of Mr. Woollam's file, and I would like to know about all the files that are missing from the Attorney Generals department also. While he is up maybe he would tell us about them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of privilege. Now the hon. gentleman says that this was merely a carbon copy, but he represented it to this house as a letter, but now he says it is merely a carbon copy. I suggest. Mr. Speaker, that anybody with a typewriter and a piece of paper could duplicate this document, — anybody, because it bears no signature, it bears no letterhead, it bears none of the hallmarks of a letter. But, Mr. Speaker, what reason have we for thinking that the docu-

ment has any authenticity whatsoever? Anyone who would lie to this house could manufacture a document of that kind, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I must challenge the former hon. Attorney General, because he cannot say that I lied to this house, certainly if anybody is doing any lying he is doing pretty well. I ask him to withdraw that word, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the word, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Thank you.

Mr. Walker: — . . . but I noticed when he referred to me and I did not ask him to withdraw three unparliamentary words, he didn't offer to withdraw them.

I want to say furthermore that the Leader of the government wants us to believe that this document has some reality and do you know how he establishes its substance, its worth? He says he found it in somebody's garbage bucket, that is where he says he found it. To the Leader of the government, this is the ultimate, the best source, the highest authority. One would have thought, Mr. Speaker, after his rebuff in Hanley constituency that the Liberals would try to resist their craving for garbage.

Mr. Speaker, it was a clever ruse and it worked for a few minutes. The Leader of the government got away with it but not for ever. The people of Saskatchewan will accumulate these little facts about the Leader of the government. This sort of thing, I submit, helps to bring the administration of the government of Saskatchewan into disrepute.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to another subject.

Mr. Thatcher: — I don't blame you.

Mr. Walker: — We all remember the headline in the Star Phoenix shortly after taking office by the present government on the 26th of May. The headline was:

The object of the government, \$20,000,000 cut in expenditures — New Liberal Government aim.

Well, I believe that the people of Saskatchewan are a little apprehensive about the uncertainty, the conflict between the avowed aims of the government and what it actually does. We are told in the Speech from the Throne that large expenditures are planned in the forthcoming years, presumably larger, because the Premier has been going about the province forecasting an increase in education costs of thirty per cent, or something in the order of \$15,000,000. He is talking about increasing the cost of highway construction by fifty per cent, that is by \$8,000,000 up to \$23,000,000. He talked up in Hanley . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Point of order. The thirty per cent increase in education costs I was speaking about applied to the operating costs of the University, nothing else . . .

An Hon. Member: — That's not what he said . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh yes, it is, yes it is . . . It is an increase of \$2,000,000 not eighteen or fifteen as the hon. member said . . .

Mr. Walker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said, we can only judge what he means by what he says, and what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the Leader of the government has told us . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . the forecast of . . .

Mr. Walker: — . . . is that the leader of the

government has told us of the many large increases that are forecast for expenditures for next year. At the same time he has told us that the surplus is not going to be very large, I believe he said a quarter of a million dollars, I wouldn't want to misquote him but I think he said about half of what the government had forecast and that was something like half a million dollars.

Mr. Thatcher: — You will find out next Friday . . .

Mr. Walker: — In Hanley, he talked about remitting or reducing the burden of taxes by \$12,000,000. You add these things all up, Mr. Speaker, and you get a deficit position in this province of anywhere from \$20,000,000 up. I suggest that this may mean that Saskatchewan is going into an era of deficit financing. It may mean that they are going to commence once again to increase the net debt of this province and if we do that, Mr. Speaker, it will mean that we will have to make provisions annually out of revenues for the payment of interest on that indebtedness and that will mean, of course, that we will be irrevocably committing ourselves to increased taxes in the future. this represents a return to the devil-may-care type of financing which brought this province to the brink of ruin between 1905 and 1930. The present government found this province in good shape and I am not going into details that have been discussed by the lady member from Regina East (Mrs. Cooper).

I do want to say, however, that everybody in this house is pleased to learn that the government believes that the province is going to continue to enjoy the boom that has existed during the past fifteen years. We are happy to know that the economy is buoyant and that it is surpassing previous records. I have here in my hand, a report from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix.

Saskatchewan Really Booms.

Business records tumbled in all directions. Retail sales soared to an estimated \$1,045,000,000. Residents became the nation's biggest per capita spenders and earners and they set new production highs and consumer buying records all over the wheat province.

Other high figures were recorded in minerals, construction, manufacturing, consumer credit rose accordingly with record sales of staple goods. Total value of production in Saskatchewan last year was up 14.4 per cent to \$2,169,000,000.

I am pleased to know that the government believes that that condition is continuing and that the province is still expanding. That report, while it is taken from the February 14th, 1964, issue of the Star Phoenix, will I am sure, be duplicated by a similar story in the current year.

The Leader Post report of March 12th, 1964, reported that Saskatchewan's increase topped all the prairie provinces, and even back in 1963, investment hit a new peak in Saskatchewan, so that Saskatchewan has a tradition now going back some fifteen years of economic growth and economic expansion. We are pleased that the Liberal government believes that this will continue for the coming year.

In view of this tremendous expansion in our economy, how then does the government justify the meat-axe approach to government services? In view of the buoyancy and the activity of business, in view of the rising levels of government income, we on this side must ask the government whether it still believes that it is justified in chopping away many useful and vital programs which are a service to the province and to its people. Other governments in other places where the people defeated Goldwaterism are talking about ushering in the great society underpinned by the growing abundance, the increasing level of affluence that you find there. On the contrary, the present government of Saskatchewan seems to be dedicated to meanness and niggardliness and it seems to practice these propensities upon the most defenceless groups of people in the community.

Can it be said, Mr. Speaker, that in 1964, the people voted a

mandate for retrenchment, curtailment, for the liquidation of government services? Well, Mr. Speaker, we examined the results of that vote and if we remember that the good people of Hanley did not get a chance to pass a decisive vote on this question until December 16th, and if we add up the votes which all the Liberal candidates received and all the CCF candidates received, this is what we find — that the CCF received 269,420 votes whereas the Liberal candidates received only 269,328 votes, almost a hundred less. So the government should remember that the people on this side of the house actually represent more votes in the province of Saskatchewan than the people on the other side of the house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — I just want to say one other thing for the benefit of my friend from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) who is so keenly interested in by-elections, that his leader said and I quote from the records of the house, only last session:

I remind you that time and again in the past, ever since this province was formed in 1905, the government which lost by-elections was invariably defeated when the main election came along.

So that, if my friend who enjoys by-elections so much gets any comfort out of it, I will give him the citation: Debates and Proceedings, page 35, 1964 . . .

Mr. Guy: — Really worried . . .

Mr. Walker: — It is clear then, Mr. Speaker, that the government opposite has no popular mandate to dismantle twenty years of progress. It has no moral authority and only the barest legal authority, to put on the auction block the fruit of twenty years of effort. It has no mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to turn the clock back to 1944 or 1844. By accident, Mr. Speaker, the government across the way, by a combination of lucky breaks, the Liberals find themselves in office without a popular mandate. They have therefore, a golden opportunity, to demonstrate that they can earn the approval of the voters. If the premier will abandon and give up the principles of Thatcherism and if he will devote himself to soundly administering the programs that have been launched by the previous government — if he will concentrate on sound and constructive husbandry of the achievements of the previous government — if he will try to remedy the administrative defects and shortcomings in the programs of the previous government, he will deserve to be hailed as one of the greatest premiers of Saskatchewan. Had he commenced doing these things on May 22nd, his party would have undoubtedly won the Hanley by-election.

Instead, what did he do? Well, they first of all, betrayed an amazing uncertainty, a fumbling grasp of the affairs of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, there have been three changes of government in the history of Saskatchewan prior to the one in 1964. This present government had approximately thirty days to put its party in order, to get ready to take over the responsibilities of government. In fact, I think they had exactly thirty days. This thirty day transition period, — how does it compare with the inter-regnum during the previous changes of government? Well, the CCF when it took office on July 10, 1944, had only 26 days to put its house in order and get ready to take over the government of the province. This government had four days longer to get ready.

The second Gardiner government in the year 1934, had exactly thirty days to get ready to take office, just as this government across the way had — thirty days.

The Anderson government had ninety-five days to prepare to take office from the first Gardiner government because that government, having won twenty-eight seats out of sixty-three could not make up its mind that it was defeated for ninety-four days. It wasn't sure. They had twenty-eight seats out of sixty-three and they hung on for ninety-four days. So that although the present government had just as much time as any to get ready, except for the Anderson government in 1929, and what did they do? Well, apparently they spent all their time doing something else than

getting ready to take over the government.

This government now in office, also had longer in which to call a special session, because the previous government took office on July 10, 1944. This government took office on May 22, almost two months earlier. It had two months longer to prepare for a special fall session than did the government that held office immediately prior to this government. And after the CCF government took office on July 10th, it did have a special fall session and at that special session it passed the Farm Security Act; it passed the Holidays with Pay Act, the first one in Canada, since been emulated in every other province; it made provision for free cancer care; and many other valuable programs which the people of Saskatchewan have come to cherish in the years since that time.

Although the present government took office two months earlier, in May, it has done nothing but give flimsy excuses for its failure to carry out its pledge to call a special session of the legislature to lift the gas tax from the fuel and farm trucks; to take off one per cent of the sales tax as it was pledged to do.

Perhaps this thirty day waiting period that the government had to get ready to take office was not wisely used. During that period we commenced to hear suggestions from the premier himself that perhaps all of the election promises could not be carried out or perhaps they could not all be carried out within the time which they had pledged. And this inspired the half joking remark of the former premier, Mr. Lloyd, that "the unborn liberal government had established a new record with flouting its promises even before assuming office".

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — On the very day that the new government took office apparently it broke its first promise. This was a promise which it evidently made to some of its back benchers. It broke this promise and the evidence of the promise was that, on the day it assumed office, it announced that it would give as an alternative, a prize or little reward, a little emolument of two or three thousand dollars each session to assuage the grief of those private members who had not been included in the original cabinet.

I refer to the proposal to establish parliamentary assistants, or undersecretaries to the ministers. I would like to make some comment on the merits of this proposal since it is set out in the Speech from the Throne. In my view, in most departments, the burden on most ministers is onerous enough to justify the appointment of one or indeed in some cases perhaps more than one executive assistant to the minister. By executive assistant, I do not mean some broken-down liberal back bencher, I mean a well trained and well qualified civil servant.

Two or three of the ministers in the previous government had executive assistants. I believe that that government would have been a better government if more ministers had made use of this excellent administrative device. I recognize that each minister has some duties which are not strictly departmental in nature, but which involve the whole government, or which involve the relationship between the government and the public and which you cannot ask a departmental official to perform. The minister, therefore, has to attend to these duties himself. I believe that if the minister is to do his job properly, if he is to have some time for contemplative reflection, which I think he needs, then he ought to have a capable executive assistant to assist him in the performance of his duties.

Parliamentary assistants do not fill this role. If we had lengthy parliamentary sessions as they do in Ottawa, then conceivably a minister might have to be absent from parliament or the legislature for extended periods of time and might require a legislative spokesman to sit in the assembly during his absence. But this is clearly not the case in Saskatchewan where we have an eight to ten week legislative session. The appointment of parliamentary assistants is therefore manifestly unnecessary in this province. They would not only be unnecessary but undesirable because they would be getting in the way of the government, of the legislative process, getting in the way of the ministers actually, and their emoluments would be a waste of money.

I should think that we should remember that the duties of opposition members of the legislature are at least as onerous as the duties

of members of the government side and, if this is so, and I am speaking of private members, if this is so, there is no reason in the world why government back benchers should not receive a few thousand dollars of supplementary indemnity. Indeed, I suggest this innovation, if the government seriously goes through with it. I am pleased to note that the minister has allowed the initially proposed bill to drop. I hope that the government has had second thoughts on this and will forget this idea, because no case has been made for it in this house or anywhere else, and no case can be made for it. It will only be regarded and quite properly so, as a pork barrel for Liberal MLAs. One would think that the present government in Saskatchewan would be a bit wary of getting involved with a system, known as parliamentary assistants, after seeing the trouble that this ilk has caused to their kinfolk in power in Ottawa. This propensity of parliamentary assistants to get into trouble, I think, stems from the fact that they don't have enough to do and we certainly don't want members of this legislature to find themselves in that position. They will have less to do here in Saskatchewan than they do in Ottawa.

I think the experience of the new ministers, and I say this quite sincerely, has proven that a cabinet of eleven ministers besides the premier is too small — that there are many portfolios in the government that are too heavy as presently constituted, for any person to carry and engage in ordinary social activity and still have time to consider the general trend and direction of government. I think that the government should change its view on this matter and should decide that the cabinet should be at least thirteen ministers plus the Premier, which would be one less than we had, and that they should abandon altogether this notion of executive assistants. So far as we on this side of the house are concerned we think this what you should do. You no doubt will get a lot of gratuitous advice from this side of the house but I think that if you consider the matter carefully you will agree that this proposal was a mistake and heaven knows, we all have to acknowledge our mistakes once in a while, and so I think this is one that the government should acknowledge.

Let us turn from the consideration of the composition of the house to an examination of its record in office.

Well, the Liberal government has taken some rather contradictory twists and turns of policy. They decided first of all, that it would be a popular move to liquidate the fleet of automobiles and I think the Premier at one stage was stating that he sold 6,000 automobiles or that he was going to reduce the fleet of 6,000 automobiles. Well, when it got around to counting them up I am sure he found that there was less than one-third of that number but there is something kind of dramatic about selling off surplus automobiles. The government did sell, I am told, some 500 or 600 automobiles after taking office and I presume that during the summer many civil servants found it difficult if not impossible, to perform their duties because of lack of transportation facilities. I am sure that the government found it more expensive to provide other kinds of transportation facilities than to pay their employees for the use of their cars.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Get on the track, Bob. You haven't been right yet.

Mr. Walker: — I am sure that the government has found that the policy which we followed of purchasing cars, tax free, of supplying them to civil servants, was in the long run the most economical. And I notice that now they have decided to purchase some 400 or 500 cars in one fell sweep between now and the end of the fiscal year. I just remind the hon. members opposite that if they do that they are merely spending the money that was voted by this legislature for that very purpose last April. The little experiment in policy may have caused a little pain, a little anxiety but I am sure that the government is ending up just exactly where it started on this question.

Something was said yesterday, by the acting leader of the opposition about medicare, about the wisdom of the present government in urging that Ottawa proceed to implement a national medical care plan. The minister of Health, who I am sorry is not in his heat, denied that he had urged Ottawa to go slow on implementation of a medical care plan and at that time the acting leader of the opposition had to withdraw the allegation he had made to the effect because he had no evidence to support it. Well, he found it and gave it to me and this is what the clipping says.

I am sure the minister will not mind if I read it to the assembly. The heading is "Canada cannot afford Medicare", and this is taken from the Leader Post of June 22, 1964. The story apparently originated in Saskatoon.

Health Minister Dave Steuart of Saskatchewan said Saturday, he does not think Canada at present can afford the medical care plan envisaged in the report of the Hall Royal Commission announced on Friday.

Now, as I understood the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition, this is exactly what he had said was the government's position. This government tries to make us think that they are in favor of medical care. They try to make us think that they are more enthusiastic about medical care even than we are. And yet, when asked why they do not urge the institution of a national medical care plan, the answer they give is that in their view Canada can't afford a national medical care plan. That is their position. Their position is a matter of record.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert): — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The point was raised by the hon. member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) and again by the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker), the point I made — you said we were talking about the institution of a medical care program for Canada, not the entire Hall Commission report — was what we were referring to in that partial write-up you probably took out of context.

Mr. Walker: — I am sorry that the Leader Post didn't make that distinction and I realize that people in public life have this problem — that the press does not always detect the fine distinctions and nuances in our interviews and our statements, and I am sorry that the press failed to get the distinction of the Minister of Public Health.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is our position with reference to the inclusion of drugs in the medical care plan? Well, first of all, it is more interesting to know what is the position of the government because on this side of the house, the prospects of us changing the provisions are somewhat remote but what is the position of the government?

Well, the premier was interviewed by one E.N. Davis, and the interview is reported in the Leader Post of April 11th, 1964, page 20. This is what the Premier said:

We are proposing to add catastrophic drug costs to the benefits under the act.

I presume that means drug costs in excess of a certain proportion of a person's income or something to that effect. That was the position which the Liberal party took prior to April 22 and if the minister of Public Health wants me to quote his statements on the same subject I can do so. But what was the position that the present government took, which the Liberal party took upon achieving office? Well, they say that any significant legislation in this field would only be passed when federal assistance is available.

An Hon. Member: — Federal?

Mr. Walker: — When federal assistance is available. Well, we have some new cry babies to Ottawa. I do not think that the Liberals when they were seeking votes last March said that this pledge was to be implemented only if Ottawa provided the money. I think that the Liberal party appealed for the votes of the people of Saskatchewan on the basis that this is what they would do, not what they would ask Ottawa to do. Here is another clipping from a report of the same minister from the Leader Post of September 3: "Minister Shelves Drug Cost Plans". And that ever-loving sycophant, the editor, says, "Free Drugs Must Wait".

Well, that editorial was on September 4th. On September 16th there were some developments in the constituency of Hanley. Suddenly the government had some new ideas on the subject of medical care, of drugs and drug benefits under the medical care plan. Suddenly it became a matter worth talking about again. Suddenly it was a matter which the government was going to do without any help from Ottawa. And I have here an advertisement authorized by the Saskatchewan Liberal Association, prom-

ising once more, unequivocally and without reservation, an extension of medicare to cover major drug costs. That apparently was their position just before the election of December 16th. So the Liberal party has in six months tripped twice on this question. As late as December they were in favor of it again. But, lo and behold, now we have met here in the legislative session and not a word about it. No suggestion by the Liberal party that it will now or ever implement that pledge.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, before I resume my seat I intend to move an amendment to the amendment which will provide as follows:

That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the following words:

And this assembly also regrets that no action is proposed to put into effect the promise of the government party to include the supplying of drugs with medical care benefits.

I suppose I might as well move it right now, Mr. Speaker, and reserve my right to continue my remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so much for drug care. The present government having weaved all over the place, having varied its attitude on every question under the sun started to look for something spectacular that it could do. They immediately remembered the old speeches that they made when they were sitting here in opposition about all the fat that had accumulated in administrative levels of government and they were going to therefore squeeze some of the fat out. Well, having made this statement, the Premier was then under some obligation to produce some figures of some fat that he had squeezed out. And so we heard varying figures running all the way up to \$6,500,000 of fat that he had squeezed out.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you can postpone expenditures, you can delete items of expenditure that had been provided by the legislature, but if you do, you are defying the legislature itself, but that is alright, they were prepared to do this. And so they cut some things out, they postponed some things, they wiped out the farm machinery testing service in the Department of Agriculture. Well, that is a small saving no doubt, but let us remember the extra cost to the farmer will more than offset the picayune saving which the government achieve. It is an improvident kind of saying which my grandmother used to call 'penny wise and pound foolish'.

Whom did they please by doing that? Every farmer in Saskatchewan who understands the use of this organization, protests about it, is unhappy about it. I have here a clipping from the Star Phoenix of January 22, 1965. It reads: "Implement dealers approve of the A.M.A. move." Well, the government is pleasing its friends. This was supposed to be a government that was to do things for farmers. What has happened? They have only been in office six months and they forget who their friends are. Or maybe, they have found out.

The new Minister of Education said two days or so after the election, that the government was going to make a close study before acting on the vocational school plan. The sum that was voted by the legislature, as I recall it, was \$500,000. Admittedly, \$500,000 will not go very far to establish four or five technical institutes, but it will do something. I hope the minister will stand up and tell us whether he spent any of that \$500,000 during the course of the current fiscal year. Or whether his decision to act with caution has overpowered his directions from the legislature when the budget was passed last March.

The striking out of this sum for technical institutes will inevitably delay, I believe, the construction of these projects. This may cost the province of Saskatchewan some federal participation grants for the construction of these buildings. I hope that the minister can assure us that the deadline has been extended beyond the deadline that existed at this time last year for federal participation in this program. I hope he can.

The effect of this delay will be to reduce the output of students trained for the growing requirements of industry in this province. Belatedly again, during the Hanley by-election campaign, the premier reversed this decision. At Sutherland, he said that the government was now going to give the green light to this project.

So the government wasn't able to make up its mind on this

question. One of the first headlines made by the minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) after assuming office was: "Lease Rentals to be Raised". The story goes on:

Agriculture Minister A.M. McDonald said today that his department is considering increases in the rentals on crown grazing and cultivation leases. He said that increases likely would go into effect at the beginning of the year.

Since the issue of the writ for the Hanley by-election, nothing more has been heard from the minister or from the government on this proposal.

It soon became apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the government was having more difficulty with controlling events than they were having in making news. Their much trumpeted savings were picayune or non-existent and the harassments and upheavals caused by their tampering with approved and long established programs were causing anxiety and distressing the people of Saskatchewan. The government, therefore, decided that it might be easier and more profitable politically, to control the news, rather than to try to control events. And so they launched out on a campaign of claiming credit for everything in sight. This decision to manipulate the news instead of shaping the events, was, I believe a sorry choice for the government. We saw them trying to claim credit for the potash plant at Belle Plaine. With the announcement of the Hanley by-election, we saw them put the wheels of propaganda into high gear. The minister of Industry (Mr. Grant) tried to claim credit for having lured the U.S. Borax and Chemical Company to erect a plant at Allen in the Hanley constituency and I believe some attempt had been made here in this house to claim credit for that. The fact was, of course, that the people who planned and designed this plant had been working on it for many months before the election last April 22.

Mr. Thatcher: — A real private enterprise.

Mr. Walker: — Indeed, it was a real private enterprise, yes.

Mr. Thatcher: — Capitalist.

Mr. Walker: — They had extracted from the CCF government, from the Department of Highways of the CCF government, an undertaking to provide a road to connect with the mine site. This telegram was on file from "Carlsbad, New Mexico", April 10th 1964, (before the election):

It is our firm intention to start field construction at the site in June or July. If you require further assurance of our intention we are prepared to offer to reimburse the government the cost of improving the road from Elstow to the plant site, should our plans fail to materialize . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Where did you get that?

Mr. Coderre: — Where did you get that?

Mr. Walker: — This is a copy of a telegram I said . . .

Mr. Coderre: — . . . files . . .

Mr. Walker: — Why have you got . . .

Mr. Walker: — This was minister's correspondence and I take the responsibility for stating that it is a correct copy, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Table it . . .

Mr. Walker: —

We are most anxious to have the road improved during this summer construction season and we very greatly appreciate

your efforts on our behalf.

An Hon. Member: — That is from one of the missing files . . .

Mr. Walker: — and it is signed. R.E. Kendall, U.S. Borax and Chemical Corporation. Now, the Liberal party went about trying to say that this was another industry that had been induced to come to Saskatchewan by the attractions of the Liberal government.

Mr. Steuart: — Will the member table that?

Mr. Walker: — Yes, I will lay it on the table.

Mr. Coderre: — I wish you would explain to the house where you got possession of that though.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I have already made this clear. This is not a government document. This is merely my copy made of a document.

An Hon. Member: — Have you authority to take a document out of the house?

Mr. Walker: — This document wasn't taken out of the possession of the government. It was merely copied off of a document which is, so far as I know, still in the possession of the government. I didn't find it in the waste basket either.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder if the hon. gentleman would indicate which department the original of the document is in.

Mr. Walker: — Probably the Department of Industry and Information. It was addressed to the Hon. Russ Brown

Mr. Heald: — Thank you.

Mr. Walker: — And I should say, Mr. Speaker, that this document was addressed to the Hon. Russ Brown, Minister of Industry and Information. Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Are you referring to a letter?

Mr. Walker: — No, I thought I made it clear, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to my copy of a telegram which was received by the Hon. Russ Brown, Minister of Industry and Information on April 10, 1964.

Mr. Speaker: — I must ask the indulgence of the house. I am concerned a little with the sub-amendment that was being ruled. I think I have it correctly that because the signature of a telegram cannot be proved, and because anybody can send a wire from me to me, as everybody knows, or you to you, I don't think the use and the reference to wires in debates is correct and I think if I can find that chapter and verse in Beauchesne . . .

Mr. Walker: — I agree, Mr. Speaker, this is not an official document, this is merely a copy taken from a telegram and I take responsibility for its existence.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, you say it on your own responsibility. You will have to take responsibility for the signature there too, the man that signed it.

Mr. Walker: — I do . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I think if you do that you can proceed, but the citing of wires, unless the member is willing to take responsibility for them, is unparliamentary.

Mr. Walker: — Yes, Sir, I don't dispute that at all, and as a matter of fact, neither does Mr. Kendall, the President of the company, whom I know.

Mr. Stuart: — He won't admit he knows you.

Mr. Walker: — Well, he doesn't know . . . I am the one who knows whether or not I know him.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — He won't admit that he knows you.

Mr. Walker: — Well . . . I didn't say that he knew me. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I said that I knew him. Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened? What happened? Well, the government was caught a little flat footed. They claimed credit for this, including the Premier, in the constituency of Hanley. I think he didn't realize that we remembered this telegram. I think he did not realize it.

So I am informed, Mr. Speaker, the present government did not honor this commitment of the government of Saskatchewan to build a road to the plant from the highway system. Instead they went to the municipality of Blucher and they drove a hard bargain with them. They made the municipality cough up ten per cent of the cost of the road. Ten per cent of the cost of the road, a road which had been undertaken by the government without any reference to the municipality. The previous government made no reference to the municipality, simply undertook to build the road and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government should now disgorge this amount and reimburse the municipality.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, one other thing while I am on the subject of this plant at Allan. I should remind the house that a year ago . . .

Mr. Bernard Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is it right that the member after moving an amendment or a sub-amendment to an amendment can carry on speaking on the whole debate or does he not have to confine his remarks to the amendment regarding the drugs?

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I haven't proposed the sub-amendment to the house. The debate is continuing on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. Gallagher: — Fooled again.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I ruled when the amendment was moved that the debate would continue on the motion and the amendment and until such time as I propose the sub-amendment and rule as to what shall take place from there on in, the debate continues on the motion and the amendment. Now, when the hon. member gets ready, or indicates that he is ready, I will rule on the sub-amendment.

Mr. Walker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, thank you. While I am on the subject of this mine at Allan, I want to say one other thing.

The hon. members who were here last year will recall that we passed an Industrial Townsite Act, and that we did so because we realized that certain small urban communities lacked the capital and the resources and the planning services to be able to provide for a doubling or a trebling of their size in say a year, or two years, and the act provides that the local community may draw upon the province for support of this kind.

I notice that Lanigan almost at once took the benefit of the

act. I also noticed that as soon as the plant was announced at Delisle, the town of Delisle applied for the benefits of the act immediately that the mine was announced.

Mr. Thatcher: — Did you get that one too?

Mr. Walker: — The people of Allan, Mr. Speaker, are finding the cost of sewer and water and modernization (which was underway independently of this industry locating there) a serious burden indeed. If the town could manage to get assistance for the capital costs of this program under this plan, it would enable the town to acquire quickly large numbers of new residents, thereby expanding their assessment and securing a wider distribution of the capital and service costs. I would like to know what the government is prepared to do to help Allan under this program. I am told that the former Minister of Industry (Mr. Pinder) actually advised the community of Allan not to apply or seek to take advantage of its rights under this legislation, that he actually discouraged them from claiming benefits under the act.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Who told him . . .

Mr. Walker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with a claim made by the Premier himself, with regard to industrial development. Look, for example, Mr. Speaker, at the attempt by the government to squeeze some political advantage out of the extension to the Canada Cement Plant at Floral. This event occurred just a week before the Hanley by-election. The Premier and his Minister of Industry were together on the platform that day. The Premier told all and sundry who were assembled there that his Minister of Industry had worked with the company and the municipal officials in attracting this industry to the constituency. Then according to the press report and I quote from the press report:

Industry Minister, Herb Pinder, paid credit to the Cory Municipal Council for making tax arrangements to encourage industry to the area. He said the municipality was following the lead of the provincial government in realizing incentives must be provided to attract industry.

and the Premier presumably sat and listened to that remark. Seeing this in print . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — A good speech too . . .

Mr. Walker: — Seeing this in print, the officials of the Cory municipality didn't think it was a very good speech because they denied the truth of it. The reeve and the council and the secretary of the Cory municipality got in touch with the local newspaper and the newspaper issue of December 11th, we find this heading: "Cory Denies Incentives". The story goes on:

The Rural Municipality of Cory denied today that it made any special tax concessions to attract the \$5,500,00 plant to the municipality. Officials of the Canada Cement Company also contradicted Industry Minister Pinder's statement Thursday that Cory had such an arrangement.

An Hon. Member: — . . . Didn't work . . .

Mr. Walker: — Well, I suggest that if we read the Speech from the Throne, and the government is only now making provision for municipalities to do this sort of thing, that if the Minister of Industry had spent some time attending to his duties in the cabinet, he would have known that it was impossible for this sort of arrangement to be made and he would not have made such a spurious claim in the first place.

Clearly neither the minister nor the Premier had any hand in persuading the Canada Cement Company to build the extension to this plant. Indeed, at the time the original plant was built, some year or two ago, it was announced by the officials of the company that there would be at

this time an expansion of the plant. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it would have been much more creditable to the Premier if he had restrained his candidate in Hanley constituency from making such a claim, because this was the kind of thing that discredited the Liberal campaign in the Hanley by-election.

Another example of this moral decrepitude, I suppose one could call it, relates to the Anglo-Rouyn mine announcement. The story says and I quote:

Start of construction of Saskatchewan's first base metal mine is slated almost immediately at Waden Bay on the north shore of Lac La Ronge.

Now, this is, of course, an exaggeration, there have been other larger and smaller deposits of base metal which have been worked out in the past, and His Honor was made to say that the mine had been established. Now, I don't know whether this is an exaggeration or not, I rather doubt the truth of that statement . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — We have to wait to see . . .

Mr. Walker: — Oh yes, it hasn't been, they have to wait to see, but His Honor was told that it was already established.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Well, it has . . .

Mr. Walker: — I suggest that the Deputy Premier should have a hand in composing the Speech from the Throne if he really . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — There is none so blind as those that will not see, Bob.

Mr. Walker: — I think that the statement by the Premier was almost more exaggerated when he said that this represents a major breakthrough in mineral development in the province of Saskatchewan. We hope it does . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh yes . . .

Mr. Walker: — . . . but we do think that the Premier is being a little optimistic, excessively optimistic. The Liberals attempted throughout this whole discussion, Mr. Speaker, to claim that they were responsible for this development . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Winters said . . .

Mr. Walker: — Yes, and who is Mr. Winters?

Mr. Thatcher: — He is the President of the company . . .

Mr. Walker: — He was a Liberal Cabinet Minister, that is who Mr. Winters is. Just another defeated Liberal Cabinet Minister, that is all.

An Hon. Member: — Great industrialist . . .

Mr. Walker: — He is now the President of the Rio-Algoma Mines and he said that Mr. Pinder is largely responsible for the fact that he was here today. I understand there had been a Liberal banquet in Prince Albert the night before. The Liberal candidate placed advertisements — the heading — "Mining Man Admires H. Pinder". I think that is very touching. I am sure that H. Pinder admires the mining man too if the truth is known, but the liberal candidate put this in an advertisement and marked it "Mr. Pinder is largely responsible for the fact that I am here today" and he marked it, thereby accepting some responsibility for the tone which such a fraudulent claim really sets.

The fact of the matter was, Mr. Speaker, that the ore body found there was found in 1956 by a . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Why didn't he . . .

Mr. Walker: — I will come to that. I will come to that. You know the answer as well as I do, Davy. It was found in 1956 under a prospector's assistance program which was financed by this government, a program which I believe is now no longer in existence. Because of the small size of the ore body and because of the depressed state of the base metal prices at that time, it was considered to be uneconomic for immediate development, and this, Mr. Speaker, you don't have to take . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Nonsense.

Mr. Walker: — You don't; have to take my word for it, this was confirmed by a Mr. W.P. Arnold, Vice-President of Rio-Tinto on the 30th of November, 1964, as reported in the Leader Post and this is the way the Vice-President who was not a defeated Liberal politician said:

Increased market prices for base metals, particularly copper, is one of the major reasons for the decisions to open a base metal mine in the La Ronge area.

Mr. Steuart: — What is the other one . . .

Mr. Walker: — And, of course, Mr. Speaker, it was widely bandied about in the Financial Post back in September that because of the rising level of base metal prices, such uneconomical deposits as the one at Anglo-Rouyn might become economically feasible.

An Hon. Member: — . . . sure as heck make no money . . .

Mr. Walker: — So, we have the word of the Vice-President of the company, that the . . .

Mr. Steuart: — We have the word of the President . . .

Mr. Walker: — Well, for my part, Mr. Speaker, I would rather accept the word of anybody who wasn't a defeated Liberal candidate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — Then we are told, Mr. Speaker, we are told, and this was while a CCF government was in office, that it was the intention to proceed with this mine. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in September, a year before, this company took additional claims on properties around the original deposit with a view to development. It is pretty clear, Mr. Speaker, that the present government had nothing whatever to do with this project. Now, I want to make it abundantly clear, Sir, that I am not decrying legitimate efforts and legitimate successes which this government has achieved or may achieve. I wish the government well in the whole area of economic and industrial development. I want to make this perfectly clear. All I . . .

An Hon. Member: — He wants another chance . . .

Mr. Walker: — All I do, Mr. Speaker, is to say this — that I deplore fraudulent attempts to claim credit where credit is not due, and I might say, and I warn them of this, that when the time comes and it may come sooner than we expect, that when this government is entitled to claim credit for something, nobody will believe you, you will be like the boy that cried "wolf".

Mr. Steuart: — Don't you believe . . .

Mr. Walker: — I want to refer to another example of this kind of specious claim to credit and I refer to a statement, and I am kind of sorry we have to do this. The Minister of Education was speaking in Hanley constituency on December 9th at Graystone School, and he is reported in the Star Phoenix as having said:

One of the first things the new Liberal government did, (said the Education Minister) was to raise pensions for older, retired teachers who had previously received an inadequate income.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, these are set by statute and unless I misled a session of the legislature some time last August or September . . .

Hon. George J. Trapp (Minister of Education): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I must say that was an error in the printing, it was a matter of tense if you look at it. It was: "we will raise pensions" and I can assure the hon. member we shall do so at the first session. This was a mistake in printing I must say.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — Well, I am very happy to have the hon. member make that explanation. I just wanted to say that I spoke in the same hall the next night and although I was urged at that time to repudiate the statement which was attributed to the hon. member, I must say that I said then, and I say now, that this is really a matter for the Teachers' Federation to deal with and I presume they did. I presume they took up the matter of the misstatement and had it corrected.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't put that forward as any particular discredit to the new Minister of Education. I think, however, it should have been corrected in the next issue of the paper.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — It was.

Mr. Walker: — Oh, I am sorry then, I missed seeing it. There are other examples, Mr. Speaker, of the Liberals playing fast and loose with the truth for political purposes and I would like to refer to another example from Hanley constituency. My seatmate says if I am going to deal with all these examples we will be here all winter. Well, I will try to make it as brief as I can.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — Thank you, I appreciate that touching demonstration of sympathy from the other side.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the irrigation project at Broderick, and this is one that will interest the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald). First, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the former government favored an increase in the agricultural productivity of the province of Saskatchewan. We acceded to the demand of the Diefenbaker government that we undertake and commit ourselves to construct the works to provide water for the irrigation of 50,000 acres, which is about 1/5th of the total irrigable area connected with that project, with the whole Douglas Dam project.

We carried on a full program of extension commencing back in 1959. Our program assumed that the plan would be laid before the farmers in the various areas were affected. We assumed that finally the government would select or designate the most promising area among the four or five alternate areas and the most promising area would be selected for a vote. We expected that the degree of financial assistance and support which would be given by the government would merit the approval of the majority of the residents in whichever district was finally selected as the most promising possibility.

A firm undertaking was made by the CCF government by the then Minister of Agriculture and I was there when he did it, on August 6th, 1960, when he said: "We are not going to push irrigation down your throats." It had been the intention and the policy of the CCF government that the acceptance of irrigation would have to be without any measure of coercion or compulsion.

The present Minister of Agriculture would now have the people of Broderick believe that the previous government intended to coerce them. The Liberals point to the terms of the agreement with Ottawa and they

claim that this agreement is evidence of such an intention.

Well, first of all, there are two answers to this, Mr. Speaker. First, as I have said, there were several alternate areas that could be irrigated on that project which might be selected for initial irrigation, and it is no answer to say that one of the other areas may be more costly to develop because it is claimed that eventually all the areas are going to be developed anyway. Secondly, it is no argument to say that just because we favor irrigation and want to see it, that this means you have to force people to comply, to pay water rates, and to take water for irrigation. Leading and persuading people to do things which are in their own interests are more effective than any form of compulsion devised by even the most tyrannical government. The residents of the area are reasonable men and women, and I suggest that if economically just proposals are made to them, they will be found receptive to these proposals. These people are successful farmers. They cannot be deceived as to the future prospects under the proposal as it presently stands.

The government now tries to leave the impression that the threats of compulsion were formulated by the previous government. The only legislation by which this government, or the previous government, could impose taxation for water rights upon those residents, as the statutes stand at the present time, are through The Irrigation Districts Act. That act provides for a vote of the resident farmers. If the present government adheres to the policy laid down by the previous government, it will follow that legislation. It will use that act. It will give the people of the community the democratic choice of determining whether or not they want to submit to water rights charges upon their land.

But here we have a newly elected government, Mr. Speaker, which is treating, or attempting to treat, farmers of Saskatchewan as though they were red-skins standing in the way of the building of the C.P.R., or as if they were Egyptian nomads trying to resist the construction of the Suez Canal.

An attempt has been made by spokesmen on the other side to say that the agreement between Saskatchewan and the Dominion of Canada commits the province to compel farmers to pay water rates.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — It does . . .

Mr. Walker: — Some one over there says it does. Well, I have the agreement here. This agreement should be known to all members of the legislature. It was annexed to a schedule. It was a schedule to an act passed in 1959, and it recites the whole agreement. Construction of the reservoir, part 1.

Mr. Allan Guy (Athabaska): — Read it all . . .

Mr. Walker: — Part 2, is operation and maintenance of the reservoir.

Mr. Guy: — Read it all . . .

Mr. Walker: — This may be the only way the hon. member will ever know what was in it. Part 3, Pen stocks and power development. Part 4. Irrigation works, and I will read the relevant parts of part 4, Clause 13, sub-section 1:

Saskatchewan will assume responsibility for and undertake the construction, operation and maintenance, as part of the project of all main canals, secondary reservoirs, distribution, distributors, pumping stations and equipment, and all other works required for the conveyance and distribution of water to all lands to be irrigated by the reservoir, hereinafter referred to as the Irrigation Works, and further agrees to proceed as rapidly as practicable with the construction of the said works.

Then subsection 2 says:

Upon the transfer of the reservoir to

Saskatchewan, under sub-clause 1, of clause 7, Saskatchewan will [(a) doesn't deal with this] (b) before the expiry of one year from the day on which the reservoir is built to minimum irrigation level, as determined by the minister, or of three years from date of transfer of the reservoir to Saskatchewan, under sub-clause 1, of clause 7, whichever is earlier, complete construction of irrigation works to the extent necessary to provide full irrigation to not less than 50,000 acres of land.

This means to build the works necessary to carry the quantity of water that would be required by 50,000 acres of land.

The government is perfectly entitled to say that nobody but a fool would build the works to provide water to irrigate 50,000 acres of land unless there were 50,000 acres committed to be irrigated, and I agree. I think it is the responsibility of the government to find 50,000 acres, in keeping with the democratic rights of the owners of these 50,000 acres, and then to build the works necessary to provide irrigation water for them. But there is nowhere in this agreement or in any legislation presently on the statute books of this province which gives the government power to go in and ride rough-shod over the owners of that 50,000 acres or any other 50,000 acres in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — The government should do exactly what was contemplated by the previous government in this respect. It should make such a satisfactory proposal to the owners of the land, that they will willingly — sixty-two and one-half-percent I believe is the percentage required under the act — approve of the establishment of an irrigation district. The minister can correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — It would take all day . . .

Mr. Walker: — Well, correct that one statement . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — There is not enough hours in the day.

Mr. Walker: — And so, Mr. Speaker, if this government really means to follow the policies and the assurances of the guarantees given by the previous government to these people, it will not have to introduce any new legislation. It will simply go about carrying out existing legislation. And you say there are only fifty or one hundred farmers that are concerned. Why am I raising this now? I am raising it now, Mr. Speaker, because these fifty or one hundred farmers are important, half of them are in the constituency of Hanley. But the principle is even more important. When there is a workable and feasible legislative method of achieving the end by democratic means and democratic processes, the government should exhaust every effort to implement their policies and their wishes by those methods. I don't believe the government has yet exhausted every possibility of carrying out this project in accordance with the principles that were laid down and accepted for the last fifteen years. The principle was laid down in the Irrigation District Act and that act incidentally has been on the statute books now for something like fifty years in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not gone into all the various aspects of government policies and don't intend to at this time, and I don't intend to show how the Liberal party went about losing the confidence of the people of the Hanley constituency but I suggest that when they talk about tax reductions, and in the same breath increase taxes, it does not lend to confidence and trust. The people of Hanley constituency, like all the people of Saskatchewan, aren't easily deluded by promises of this kind. When the government is elected on the pledge to reduce taxes, what do they do first? Like some unscrupulous merchant they put all the prices up before giving the reductions. People aren't impressed by that kind of ethical standard being adopted in the government.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — You change your coat in a

hurry . . .

Mr. Walker: — I will say more, Mr. Speaker, about the unnecessary hike in health taxes when the budget comes along, and I will say something about sales tax and about purple gas and something about the other aspects of the financial management of the government. I will also say something about royalties, and about industrial development, at that time.

Before I resume my seat however, I want to place on the records of the house the facts concerning another important issue in the Hanley constituency by-election.

I believe that it is a basic rule of responsible government, that the Lieutenant Governor should confine himself in appointing his ministers to persons who have been elected to the legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — It may be argued, Mr. Speaker, that the former Minister (Mr. Pinder) was an elected member but what were the facts? I don't propose to go into all the facts surrounding the final count and the recount, my offered resignation, the Liberal application to have the election controverted, and my application subsequently to have the election declared void. These facts are complicated and some of them permit more than one explanation and I don't wish to engage in a controversy as to facts surrounding those events because there is no one else here who has the advantage of first-hand knowledge of these facts and I am sure the legislature doesn't want to hear any one-sided presentation of it.

But the action of the Premier in appointing a person whose election was highly dubious and keeping him in office throughout the time when the Hanley Liberals were doing everything in their power to prevent the Judge from counting the ballots, I suggest was a deliberate plan to subvert the democratic process, and the Premier must answer for that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — The apparent attitude of the government was summed up in an article which appeared in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix. This article is headed: Pinder Doesn't Need Seat To Remain Minister".

An Hon. Member: — What is he going to sit on?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: —

Hon. Herb Pinder . . .

the article goes on,

the Minister of Industry and Information, has the constitutional right to stay in his cabinet position, as long as he wants, provided that the Liberal government remains in power, although he doesn't at present hold a seat in the Saskatchewan legislature.

It goes on to say:

However, one authority in Canadian politics says that Mr. Pinder constitutionally was not bound to give up his cabinet position and that neither was Mr. Thatcher obliged to call an immediate by-election. The authority said that it is generally considered proper that a cabinet minister hold a seat in the house, but constitutionally it is perfectly alright for him to hold a portfolio without being an elected representative.

The Star Phoenix didn't acknowledge whom they were quoting in that article, but I suggest that with such eminent authorities on constitutional law as

Dean Lang of the College of Law and Professor Strayer and others at the University, the Star Phoenix might have gone further than to ask some junior clerk in the Premier's office what the constitutional position of the province is, in matters of this kind.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — What about Prime Minister Wilson of Great Britain and his friend Walker?

An Hon. Member: — What about that one?

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, there is no express provision in the constitution, no express statute prohibiting or forbidding the Lieutenant Governor from appointing members who are not members of the house. Indeed there is a well recognized precedent in the appointment of the hon. W.S.A. Turgeon, the hon. W.S. Martin, the hon. George Spence, all to cabinet portfolios while they did not have seats in the house. But in every one of these cases, they went about getting a seat or seeking a seat, in the minimum number of days prescribed by law and by-elections were held immediately within twenty-one or twenty-two days, the minimum time prescribed by law. It is not the practice of appointing non-members, particularly, that I am complaining about. What I am complaining about is the attempt to prevent the voters from passing upon the person who had been appointed and that no attempt was made to facilitate proceedings of the court in order to permit an early appeal to the electors for this minister to get a seat in the legislature.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — He was defeated twice . . .

Mr. Walker: — There was no reason . . .

An Hon. Member: — You are working to . . .

Mr. Walker: — There was no reason at all why the by-election on December 16th couldn't have been held in June, if the Liberal candidate had been willing to allow the processes to proceed in the ordinary way, no reason at all.

An Hon. Member: — By when?

Mr. Walker: — The recount was originally set for June and would have been over by the end of June by the very latest, if the Liberal candidate had acceded to the forms and the procedures set out in the act.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — What not call one in Kelsey?

Mr. Walker: — This anonymous constitutional expert, I submit, was misleading the Premier, when he said that he can have non-elected persons in his cabinet for an indefinite period. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if this crisis was followed through to its logical conclusion, if you can have one who is not a member, you can have ten, you can have a whole cabinet of non-elected members. This obviously defeats the whole principle of responsible government and the practices that have grown up under them in Britain and in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take time to deal any longer with that subject, except to say that the voters from Hanley constituency re-enforced the precedents which were set in 1945 in dealing with the Defence Minister of the federal government who had to be defeated twice, you will remember, before he could be kept from occupying his seat. The people of Saskatchewan have a rough sense of justice about these matters and I submit that was one factor in the outcome of the election.

I would like to turn attention now, to another subject that is dealt with in the Speech from the Throne. I would like to say, first of all, that there are many subjects in the Speech from the Throne with which we on this side of the house can frankly say, we concur and which merit nothing but commendation.

We are pleased with the forecast that the rate of industrial development in the province will rise, that the progress of the past will

continue in the future.

We, on this side of the house are, however, a little concerned about the veering and wobbling of the government and that it might slow down the tempo of Industrial development. We are concerned that the sometimes extravagant commitments of the government to attract new industry, — and the Premier has said that he is willing to do anything or give anything to attract new industry, — may be excessive, and that the price we pay may be worth more than the industry which is attracted by the promises. We don't want the people of Saskatchewan to be in a worse position because of the attraction of new industry. We don't want them to be in a position where they actually have less advantage than they would have had if the industry had stayed away.

The house will welcome the large increase that is proposed in the field of education. The Liberals through the years, have lamented the fact of the rising level of school taxes, of taxes on property in this province and we will rejoice in the statement which promises to fulfil the solemn Liberal obligation made by the Premier before the election to get taxes down on land and property in this province. And we will rejoice in the implementation of that promise. If the government lives up to that billing, it is to be commended.

All quarters of the house will learn with satisfaction of the government's conviction that the province can now afford an increase in the minimum wage. The minimum wage in this province is presently the highest in Canada, even though it hasn't been increased in several years, but we nevertheless welcome the announcement that it will still further be increased.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — I hope that the government in increasing it, will take into account the increase in the cost of living that has occurred since the minimum wage was established in this country.

Furthermore I hope that the government will take into account the increase in the productivity of labor, the generally increased level of wealth production in the province, since the time that the present level was set. There is at least one other factor which I think must be taken into account. When the last increase was granted, everyone acknowledged and most of all those of us in the government, that the rate was not as high as it should be then. We recognized then that we were forced to compromise between what should ideally have been done and what was the situation in other provinces in Canada, because we were confronted with the threat of unfair competition which was posed in the scramble between provinces to attract new industry and we had therefore to moderate the level which we would like to have set. Now of course, other provinces have closed the gap somewhat and if the words of the Lieutenant Governor are to be accepted at face value, the province now is not having any difficulty in inducing industry to come and, therefore, this factor can now be discounted or be ignored in setting the new minimum wage level.

Mr. Speaker: — Just a few seconds ago, the speaker mentioned the Lieutenant Governor, and if I take his word correctly, he said if the words of the Lieutenant Governor are to be taken at face value. I draw to his attention that no aspersions may be cast by any member in this legislature to anything said by the Lieutenant Governor, and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. Walker: — I certainly didn't intend to cast any reflection on His Honour, I certainly withdraw any implication from my words that may have been construed as reflection on His Honour. I say however, instead, that if we are to take those words as being an indication of what the government really intends to do, then we will be concerned about another aspect of the announcement, and that is: does the government intend that this increase in the minimum wage shall be applicable to workers in all regions in the province? Or does it intend merely to apply this increase

to a limited category of workers or to workers only in a part of the province? If that is the case, then of course it is just a hoax because it is easy to find areas and to find occupations where the minimum wage could be increased substantially without having any effect upon anybody. It would only be a paper doll, a paper figure, it would only be a shadow of reality. I would hope that the government is wiser than to bask in widespread public support and public approval over an announcement of this kind, and then try to get by with such a meaningless gesture in fulfilment of their obligation.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we share the opinion expressed in His Honour's address, that the government is opposed to the wholesale abandonment of railways. The point that the CCF and the Farm Organizations have been trying to get across, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not only opposed to the wholesale abandonment of railways but we are opposed to the retail abandonment of railways also. And when undertakings are made that there will be no abandonment, and when the word "wholesale" is put on as the qualifying or limiting adjective, then of course the substance of the words lose their reality. We are opposed also to retail abandonment. The phrase wholesale abandonment was invented by Mr. Donald Gordon, I believe, when he officiated at the opening of the new station at Saskatoon. He said: "there is no danger of wholesale abandonment." The Premier said: "Well, thank you very much for your assurance, now that matter is settled."

Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — State your point.

Mr. Gallagher: — I think the hon. member is out of order speaking about this because it appears on the order paper in the form of a resolution.

Mr. Walker: — In that event, Mr. Speaker, I will be more than happy to postpone my remarks on this subject to a later date.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is some comfort, of course, in the fact that it is even mentioned in the Speech from the Throne and I shall be pleased to take part in that debate when the resolution comes forward.

By and large, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne contains many good and worthy objectives and sentiments. It contains many statements that would commend themselves to the average citizen. Before I deal with that however, I would just like to deal with one other matter. Something was said by the mover of the address and reply about the origins of the CCF. Well, perhaps I should give him a little instruction on this matter. The CCF did not come into being overnight. The CCF people of my age and older will recall the growth and the development and evolution of this political movement. First, they will recall there was the taproot of British Labor Socialists. There was the influence of American populism and there was the non-partisan tradition of the turn of the century American mid-west. The progressive party of Canada drew from all of this rich heritage of ideas from the United States and Britain. The present CCF evolved first as a farmer-labor party, and then to another phase of evolution when it became the CCF as a party able to deal more effectively with current economics and social problems.

In Saskatchewan, for the information of my hon. friend, we now have this new political philosophy to which I referred earlier as Thatwaterism. Thatwaterism . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — Thatwaterism didn't evolve the way the CCF did. It was born of a political mother, and that political mother was a regression or a throw-back in the evolution of socialism, a resemblance to some freak ancestor of long ago. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that it was sired by some wandering errant Bircher from South-Western United States. And so we have this political philosophy in this province now to contend with.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in deciding whether or not to support this Speech from the Throne, one is struck first of all by the worthy ideas that are expressed in it, phrases and sentences with which no one can take exception. Many voters, however, last April, made the mistake of believing that statements made by Liberals could be taken at face value. This

can be dangerous. Some of us cautioned our friends that they should look behind the bouquet of promises and words and that they should examine the character, the reputation for performance of the party making the promises.

Last spring unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, these warnings went unheeded by many citizens. This resulted in the people in Saskatchewan having a Liberal government. The people have now, however, learned to their sorrow that it is sometimes difficult to reconcile Liberal actions and Liberal words, that Liberal actions are so often incompatible with Liberal words. And so members on this side of the house who have learned this lesson will not be taken in by the attractive trappings contained in the Speech from the Throne.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I resume my seat, I would like to move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Nollet (Cut Knife), the amendment which I read earlier and which I have since tabled.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I have here before me a sub-amendment and it is necessary for me to rule on that before anybody else speaks. The question which has to be decided is the matter of relevance, that is whether this sub-amendment is in order. I want to quote from Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Citation 107, which says:

Amendments to the Address-In-Reply to the Speech from the Throne are the means used by the opposition for the purpose of challenging government policy or actions when parliament meets again after a few months recess. This practice is recognized as one of the prerogatives of Her Majesty's loyal opposition. An amendment to the opposition amendment may be moved . . .

and this is what we are talking about now —

provided it is relevant. But if it proposes to add to the main amendment with commendation to the government, then it is equivalent to an expanded negative, etc.

A little further in Citation 207, we find this:

The sub-amendment on the Address-In-Reply to the Speech from the Throne may be moved subject to the same rules as any other amendment. It must be relevant to the amendment and cannot raise a new issue.

The amendment before the house is as follows:

But in view of the present high provincial revenues and the promised reduction in taxes this assembly regrets that Your Honour's advisers have increased the personal tax for hospitalization and medicare.

I find the sub-amendment relevant to the amendment, and I therefore rule that it is in order and I am going to propose it to the house now.

Moved by the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), seconded by the hon. member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) that the amendment be amended by adding thereto the following words:

And this assembly also regrets that no action is proposed to put into effect the promise of the Government party to include the supplying of drugs with medical care benefits.

Now having proposed the sub-amendment, having ruled it in order and proposed it, it becomes necessary to decide how the debate shall continue upon the motion, amendment and sub-amendment. I have gone through the journals of the house and through the various regulations and I want to

refer to Citation 170 again in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

Amendments to the Address are moved by way of additions thereto; the general debate may take place on the Address but when an amendment is proposed, discussion should be strictly confined to the subject matter in the amendment.

Now that is the ruling in Beauchesne. I have gone back through all the journals of the province of Saskatchewan and when amendments have been moved to the Address, some journals show that the debate was continued on the Address on the motion and amendment. Some have shown nothing and some, I would say approximately twenty years ago and before, showed where debate continued strictly on the amendment. Of latter years, and as I ruled the other day, which ruling was compatible with the precedents of the house, the debate is continued on the motion and the amendment. We have never been faced, as far as I can find in the journals, with the problem of ruling as to how the debate continues when there is a sub-amendment. However, I want to draw your attention to the journals of the legislature of this province for the year 1961, when a ruling was made in regard to how the debate may continue on an amendment. (This is recorded in the journals of 1961 — page 21). This was a ruling that was made by the Speaker at that time:

Yesterday a point of order was raised questioning a practice of this house which has obtained for some time — (the practice obtained for almost fifteen years!), namely that of permitting the debate on both the Address-In-Reply and on the amendment thereto at the same time. In my opinion, the point of order requires not so much a ruling on the practice as an explanation of its purposes. The Speech from the Throne is traditionally a general statement of government policy as well as the general outline of the proposed legislation. Following the Speech, the house has an opportunity to debate in general terms, the policies and the legislative proposals of the government on the motion for an Address-In-Reply, This debate provides for an opportunity to test the government on a vote of confidence motion, moved as an amendment to the Address-In-Reply and in this house such an amendment has long been regarded simply as a non-confidence motion, without in any way restricting the generality of the debate. Thus after the amendment has been moved to the motion for the Address-In-Reply, the house continues to debate the general policy of the government and not simply the specific substance of the amendment.

The Speaker then ruled that it was in order to debate both the motion and the amendment. In view of this ruling and precedent of past procedures in this house, and above all things, in order to allow all members the widest possible latitude of debate and complete freedom of speech and discussion, I rule that the debate will now continue on the main motion, the amendment and the sub-amendment.

I am going to rule that the debate continue on the motion, the amendment and the sub-amendment and the other reason which I am going to mention is that I would not wish to do anything which would in any way limit the complete freedom of the discussion and expression of all members in this house in the Throne Speech debate. I think I am following the precedence of this house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Now, the debate continues on the motion, the amendment and the sub-amendment. Those who have not spoken to the sub-amendment will have an opportunity to do so but they must confine their remarks strictly to the sub-amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. George G. Leith (Elrose): — I rise in my place to speak in this debate. Will you

call it 5:30?

The assembly recessed from 5:30 until 7:30.

Mr. Leith: — I wish to resume the debate on the sub-amendment and the amendment and the motion on the Speech from the Throne.

First of all, Sir, I want to congratulate you on your election to your present eminence. I am sure that you are going to make your decisions on the basis of honesty and fairness and also on the basis of precedents from this house and from other honorable institutions of various parliamentary procedure. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, I may be a little out of order in proposing this but I want to suggest to members of this legislature that perhaps in these four years or in this legislature we should begin to be thinking about making the position a permanent one. Mr. Speaker, if you were so chosen for a permanent Speaker than I wish you many, many terms, many legislatures, many years and when you are finally carried away to that great parliament above where all Liberal members go, at least, I wish and hope that you may be Speaker in that place too.

Mr. Pederson: — What time is the train?

Mr. Leith: — I see the hon. member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) has suggested that they all will go too. Well, I have my doubts, Mr. Speaker, but charity is the father of hope so perhaps they can come too.

I want to congratulate the mover and seconder of the reply to the Speech from the Throne. The member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) made his points clearly and effectively, and even if the people of your left, Mr. Speaker, didn't like some of his points, I suggest to you, and through you to them, that it is the truth that hurts. Many of the things hit home, hit close to the people who sit on your left. Some of them will be reading the speech, some members of the last legislature who are not here today will be reading the speech and I think that probably they may reflect that some of the things that he said to this house may very well have helped them get elected back into this legislature if they had listened or if they had known.

The lady member from Saskatoon seconded the reply in a very able manner. She brought honor to herself and to the city of Saskatoon and I am only saying that I am proud to associate myself with her on this side of the house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Leith: — I want to speak just a minute about the Elrose constituency which I am proud to represent. We have good land, good grain land, and good ranch land. We have fine people. We have many ethnic groups in the constituency, and one thing about this area of the country is that there are no divisions — social or economic. There are differences, of course, between social groups and economic groups, just as there are political differences, but I want to hold this constituency up to you as an example of unity through diversity from which we could all benefit.

We have lots of local problems. The problems are not peculiar to the Elrose constituency but I want to mention a few of them that plague us particularly. We have spent some time discussing the prices of agricultural commodities. These are important, of course they are important. The price of wheat is important. But also the price of cattle and the price of eggs are important to an agricultural economy. I think that all members know, but I am going to say it again, that every phase of our society, federal government, provincial government, producer and consumer are going to have to co-operate to make sure that the agricultural segment of our economy is well treated because when the farmer has a dollar, he spends it. The farmer is the greatest spender in the west, or in Canada even. This dollar that he spends circulates. It increases the rate of money flow, and all of us, and I mean all of us, get the benefits that accrue from a high rate of money transfer.

But we have local problems that I want to talk about just for a minute. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I must blame the philosophy of the members who sit on your left, for some of them. I am speaking particularly about the trend toward centralization that has taken place in the last twenty to twenty-five years in Saskatchewan. Nobody is going to turn

the clock back on the school system. We are not going to turn the clock back on the school system. We are not going to go back to one room schools with six and eight and ten children in them. But at the same time, the trend toward centralization, and this applies not only in the schools, but in other segments of our rural life, has been accelerated and helped by the members of the opposition when they were in government. I am thinking particularly of the attempt that was made to introduce the county system in Saskatchewan. Many people supported the idea of a larger municipal district. In fact, in the Elrose seat now there are two municipalities who want to go together. They want to get bigger. They think that they can get some advantage from a little bigger unit. But the county system was proposed by the then government, and only the determined resistance of the farm people itself kept this from being brought in. If there is any one crime I think that we can attribute to the members opposite, collectively when they were a government, it is the fact they seem to embrace the principle of centralization. They want to make our big centres bigger. They don't care, I think, if the little centres get smaller and finally die away.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give an example of this. You will forgive me, sir, for using a particular locality. I am going to talk about the town of Beechy, which in the south-east corner of the Elrose seat. The people of Beechy some twenty-five years ago pulled a house into town and built it into a hospital. They remodelled it and they have been using this little plant ever since. For twenty years they have been asking the government of Saskatchewan to help them build a new hospital and for twenty long years the government that was in power formerly, the members that sit opposite, turned a deaf ear to their requests and their demands for help to build up a small hospital.

An Hon. Member: — Shame.

Mr. Leith: — Now they are going to say or some of the members opposite are going to say, "Well, fine. We might have helped Beechy get a hospital if we had thought that it was really needed. Lucky Lake is only a few miles away and we want to perhaps build a big hospital in Lucky Lake, or we want a better hospital in Dinsmore or Rosetown", but just the same, sir, their request for help in the Beechy community was ignored, and ignored for twenty long years. Beechy is seven miles from a highway. For twenty years they have been asking for a highway hook-up to this town. They haven't got it. The Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart), I am sorry to see that the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) is not here, but I want to ask them particularly, to listen to this appeal for help from this area. They need a small hospital there. They need a highway extension to get hooked-up to the highway system. If the members opposite have ignored this for twenty years, I hope that the members of the government on this side will not ignore it.

This example has particular interest for all of us, I think. Members opposite would do well to listen too. These problems are not peculiar to Beechy or to Elrose constituency. These problems of small communities which are inaccessible from highways and which are losing their hospitals and their services, are problems that are general in rural Saskatchewan. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite, when they were in the government, didn't try to stop this trend toward bigger centres. In fact, they abetted the flow of industry and commerce and services to larger areas. This is the one crime, as far as rural Saskatchewan is concerned that they have committed that is the most heinous. If we look across the house we see twelve members representing rural seats. The number on this side of the house is about double. I am convinced, sir, that this is one of the reasons why I am sitting in this house today instead of the member who was the minister of education in the last government.

People of rural Saskatchewan are tired of being forgotten and neglected. We see the cities growing. We don't mind them growing but still we want some share of the prosperity that is coming to Saskatchewan.

I could go on for a long time and talk about the evils of the former government. I don't think I want to do that. I want to talk first about what the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) had to say about the Broderick area. I believe the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) made some reference to the Broderick area in the Hanley by-election.

I want to tell all members of the house that I worked in that Hanley by-election and I am proud that I did work. I worked as hard as I

possibly could to get Mr. Herb Pinder elected to this house. The Broderick area was my particular concern because it happens to be close to my seat, just across the river and across the bridge and you are at Broderick. I made some friends when I was in there. I was in the area that is irrigated. I met some people in there too that are in this room today, the member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) was in one yard the day that I was there and we had a little chat . . .

Mr. Nollet: — It didn't do much good.

Mr. Leith: — It didn't do much good, the member from Cut Knife has just said. Well it did me a lot of good. It did me good to get into that area and see what's happening to those people, and see what the former administration both federally and provincially had laid out for them.

There have been numerous references to what would or wouldn't happen in the irrigation area. I want to quote to you something that the former Minister of Agriculture said in this last house. The date was February 17, 1964, in the Throne Speech debate. The member said:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now also refer again to this south Saskatchewan project. People overlook the fact that we are still faced with huge expenditures in the continued development of this project for electric power and for industrial, recreational and for irrigation purposes. The estimate for developing the total area for irrigation at one time, was somewhere in the order of \$40,000,000.

And here is the significant line

We will have to proceed with this development in the future and we are glad to do so.

I would like to remind the member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) that both he and the now member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) went around that part of the country during the by-election and I was surprised at some of the things that the people told me that these two people were saying. One of the things that a friend of mine told me about the former minister of Agriculture was that he said, "Well, if you fellows don't want irrigation, we will have to run it off somewhere else. You just don't know what you're missing".

Now, I realize that these are quotes from memory and I am not going to pursue them. But I am also going to say something, and I am sorry that the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) is not in his seat to hear this. I am going to repeat something that was told to me by people who supported him at this last by-election. They said that Mr. Walker had come in to the yard and they got talking about the agreement that he read today, and the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) said to them, "Do you know, fellows, this agreement isn't very binding". Now, can you imagine, the former Attorney General of the province saying that an agreement is not very binding. It is binding or it isn't binding? Is it very binding or is it not very binding?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Leith: — Now, I don't want members of the opposition to skip out of their responsibility in this affair. I have never advocated the South Saskatchewan River Dam. I put it to you that the people who are going to be in the irrigation district know more about irrigation than the former Minister of Agriculture ever knew. They have been to Alberta and they can see the effects. And all I can say to you, sir, is that the people of Broderick will be treated in a fair and honorable manner. I have made this pledge myself. Nobody is going to force them to irrigate against their wishes. They will find out that they will be able to move or they will be able to stay there and irrigate part if they wish but it is for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) to lay down a policy.

The member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) said something about educating the public. I submit to you, sir, that if the members of this house and the members who are not in this house but were in the former government had spent some time trying to find out about the possibilities

of irrigation and also the necessary evils of irrigation that they might not have been so quick to sign that agreement with the Diefenbaker government. There has been a suggestion that it be called the 'Diefenbaker Dam'. I heard another suggestion here that it be called the 'Douglas Dam'. Well, I think that we will find a name for that dam yet but it won't be either of those.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Leith: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I came to this house full of good humor and high hopes. I thought that perhaps the business of government would get through this session without some of the unfortunate things coming to light that I had been hearing about. But there were some documents tabled in this house the other day that have made me wonder just a little bit about front rank opposition members. These documents are purported to be written by, or at least they are copies of letter written by a Mr. Ray Woollam. I don't know him. I do know Mr. T.K Shoyama, the Hon. T.C. Douglas, Hon. W.S. Lloyd, Mr. Percy Brown. I know these people. I know who they are. I am perfectly willing to adopt a fair attitude toward these documents. I realize that they are copies and are not signed but I put it to you as honest people that copies of documents of letters that are written by a stenographer are not signed. They are filed.

An Hon. Member: — In the wastebasket.

Mr. Leith: — I want to introduce into the records of this house one of these letters. I don't approve of quoting parts of letters because anything can be read into it. But this one is, this copy, or copy of a letter dated February 28, 1963, addressed to the Hon. Everett Wood, Minister of Municipal Affairs, Administration Building, Regina:

Dear Mr. Wood:

Regarding politics and Hutterites:

On numerous occasions I have tried to point out to some of our MLA's that we ought not to assume the unreadiness of Hutterite brethren to participate in provincial or federal elections. Partly as a result of my work during the last four years, colonies in both Alberta and Saskatchewan are very sympathetic to the CCF-NDP point of view. Partly they base this on two issues about which they feel very strongly.

Firstly, this is a pacifist group and they are very emotionally involved in the no-nuclear arms issue.

Secondly, they are very appreciative of the leadership we have given with respect to our Bill of Rights and anti-discrimination programs as these have affected them.

Surveying the political spectrum in Canada, they tend to feel much hostility toward the social credit party, essentially because of the discriminatory legislation of the Alberta statutes, and feel a strong identification with the CCF because of our interest in co-op farms and a planned and peaceful economy.

For reasons of the resulting implications and larger questions of social change effecting colonies, I would like to urge that some of our candidates and key political figures approach the colonies of Saskatchewan with long term political objectives in view.

Of the fifteen colonies in the province, I speculate that two or three will be voting in force at the April 8th federal election. The other twelve will immediately rationalize in

scriptural terms, their determination to remain aloof from the decisions of this world.

On the other hand, some twelve colonies are permissive about the voting habits of the three colonies and have great difficulty answering a number of questions such as, "What would you do if there was a national showdown between the Social Credit and CCF parties." With a little patience, and occasional visits from some of our people, I am confident that all the colonies in Saskatchewan would vote CCF in the next provincial election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Leith: —

A case in point is the colony which we established about two years ago near Cut Knife.

I wonder where that is?

I began pursuing political discussions with this group as soon as they came into the province (inaudible). Pete Peterson . . .

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am putting these back on the table. I don't know . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Read a little.

Mr. Leith: — All right, I will. I will finish it.

An Hon. Member: — You'll know if a . . .

Mr. Leith: — All right, I will finish the whole letter. I have opened it up so I will finish it . . .

An Hon. Member: — Finish it for . . .

Mr. Leith: —

Pete Peterson, the real estate agent in North Battleford, who settled them, has made of this colony a personal political project. He had visited them about twice a month and has established a very strong personal relationship which has resulted in a very strong party allegiance of all the colony adults.

An Hon. Member: — Nothing to do . . .

Mr. Leith: —

A year ago he arranged for Tommy Douglas to have tea one afternoon with the colony leaders. On a number of occasions he has taken Eiling Kramer out to visit them. Last year they contributed \$25 to the Battleford constituency; last week the colony leaders attended the federal nominating convention and kicked in another \$25, and took out personal memberships. It has several times been suggested to Mr. Nollet that he pay a visit to the colony but he has not done so to date.

Mr. Nollet: — Never have.

Mr. Leith: — May I suggest that that was very good thinking.

I suggest that it is very important that he arrange to do this, perhaps through Pete Peterson of the Battleford Credit Union office. I suggest that if the entire adult group in this colony decides to vote CCF in every election, the colony, at least, will

follow suit without any difficulty.

From here, I have little doubt that the Sutherland colony, near Saskatoon, would pursue the same course of action, etc. I have been doing everything possible to involve colony leaders in community activities, in any level.

We have had good results here in terms of changing the colony's purchasing habits and involvement in local communities. Any of our men who could take the time to consolidate the interests of Saskatchewan colonies by encouraging their political participation, would be making a large contribution to a more general program of fostering the social and economic integration of colonies into the larger Saskatchewan community.

If a particular candidate wished further information on colony life, I would be pleased to provide this during the coming year.

and he finishes:

My post office address will be Post Office Box 4411, South Edmonton, Alberta.

Yours sincerely,
Ray Woollam

c.c. to Woodrow Lloyd
M. Brownstone
John Thiessen
I.C. Nollet
A. Kuziak.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to labor this any more, I have . . .

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? I would first like to know — do you have the date of that letter?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — He read the date . . .

Mr. Leith: — May I answer him, Mr. Speaker? I read the date and I would be quite happy to answer any more questions about this letter. Have you read it? February 28th, 1963. All right, I don't propose to read anymore . . .

Mr. Wood: — May I ask another question, please, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — I think this is a good time to explain the ruling in regard to asking a member questions when he is making a speech. That is that if any member not speaking wishes to interrupt a member who is speaking, he may rise in his place and ask if the member would permit a question. If the member doesn't take his seat, the question isn't allowed, if the member does take his seat, it is an indication he is prepared to answer the question.

Mr. Wood: — Is there anything in this letter that indicates in any way that this information was requested or encouraged . . .

Mr. Leith: — No, I would like to say the member from Swift Current is right, it isn't encouraged or asked for but the point is that it has been sent, this is what troubles me. I am not going to read any more, but I want to inform members of both sides of the house that there are more of these letters, and I used this as a particular example, maybe it isn't a good example, but I think it is. The whole point of the matter of these documents isn't very simple and it isn't very nice. Here was a public servant, a person who is being paid by all the people of Saskatchewan who is going out on public time, using public money, public transportation to

advocate participating in one political party. This is not what he is hired for, it is not what he is paid for, and I think that if the members in the front benches . . .

Mr. Wood: — . . . he is not required to do that work . . .

Mr. Leith: — . . . the members on the opposite side on the front benches have guilty knowledge of this, in my opinion.

Furthermore, in taking the file that he is supposed to have taken, he is trying to conceal the fact that he was trying to peddle politics, and this to me is absolutely reprehensible. I want to tell members on both sides of the house again, that if this government employs that tactic too, to try and perpetuate and build up a political party then I will not run again.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — . . . first year . . .

Mr. Leith: —I say again, Mr. Speaker, that I think the members opposite, especially in the front ranks, the front benches, today, have guilty knowledge of this kind of thing and I say to you backbenchers across there that you are not doing the job that you were sent here by the people of Saskatchewan to do, and that is to watch your government ministers and see that they don't get into this kind of a dirty mess.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't got much more to say, the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) made several points in quite a long dissertation. He said many things that I would like to answer but I am not going to do so at this time. I only want to say something about the business of drugs.

I, too, want drugs under prepaid medicare. I would dearly like to see some kind of a prepaid, small deductible, insurance policy for drugs. We have said that we are going to try and include the major drug costs in the government platform. This platform, again, I remind you is of four year's duration. We cannot and we have not promised to implement every item on this platform in the first year.

An Hon. Member: — . . . first year . . .

Mr. Leith: —In the first year, we have four years to do it and we will. We have promised to do so.

Now, much has been said about the philosophy of political parties and I don't think that I would feel that I had been treated fairly if I didn't say something about it too. The philosophy of Socialism has been explained by the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) and other members opposite. I have been reading about the philosophy of Socialism in this book in which some of the hon. members opposite took great pains to record for posterity, but I want to tell you that in my opinion the people of Saskatchewan have turned their backs on your philosophy of Socialism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Leith: — I want to say to you that your twelve rural members opposite indicate clearly that the farm people have turned their backs on you.

In my own particular case, the people who are ordinarily Conservative, and ordinarily Social Credit and ordinarily Liberal, have decided that they would rather have a Liberal member than a Socialist in this house, and they did decide that on April 22nd, and that is why I am here. And that is why some other members are here on this side of the house.

I have tried to rationalize Socialism and Socialists and the only real feature about them that strikes me right now is that if they see a problem, if a problem comes before them, they have one solution, and that is nationalization. They have State Ownership and Nationalization as their solution to the problems that beset us. I want to tell you, hon. members, that 19th century Socialism will not solve 20th century problems.

You are just fifty years too late. We are moving into a new era, and I want to say that the Liberal ideal is maximum freedom and initiative for every individual. We have a platform that we can be proud of and we are going to implement this platform. The Throne Speech has explained the platform clearly and concisely and, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against the sub-amendment, I am going to vote against the amendment, and I am going to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Leith: — This Throne Speech gives us a pattern for a program to make Saskatchewan a better place to live in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Leonard M. Larson (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise at this time and participate in the Throne Speech Debate.

I want first of all to join with others in this assembly in congratulating you in your elevation to the high post of Speaker. I think that our experience with you to this point has been a pleasant one. I want to say for myself that if I transgress the rules I hope that you will immediately bring me to order.

Also, I want to congratulate the members opposite on their victory of April 22nd. In many respects it was a surprising victory, somewhat as surprising as my win in the constituency of Pelly was to many people. I want to congratulate the two lady members of our assembly. The lady member from Regina West (Mrs. Cooper), on this side of the house, certainly displayed this afternoon that she has very attributable attributes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — To the lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) I want to say that she earned my respect in her seconding of the motion of the Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — I want to say that her job was made rather difficult, if not impossible, by the mover of the motion. After he had chastised members on this side of the house and the former government to no end, the lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) was able to get up and muster dignity and bring back to this house some of the dignity, that in my opinion, should be practised at all times.

I want to say to the hon. member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) who just resumed his seat, that if he had some butterflies in his stomach prior to his getting up, they have now moved to this side of the house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — I want to say further to the hon. member, I was rather disappointed in the presentation he made. I had the good privilege of meeting him and getting acquainted with him and I want to say to him that he will not enhance his political future if he persists in reading the type of letters and the type of insinuations that seems to be the order of the day in this house.

I think there are many other, very much more important, matters that we could discuss and that we are going to have to face up to, so I wanted to say that to him. Otherwise, I would congratulate him on his efforts.

Now, I want to say something about the constituency of Pelly. You know we are rather proud of the north-east part of the province. We have some rather unique and some rather pretty settings up there. Bordered to the north by the once lustrous and rich Porcupine Forest Reserve, which is now almost extinct. As a young boy I used to work in saw-mills up there. There were a few very great big ones and we used to get jobs

working for around 50 cents or \$1 a day. That forest was almost entirely stripped off by the large operators. If it hadn't been for the conservation policies that were implemented through the Timber Board of this province, there would not have been very much, if any, timber left. Today, on a sustaining yield basis, we were on the way of coming back.

I want to say further that it is one of the best big game hunting areas to be found anywhere in the province. Moose, deer, elk and bear, and so on. Just south of the Porcupine Reserve we have Swan River with its beautiful scenery and lush rich farm lands. South of the Swan River we have two of the great historic sites of the province, Fort Pelly and Fort Livingstone, which, if my information is correct, once served as the seat of government for the Northwest Territories.

If you move a little further down you will run into the Assiniboine River, again rich land. It is a muddy river which gives us some trouble with flooding in the spring and has marvellously rich farm land in its valleys. Then we have one of the most beautiful parks in the whole country. We have a saying in the Pelly constituency, "you haven't lived until you have glimpsed the beauties of the Duck Mountain and Madge Lake area." Thanks to the development of the former government, we have a beautiful summer resort, well developed and well taken care of, to provide all the recreational facilities that anyone could desire. I invite you all to come and have a little glimpse of our heaven.

I suppose I would be a little less than human if I didn't say something about my own home town of Kamsack. It is rather unique in very many respects. In the first place we have in Kamsack, the only completely independent oil refinery left in Canada, "Northern Petroleum", run and operated by local people and local capital, providing employment for fifty to sixty local people. We are proud of this local industry and very proud that it is able to remain independent in this socialist society that we have heard so much about. They are not worried about being taken over and have been very happy with the contracts they have had for supplying oil for hard-surfacing roads.

We have some other unique features, we are one of the highest grain producing areas per square mile that you will find anywhere. We have a ten year average of grain deliveries of 1,500,000 bushels and if you take into consideration the size of the area, it is difficult to match anywhere.

There is something else that is very unique, a very shallow gas field, not developed to commercial production, but still there. We have farmers who are burning natural gas in their stoves and in shops. We have a brand new nursing home. The lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) quite rightly suggested that we ought to be moving in this direction. We have already moved with the assistance of the former government. A new nursing home, now ready to open, ready for staff, and will be in operation very shortly,

All in all, we have, we think, something worthwhile. Of course, you will recognize that this is strictly an agricultural area with a few minor industries. We produce grain, cattle, hogs and other agricultural products.

I want to spend a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, talking about some of the needs of my constituency, and in doing this I want to give full marks and full credit to the former government. We have had development. Natural gas has reached most of our communities; as have roads; grid roads; schools; power, and so on. We are quite prepared to match our educational facilities in the constituency with anyone. We have a junior high school, which is still one of the very few in the province, but we still have needs as we always will have and I certainly would be remiss in my duties to my people, and my constituency, if I didn't mention some of these needs.

We need natural gas extension from Stenen in the north to Hvas, Norquay, Pelly and Arran. We need a gas extension from Kamsack to Cote, Runnymede and Togo. We need some road completions, we need the completion of black topping of no. 49 highway to its junction west with no. 9. We also need a new bridge south of the town of Kamsack across the Assiniboine River.

The other day one of these car transports, passing under the bridge, shaved the top of one of the vehicles that was on the transport. Much damage has been done both to property and through accidents because of this bridge. We need a new one very badly.

We need the rebuilding of the whole no. 8 highway, south to its junction with no. 10. We need some black topping on no. 5 through Kamsack to the Manitoba border. We need more grid roads. In the north some of these municipalities with very low assessment require considerable assistance. They lack municipal machinery and the equipment to do the work. They need assistance and we will welcome any assistance in the form of a grid road program that we can get.

It becomes obvious from what I have said that some of these needs will benefit and connect us with other constituencies. I want to say to the member from Yorkton and to the pro tem member from Canora that I am quite willing to co-operate and work with you in getting some of this work done. In this north-east area, with our heavy concentration of population and traffic, these roads are a must.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to spend some time talking about the Throne Speech. I have listened to a considerable amount of bickering, a considerable amount of bragging and boasting.

So far the debate has reminded me somewhat of a dedication that was made by CKCK radio to all politicians on the opening of the legislature. The disc jockey said we are going to play a very appropriate record and the title of the record is "Anything you can do, I can do better" and so on. This to a great extent has been the theme of this legislature to this point.

I don't propose to participate in this type of debate. I would rather take stock as it were of some of the problems that face us, of some of the real decisions that we are going to have to make in Saskatchewan and in Canada in the future, because I recognize the depth, the breadth, and the scope of these decisions and problems. I have to some extent labelled the Throne Speech as non-imaginative, non-substantiative and non-remedial.

I want to elaborate on this. I say it is non-imaginative because it fails to imagine the specific type of society, the specific type of problems and the specific type of remedies and we are probably going to have to have and face in the very near future.

I say it is non-substantiative because it fails to substantiate and document a great amount of the allegations that have been thrown against the former government and, of course, I say it is non-remedial because it offers nothing by way of constructive remedies. The only solution that I have heard offered to this point is a return to the free enterprise system and I want to say something about this a little later on.

First of all I am going to, Mr. Speaker, read into the records of this assembly some of the pertinent, very pertinent in my opinion, things that are happening around us, particularly Canada and the developed countries of the world. I am going to comment on some of them as I pass over them and read them into the record. Some of the notes that I am using are from June Callwood's article in Macleans' Magazine of January 23rd, 1965, commenting on education. She starts out by stating:

Tomorrow is here and we are all set for yesterday. There are approximately 1,250,000 teen-agers who will emerge on the labor market within the next few years. This is at a time when it is estimated that jobs will be disappearing at a rate of 4,000 a week. Over the same period a little calculation will show that there will be 1,000 young people a day looking for jobs.

Now in the United States where automation and cybernation is, of course, ahead of us, J.F. Henning, the Under Secretary of Labor, has calculated that during the 1960's more than 12,000,000 young people will be ready to enter the labor force.

During this same period 24,000,000 jobs will have disappeared because of automation.

Imperial Oil very recently made some

comments, they showed that they have increased production by over 25 per cent during the last five year period and during this same time there have disappeared 3,000 jobs. Three thousand jobs have just gone out of existence.

This shows that production has gone up 25 per cent and the staff and workers have gone down by about 20 per cent. There were few dismissals but they were all jobs that just disappeared, and no new people were hired.

One of the secretaries said this, "it's really weird, when people around here retire, their desks just disappear and we go on exactly as before". Doctor Jackson of the University of Toronto has this to say:

For the first time in our history, parents are unable to advise their children in regard to the future they face. In five years, printers, draftsmen, lathe drill makers, to name only a few of the skills, will be obsolete. In ten years, supervisors, foremen, men and women in mid-management, law clerks, filing clerks, librarians, purchasing agents will be all thinned out. A large steel company recently, an official of the steel company incidentally, recently said they are going to be able to run one of our mills with five guys and a computer instead of the 250 that are working there now. In Cleveland, a plant can produce 200 cu. yards of ready mix concrete in an hour, and not a human worker.

and so this story goes on and on. There are already computers whose brains are loaded with medical histories, law judgement and construction data. Put in a punch card, and get out a diagnosis, or a bridge on a drafting board. In Cleveland, a hospital is equipped with computers, that stores all the business office and medical records. The nurses coming to work pick up a telephone and get their orders.

This is one that I think is very interesting. In Toronto, a computer controls the entire traffic signals all over the city and in its spare time works out the tax assessment. Probably this is the kind of machine the government of Saskatchewan ought to employ, maybe it will save us some taxes.

And so the story goes on, and this in a few brief words is some of the future, some of the real challenges that we're faced with. I recently had the privilege of listening to Professor H. Baker, of the extension division of the Department of Education, speak to us in Yorkton on January 20, last. We had an adult education leadership day. We asked him a lot of pertinent questions. We sought some answers, and we got in part, some of those answers. He spoke about the real problem in education. He spoke about departmental changes. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, welcome these changes. He said that agricultural education today is becoming more urbanized because the problem and the answers extend beyond the agricultural field. He said something else. Under continuing education, he said, regardless of how much we have learned formally, we can never stop, learning comes in many forms outside the classroom. He said, let's see what goes on around us. In unemployed ranks, many are school drop-outs. Today rural drop-outs are fewer but on the other hand eighty per cent of the people on unemployed lists have only grade eight or less education. These people, he said, need to be trained and retrained. Of himself, he said, "daily I feel more and more inadequate, daily I feel I need to know more. The day will come when we have to face being put out of jobs every five years." There are some healthy signs and some healthy indications that there are others than socialists who think of the future.

Now, I said I was going to say something about the free enterprise system. You know it rather makes me laugh, it makes me smile and chuckle to myself when we hear free enterprise being taunted and talked about to a group of farmers. I will tell you why. The farmer today is the only true free enterpriser left in the world.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — I can qualify this. We

don't ask for subsidies unless we are depressed. When we produce on our farms, we compete with each other, we compete when we go to sell our land. We sell it to the highest bidder and when we go to sell our products, we have got to compete, as we have just found out recently in the price of wheat, with everyone in the world. This to me is the essence of free enterprise. Now let's look at the free enterprise society that we have got to buy in. You know it is very interesting and brings up a lot of very smart answers. I hold in my hand here some excerpts from the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission investigation that was made into the meat packing industry some three or four years ago. I have already said that when we sell, we sell in a competitive market. Well this document proves that it is not so competitive at all. I am not going to take time to read or recite the whole document, but I want to read a few of the important findings of this commission that made the investigation. It says:

Most important of all, however, the significance of the degree of concentration which exists in the meatpacking industry is greatly enhanced by Canada Packers history of anti-competitive behavior. It is my allegation that Canada Packers Limited is a combine because of its merger, trust or monopoly.

This is the voice of the chairman, C.R. Smith, of the Commission. He says:

The acquisition of Wilsil and Canada Packers Dominion Stores Limited and Thrift Stores because such merger trust monopolies has operated, is likely to operate to the detriment or against the interests of the public in general.

This is the kind of free enterprise to which I have to sell my hogs and my cattle. Keeping in mind that I produce competitively, I ask no quarter when I produce my grain, my hogs and my cattle, I ask no quarter when I go to buy anything I need by way of additions to my farm. I pay the top price or I will not get the land. This is the essence of free enterprise competition. We said something about the hog and cattle industry, which was called a monopoly by a Commission that made an extensive study on it. I want to talk about the free enterprise where I have to buy my supplies and my equipment to run my farm. As a boy, I remember a very great number of tractors of many different makes. There were all kinds and I won't bore the assembly with the names, Mr. Speaker. We had some choice. Today it is rather surprising, rather ironical the choice I have. I go to John Deere, I go to International Harvester, or I go to Massey-Harris, I find that the price of a one-hundred hp tractor varies almost nothing, hardly a dollar, and you know this is the end of it, I can't go any further, all the other companies have been absorbed. Cockshutt is gone, Minneapolis-Moline is gone, Sawyer-Massey is gone, and I could name probably a dozen more. Not much competition. So whether I go to John Deere, whether I go to Massey-Harris, we are still paying a price that is set by someone that is out of the control of the farmer. Not much competition. If I go to buy a car, of course the story is identically the same. Groceries, food, well we still have local little merchants. I remember as a boy, I used to go with my mother to sell eggs in a little village where we had one merchant on one side of the street and one merchant on the other side of the street. She would take the crate of eggs to one merchant and ask how much then she would go to the other one and ask how much and whoever paid the most got the eggs and the butter and so on.

A semblance of competition. Today chain stores have gobbled up and have monopolized the entire food distribution structure, I could read into the records some of the monopolies that exist, Mr. Speaker, but we know them all without going into details and boring the assembly with them at this time.

So you see if we are to have this glorious free enterprise system, and I am all for it, let's have it at both ends of the stick. Saskatchewan experimented with this free enterprise system for many years. We had some bitter rubs with it. It may surprise members on both sides of this house to know that I worked at one time as a hired hand. A farmer got \$5 to keep me and I got \$5 to stay. This was the glorious free enterprise structure. I worked in the summer time for \$20 a month. This was in the good old days, the good old free enterprise days.

It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, for me to believe at this

stage when the problems of poverty, illiteracy, and ill health exist all over the world, that we can in Saskatchewan hope to resolve our problems by moving ourselves back to the dog-eat-dog jungle society of free enterprise.

It is surprising that the rest of the world is moving in the opposite direction, completely the opposite direction. I had a great admiration for President Kennedy. To me he stood, Mr. Speaker, as a symbol of humanity, a symbol for men, women and children. Unfortunately, his work so ably started was not allowed to be completed. He has been followed by a man who, in my opinion, is attempting to follow his footsteps with his declaration of war on poverty, and assuming more and more responsibility for the livelihood and sustenance of human beings, not worrying about profits, not worrying about the number of dollars made but seeing to it that the great masses of people first are looked after. This, Mr. Speaker, is the essence of socialism. This is where we differ from the free enterprise structure.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — I have no quarrel with any form of competition, but for heaven sake let us look first of all after our people even if it costs money. Let us place human beings before profits, before net earnings and the likes.

I was pleased to hear the hon. Premier yesterday about some of the proposed expansion. I almost allowed myself to drift into believing that there still was a little socialism in him. You know he did little more than suggest that the good things of the former government are going to be expanded such as education and health. This we welcome, this I can support, but when he said that the return to the free enterprise system is our solution, then I of course realized how wrong I was.

This is where I cannot go along, cannot. So I find it difficult, find it nigh impossible to support this kind of thinking.

Now there is another area, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to comment on in this assembly. It is rather ironical that this happens to be the first mention of this very important item. I want to speak about war and peace for a moment or two. There was no mention of it in the Throne Speech. Today humanity lives in a danger that it has never lived under before in its history. I am not going to go into a great amount of detail regarding this danger. I am going to say that we now are capable of destroying ourselves. Recently, the war in Viet Nam has become so very serious that it could become a war that could eventually destroy us all. The threat to the United Nations is very real and very dangerous and one more danger is imminent. Red China has practically blasted its way into recognition. Our country and our government, Mr. Speaker, has seen fit to recognize this threat. The Throne Speech did not see fit to even mention this very grave and horrible danger that hangs over our head. I feel that the government was remiss in not at least making reference to something that can effect the lives of every one of us so much. We may rightfully ask, what can we do? We can do one thing, Mr. Speaker, and it is the duty of every one of us as parents and as citizens to raise our voices. If we do not even raise our voice, the . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — On what side?

Mr. Larson: — The hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) asks on which side. I will tell him very plainly, Mr. Speaker, on the side of humanity, here again . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — . . . every man, woman and child that walks on the face of this earth today may be obliterated. This is one time that we must raise our voices or be silenced forever. Let us have no misgivings about this.

New in concluding, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I will support the amendment and the sub-amendment. I cannot find it in me to support the document that neglects some of the things that I have talked about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. James B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak for the first time in this assembly, to speak on the Throne Speech, may I first add to what others have said in congratulating you on the position which you now hold. I know you to be honorable and courageous and I also know that you have a great deal of integrity. With those qualifications, hon. Sir, I know that you will be able to carry out the duties of this house with the dignity that it deserves.

I would like also to add my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech debate. They delivered their presentations in a most admirable manner. They were deserving of the confidence placed in them by the Premier. I am pleased to be able to associate myself on this side of the house with members with those talents.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — I would be remiss in my duties as a member if I did not take a moment to congratulate the Premier for the excellent manner in which he delivered his message the other day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — I would imagine the satisfaction in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan today. At long last they know that they have got a government, a Liberal free enterprise government who are not afraid to place their cards on the table and tell the people of this province what they can expect in the line of government for the next four years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to most humbly thank the good people in the constituency of Notukeu-Willowbunch, for allowing me the privilege of representing them in this assembly. To all the fine people in that constituency regardless of what their political affiliations are, I can say that I will serve them to the best of my ability. I only hope that I will be worthy of the confidence that they have placed in me.

I also feel very confident because of my association with the Premier, and those fine gentlemen who form his cabinet so that in the future, the people of Notukeu-Willowbunch will once again receive their share of the revenues of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member from Pelly (Mr. Larson). I think he delivered his address excellently and I think he is going to be a worthy member in this house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — I would also like to congratulate the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) on his election to this house. I enjoyed listening to his remarks yesterday when he chastised both sides of this house for the way they were acting and for not getting on with the business at hand. I would say to him that he should send a transcript of his speech to his counterpart in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — I would also like to suggest to him that if he gets weary sitting on the other side of the house, in a single seat like myself, I will be quite happy to move my seat over and let him move his desk in here. I would also like to congratulate the members who have been re-elected and to say a few words on behalf of myself. I think I speak for all new members in this house. I would like to say that we sincerely hope that we may make a worthwhile contribution to this legislature and also to the government of this province.

I would at this time like to say something about the constitu-

ency which I represent, Notukeu-Willowbunch. It is in the southern portion of the province, bounded on the south by that famous state, which I hear so much about from the members of the opposition, and I am very proud to say on behalf of the people of Notukeu-Willowbunch that we are very happy to have the good state of Montana as our neighbor to the south.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — On the west we have constituency of Shaunavon, on the north, Gravelbourg, and on the east, Bengough. Our constituency is some eighty by fifty miles, containing about 4,000 square miles. It has a goodly number of acres of excellent farm land but most of you know that in the south we always have the problem of drought. I believe we can grow crops there with less moisture than they can anywhere else in the province, and it is from this section of Saskatchewan that the best wheat in the world is grown. We also have a large area on the southern part of our constituency which contains many good ranches. The quality of cattle shipped from this area today is second to none. We haven't any development in oil but we have a small helium gas development near Mankota. We are hoping now with the change of government that this may go ahead.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — We have adequate but not elaborate schools, and adequate hospitals for the time being. We are short of natural gas, LaFleche being the only point in the constituency receiving it and LaFleche happens to be my home. We were fortunate to live near the town of Gravelbourg because when they got natural gas they brought it over to LaFleche. I can say possibly most times at LaFleche we say we are not too fortunate to live too close to Gravelbourg. In our constituency we have four regional parks, with another one under consideration. We have two historic sites, one resurrected this summer by the Department of Natural Resources at Wood Mountain. I think most of you who know anything about Saskatchewan history know that Wood Mountain played a large part in the development of Saskatchewan.

In fact in our constituency we haven't too much to complain about except one thing and that is roads. I listened to the hon. member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) the other day when he said that "who would have thought that in 1963 they would have dust free highways running past their door". Well, if the hon. member would have come down when his government was defeated, he would have found some dust free highway running past some people's doors, all eight miles of it. We had 1/5th of 1 per cent of the total dust free highway mileage in the province of Saskatchewan when the former government left office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — I could tell the hon. member from Melfort (Mr. Willis) that if he came out there today he would find fifty-eight miles of dust free highway and on highway no. 36. I know he is about to tell me that this was on the program for last year and I admit that part of it was. I know it was because the CCF member that was running against me was telling the people about this two or three weeks before it was announced in the paper. Now, I don't know whether there is anything wrong in this but I don't think it is very ethical that somebody would be given previous information prior to an election.

I will also say that when the estimates came out in the paper, no. 2 highway from Pickthall to Rockglen was in there, but afterwards the hon. minister said that they had made an error and forgot to put in the highway from Assiniboia to LaFleche. I was just wondering afterwards if it was because the CCF candidate who was running against me announced that one too and they had to get that in on the program. If they did I am very happy that they did because now we have oil to LaFleche.

An Hon. Member: — . . . I was driving . . .

Mr. Hooker: — We have also in our constituency a total of 163 miles of gravelled highway, some of it very sub-standard. I don't think you will find anywhere in the province of Saskatchewan, except in the constituency of Athabaska that can show less highway mileage than that.

This constituency is one of the older constituencies in the province. People came into this area as early as 1905, and I would think this past government would have been able to do more for a constituency that has been paying taxes to the province for over fifty years. I can assure you that our hon. Minister of Highways, the hon. member from Regina South (Mr. Grant) will look on more favourably.

We also have in this constituency an area from Wood Mountain to Mankota. This is another area that has been settled before 1914. Up to the present those people have lived without any government road at all. I think this is a ridiculous situation for a government that states that they take human beings ahead of everything else. These people, this winter, have been stranded in snow. They have been without mail for ten days at a time and without milk. Fortunately there has not been any serious sickness and I haven't heard of any real disasters from it.

When these people want to get out to a highway which is twenty miles away, they do so at their own expense. I can tell the former government that at one time there was a road between Wood Mountain and Mankota. This was built by local help. It was paid for by provincial funds and maintained for about twenty years. Then this past government went to these people and said, "We will give you grants toward maintenance. You maintain the road yourselves". I guess the municipalities thought that possibly this might be a good deal, so they accepted. This went on for two years. Then with the inception of the grid road program they said, "Well, you are not getting any more grants. You look after it on the grid road program."

Now I haven't any quarrel with the grid road program, I think it is a good program and I hope it is maintained and expanded. But I do not see why one segment of the population should have to maintain their own roads on a grid road program, especially when it accommodates a great deal of provincial traffic. I would like to tell you a little bit about the provincial traffic in that area. As most of you know, the area from Rock Glen to Mankota, north to LaFleche and Gravelbourg, is probably the best pheasant hunting area in the province. There are 7,500 pheasant licenses sold each year and I would bet that on the opening of pheasant hunting, 6,000 of those license holders are in that area. If somebody was to take a traffic count on those days they would find that the provincial traffic would be ninety per cent of the traffic on those roads. And this continues on for two months, to a lesser degree of course. This is the road, the area, that the people travel to hunt antelope. It is the best upland hunting area in the province. I believe that this deserves some consideration and I hope that this government will look at it more favourably.

I certainly want to congratulate our Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) for what he has done so far. I think that if we can get that area to the south looked after we will be able to wait for a little while until some work is done elsewhere. We won't complain too much. I think everybody in the constituency will be happy because they will have so much more than they have had for the last twenty years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — Being a person who has farmed for the last thirty years, I was very interested the other day when I found the members of the opposition were so concerned about the farmer. I am especially happy in this respect because they only represent twelve rural seats in this province. I know that this past government has friends, farming friends, ranching friends. This has been proven in our constituency because we have a great deal of lease land and I will say that they look after their friends fairly well.

I remember, last year, reading in Debates and Procedures, a statement made by the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet). I admire him for making the statement. He said that while he was Minister of Agriculture he never allowed political pressure to interfere with an allocation of a grazing lease or an agriculture lease. Now, I admire him for making this statement and I am not questioning his integrity, but I will say to him that if this was so he should have resigned his portfolio a long time before he was forced to abdicate because he didn't know what was going on within his department.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — And I, now, would like to take a moment to congratulate the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) the present Minister of Agriculture, for the steps he has taken to take politics out of crown lands. I know this was a step that possibly took a lot of courage. He probably did it under a great deal of pressure from people telling him not to and I can understand the people that didn't want politics taken out of crown lands because after waiting twenty years, they thought maybe they should have a chance to get in on it themselves. I would most certainly like to congratulate the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) and the cabinet, and this government for taking the steps that they have taken.

This afternoon I listened with a great deal of interest, at times to the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker). I am sorry he is not in his seat. I imagine he is tired. I know I was after he got finished.

In speaking of the letters that were read the other day, he stated that they were probably fabrications. He probably would have been able to get away with that had somebody been hanging on the coattail of the hon. member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet). But I can well recall when the argument was going on as to whether this Mr. Woollam was still in the employ of the government when he wrote those letters, the hon. member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) interjected and said, "Well, he wasn't when he wrote that last one". So I will say this, that if the last letter was authentic I will suggest that the other two were also.

I noticed too, that my good friend, His Worship, the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Baker), doesn't happen to be in his seat. He hasn't been there most of this afternoon and this evening. I imagine that he is probably making good his boast before the civic election, when he said that all it took to be an MLA was three hours a day, six weeks a year. By the way this house is going I think that probably he will be here a lot more than six weeks and I presume that he is going to have to spend a lot more than three hours a day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — I would like to move in to a prepared text and I am going to apologize to the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank). He gave some very good advice to us new members the other day when he said we shouldn't read our speeches. I know I certainly hope that if I stay in this legislature any length of time, that I will develop the ability to get up and speak without a text.

But I am going to speak tonight for a few moments on a topic that is of vital interest, I think to everybody in this province. It has been and I think it always will be, and that is municipal development. Even though I am going to follow this text very closely, I would like to say that I wrote it myself and I will take all responsibility for its contents, and if I appear to be reading it is because I am going to try to get the best out of what may be a poor speech.

To speak on municipal development I believe it necessary to explore the history of municipal development from its beginning, even before Saskatchewan became a province. The first organized municipalities were formed in 1883. They were the municipalities of Regina and Moose Jaw. At that time some legislation was passed towards starting the municipal system. Under the BNA Act, local government became the sole responsibility of the province, and with the establishment of Saskatchewan as a province, the government assumed all responsibility for local governments within its boundary. Studies were made, legislation passed and amended until 1909 when the Municipality Act was put into force. Since the original act was passed in 1909, municipalities have been going through a process of reorganization to meet the demands of the electorate in this changing economy.

I mention this gradual process of reorganization which continually took place throughout the growth of our province because, Mr. Speaker, this reorganization took place with a minimum of government control and without the dictatorial attitude of "we know what you want, better than you know yourself" which the past socialist-government has displayed on so many occasions.

When we think in terms of municipal administration, we think of

the many men and women who make up the councils of our cities, our municipalities, our towns and villages, men and women who give their time and talents, often at a great personal sacrifice to themselves. We also must think of our ancestors who came to this country, broke the prairies, hewed their ways into the timberland of the north to try to establish homes for themselves and their families. And we think of these pioneer people who, when the necessity arose, formed themselves into local organizations to look after their own needs and to assist those less fortunate than themselves.

We think of the heritage left to us by these people and we know we have witnessed self-government in its finest hour, true democracy at work. We of the Liberal party consider local government as the last stronghold of democracy and we will endeavor to see that their rights and privileges will always be respected.

In this Saskatchewan Diamond Jubilee year, I am pleased to note that the jubilee committee has taken as one of its projects to honor these pioneers and see that their contribution to the growth of this country will be most fittingly recognized.

Since 1944, when the CCF government took over the reigns of this province, they have exhibited a strong desire to rule and dominate without giving consideration to the wishes of the people involved. One of the first pieces of legislature, after being elected, was to remove the provisions of a vote by ratepayers on the establishment of larger school units, as provided for in the Liberal School Divisions Act. It was apparent then, that they planned to proceed with the same method in establishing larger units of municipal administration. Only strong opposition by municipal organization by the public caused them to refrain from their intended action. Having been thwarted in their original intention of proceeding with the establishment of larger municipal administration, they proceeded towards their original intention under the ruse of appointing commissions and committees to fill the minds of people with propaganda.

First, we had the Van Vleet committee appointed in 1945. The duties of that committee were to examine and investigate the efficiency of existing rural municipalities to render services and to report to the government concerning the constitution of the most efficient rural municipal unit. The cost of this committee was \$32,500.

Then came the famous CCF orientated Baker commission, appointed in March, 1952. They functioned for five years and came up with fourteen volumes on anything and everything including local government. With respect to local government, this commission recommended a fundamental reorganization of the municipality in the modified county or full county system. It also recommended that a boundaries committee be authorized to make recommendations regarding common boundaries for municipal and school districts in all parts of the province. When the said committee had submitted its recommendations to the government and the government has acted on its recommendations, the modified or full county was instituted throughout this province without delay.

This commission cost the people of this province \$450,000. Once again, what was accomplished other than recommending another committee?

In 1952, the municipal advisory commission was appointed and to date this commission has been drawing up boundaries and trying to get local governing bodies to accept their proposals for proposed county units. To date this commission has cost well over \$300,000 and I cannot say whether they have any of their proposals accepted.

When the Socialist government called the provincial local government conference in 1956, local governments made it quite clear that most of their problems were basically financial, brought about by provincial laws, which have imposed upon them a wide range of responsibilities but that the government had not provided them with the financial help required to cope with these additional responsibilities.

The CCF government had no intention of giving increased financial assistance, but had prepared quantities of material which they placed before the conference, advocating the adoption of county or modified county units of local administration. In fact, both the hon. Mr. Fines and the hon. Mr. Douglas made it quite clear that local reorganization should proceed without any further financial assistance. At this time I should mention the famous remark of the hon. Mr. Fines, who said, and I quote: "Further financial relief, however, should only be made to local government which is soundly organized and effectively administered. We cannot

afford to waste the taxpayers hard earned dollars".

Mr. Speaker, I presume that he meant that if the local government was to get some of their own tax dollars back, that it would be just that much less that they would have to spend on committees and commissions and for the Socialist experiments that was going on at that time.

This \$1,250,000 that these committees cost the people of this province, probably a small amount of money in the minds of the Socialists when one considers their lavish spending, but to me, Mr. Speaker, this represents a lot of money. However, the only thing accomplished from this conference was setting up another committee, the now famous Continuing Committee, which cost the taxpayers \$340,000. With reference to the Continuing Committee, I need not be told that it has representation from local governments as its members but I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the secretariat was composed of government-oriented socialistic planners, the majority of those people with no municipal experience. This secretariat had one duty to perform and that was to sell the municipal reorganizations to the members of the committees so completely that they would advocate acceptance without a vote. They did their job well. The meeting held in the rural areas were conducted by the personnel of the committee, some who had practically no experience in the field of municipal administration or local government public relations.

The did not attempt to assist the local authorities to understand the report and its implications but maintained a dictatorial attitude which was distasteful to the people attending these meetings.

And what did all this accomplish? It succeeded in creating a rift between local government and provincial government which it may take some time to correct. It proved that local governments are not likely to accept any proposals presented to them in a dictatorial manner. However, it succeeded in doing one thing. It succeeded in proving to the Socialist government that individuals have rights because very belatedly in the 1961 session of this legislature, the Socialists conceded the rights of taxpayers concerned to vote on the question of local government reorganization.

As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the recommendations of the committee have not been acceptable to local government and yet nothing whatever was done by the previous government to present alternate proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is some merit to local reorganization. I also believe that any proposal for reorganizations must come from the municipal people themselves. They are aware of their problems and I have every confidence that they will now, as they have in the past, assist in devising alternate plans which will be acceptable to themselves and to the senior government.

The people in most parts of Saskatchewan have held on firmly to the last stronghold of local representation, that is, to the control of property taxation for municipal government, at the small district level, close to home. Disturbingly enough, there has been a marked tendency recently, in the name of so-called efficiency and equalization, to breach this last stronghold and remove from the individual his next to last vestige of control, leaving him but a single vote which is seldom heard in the distant centralization.

However, at best, the ward system is a poor substitute for effective local control. It would be nothing short of tragic, therefore, if the rural dweller who in the past maintained an effective local control, should give this up for the dubious benefits of the pale imitation of city government, such as in the county.

The modern trend in legislation has been too often planned, not by the legislators, but by the hired administrators who in the interests of administrative efficiency or who, following preconceived planning, see no harm or violence done to personal right and obligation. This right and this obligation can only be properly effective at the local level. The state must check its present tendency to centralization and must recognize that the true cornerstone of democracy lies at the local level, where the individual is stimulated through his effective participation in local self-government to carry out his obligations as a citizen. The state must recognize that by not suppressing and only by fostering this local initiative, can it serve as a democracy.

In conclusion, therefore, may I leave with all of you the

following remarks, based on a few inescapable conclusions that have been forced upon me by our many experiments. To the councillors, I urge you to recall the reasons for the maintenance of effective control at a real local level. And also to the councillors, I pass on the warning that size is not synonymous with efficiency, nor efficiency with liberty.

To the local administrator, I seek the recognition that in carrying out the policy of councillors you never cease to ensure the maintenance of democratic liberty against the encroaching centralization.

To the departmental administrators, I express the sincere hope that ever present in his mind is the basic thought that the public servant administers best who serves rather than directs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time, to go on record as suggesting here and now, that this government explore with local governments, the possibility of finding an acceptable plan for local government reorganization and that financial and technical assistance be made available to local governments so that they may carry out their own study on this and other pertinent subjects.

It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that we stopped trying to tell local governments what they must do and start investigating some of the proposals presented by them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — It is very evident, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot support the amendment or the sub-amendment, but I will vote for the motion.

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate you on your new appointment as Speaker of this house, a very honorable position. I know you will fulfil its obligation both justly and well. I would like to also voice my sentiments and congratulations to the mover and the seconder to the Throne Speech, particularly, the seconder, — the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs Merchant) for the manner in which they carried out their duties at this time.

In rising to take part in this debate, I do so, Mr. Speaker, rather reluctantly because of this being my maiden speech in this legislature. I also feel quite humble and honored to have the privilege to speak as the elected representative of the Weyburn constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — This constituency was honorably represented for some seventeen years by the former Premier of the province and now the national leader of the New Democratic Party, Mr. T.C. Douglas. Then, Mr. Speaker, after a very short period of time, in which the people of Weyburn constituency had the experience of having as their representative a member of the Liberal party, they were quite prepared to elect once more a representative of the CCF. This to me was an endorsement and an approval of the satisfaction of the CCF government and its administration.

My purpose in being here is to try to assist in providing good government to the province of Saskatchewan and to see that the constituency of Weyburn get the consideration to which it is entitled, to keep it abreast with the other constituencies in the province. Any time that I can act as a spokesman for the constituency of Weyburn, I will appreciate the opportunity.

I would like to say a few words about our constituency. It is perhaps one of the most aggressive areas in the province. Some of the best agricultural land is found there. The raising of livestock is very predominate, both registered and commercial. Some of the largest oil fields in the province are found in the Weyburn constituency. And also the largest unitized water flood plant on the North American continent and I believe, Mr. Speaker, I can say further than that the largest unitized water flood plant in the world.

This oil discovery and the building of this water flood plant was neither started nor was it located, under the present government. As

a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the previous member for the Weyburn constituency, I do believe, had very little to say about things of this nature in his address. I believe in giving credit where credit is due.

We have a constituency which I think contributes more than the average to the economy of the province. But like all other constituencies we have some necessities which we desire and which I hope to present to you at a later time.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in getting back to the Throne Speech, I find it is very difficult to assume just how far a government is proposed to carry out its duties and plans, having only been in office some nine or ten months. I think you have to consider whether the promises that were made during the election campaign were reasonable and possible to carry out. To me, just how you can cut taxes on one hand and give greater services on the other, doesn't make sense. We all know that in order to give services, the money has to come from somewhere. But perhaps they have some miraculous formula to present to us, but judging from the past two months of administration, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, their formula has fallen rather flat.

I believe that the by-election in Hanley said so very differently.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — I do know that they have promised 80,000 new jobs in their first four years of office. So far they have made several jobless which to me, Mr. Speaker, is of no credit to any party unless they have a justified reason for doing so. I believe that Saskatchewan's economy is now in a position that some tax reductions can take place. Last session the CCF reduced the medical-hospital premiums \$20 per family. One of the first acts that the hon. members across the floor did, when they became the government was to increase the tax \$20, and to bring the premiums back up to \$72. This increase came in spite of the tax reduction promises. We believe in the CCF that this tax should be reduced, because it is a tax which people with low incomes find difficult to pay. We feel, Mr. Speaker, that now is the time to expand their medical care program and since the findings of the Hall Commission Report and a national health plan has been given, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we should take a firm, aggressive attitude in favor of implementing this report.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — In the rural areas of Saskatchewan, which I, as a farmer, am quite interested and concerned with, we just have to drive out into the rural areas in any direction to see the vast changes that have taken place in the last several years.

First, you will notice the miles of dust free highway, stretching from east to west, and from north to south, and the many miles of grid road which are linking up the smaller centres and making it possible for the farmers to have a good standard of road to travel on and to haul their commodities to their nearest centres. These roads are now making it possible for winter travel by car for the rural people. Only a few years ago if they got out at all it was by horses and sleighs. You remember, Mr. Speaker, when the Air Ambulance Service was made possible by the CCF government, bringing peace of mind to thousands of rural families, knowing that if sickness should strike them there are emergency measures provided for them, that they might receive medical attention.

Then there was a vast change in the educational system and the rural children used to attend the little dark and dingy country school house. I attended one. They are now able to attend centralized schools and to have equal opportunity to that of the urban or the town children. Also, in most cases, students can achieve their full grade twelve education and still live at home, and along with this, they can be of great assistance to their parents in operating the farm unit. These changes came about under a CCF government, and we can be justly proud of it.

I find that where these pleasures and benefits and comforts have cost extra money in taxes to the farmer, he doesn't object because he can see value in paying the extra tax dollar.

There is also the water and sewage program, which gives rural

people equal standards of comforts to that of the urban dweller . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — . . . not forgetting the vast power program which was initiated and developed under the CCF government, making the labor and the work of the rural dweller so much easier as well as enticing them to stay and continue to raise their families in the comfort and conveniences that they now enjoy. These are the things, Mr. Speaker, that our present Liberal government cannot take credit for, much as I know they would like to. They are accomplishments which our rural people are very happy and grateful to have.

I was quite interested to know what the Throne Speech contains for the betterment of our educational facilities. I have felt for some time that we have made vast strides and improvements in our system for the student who is qualified and wants to enter professions requiring university training. But we have not stopped to consider the student who might be referred to as a drop-out. One who perhaps hasn't the ability for university training, but who has a keen interest in other fields, such as farming, mechanics, welding, carpentry training, tinsmithing, care of machinery, study of soil types, or the care of livestock, proper feeding methods, the different food values, and livestock housing, and for the young farm maiden home economics courses, home-making, designing of houses, working with plants, flowers and general care of such. These are occupations, Mr. Speaker, that many of our rural youth in particular are very interested in and I think we should make training available to them by building a few vocational schools or secondary technical schools throughout the province in centres which would be located in sufficiently large areas to make the schools operate.

I would suggest at this time, Mr. Speaker, that in our good city of Weyburn, we would be very pleased to have them locate it. We realize that we cannot provide for some industries requiring abundance of water resources, but we could certainly handle a well equipped vocational school. The former government in its plans made mention of four or five schools that were to be started in 1964. The hon. Premier in his remarks in the Hanley by-election campaign said that they were considering a large addition to the Saskatoon Technical Institution and were considering North Battleford and Yorkton as other possibilities. I would like to remind the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) that there is a place called Weyburn to be considered, which because of its geographical location would be ideal to service a vast territory in the south-east part of the province, and we at Weyburn are prepared to negotiate, to meet with them at any time for this arrangement to be completed.

One of the throne highlights, Mr. Speaker, was the fifty per cent increase in the highway construction. I am very pleased to see our highways continuing to be improved, regarded and serviced and paved. But I do believe, Mr. Speaker, there are rural areas in the province which are needing immediate consideration over and above other areas.

I refer at this time to the Radville area in the Weyburn constituency. Radville is a town of around 1,200 population but there are no highways leading into or out of the standard which I think they deserve. The people of Radville and area were assured by the former CCF government that in 1964 they would have an oil treated highway from Weyburn west to the junction of highway no. 28. They were certainly let down by the present government, when instead of carrying out this proposal they changed the programs to other locations. However, I certainly will do all I can to see that the people of the Radville area are not overlooked for too long.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — It was overlooked for twenty years.

Mr. Pepper: — I was very disappointed there was no mention in the Throne Speech on the continuation of the grid road program, but yesterday the hon. Premier did mention that they were giving some assistance to it. I believe, Mr. Speaker, this program was one of the most important to the rural people, particularly in the smaller centres.

As I mentioned earlier, this grid road program had made the rural travel so much easier for winter driving and has contributed greatly to the welfare of the rural people who remain on their farms.

I would like to say a word in regard to the Throne Speech and the Department of Natural Resources. We all know that we are going through one of our severest winters for some time, with great amounts of snow and very cold temperatures. We, in the south of the province have lost large numbers of our upland game. Pheasants, partridges and chicken are not only beautiful to look at, but they have increased our tourist population in the hunting season, particularly of our American neighbors to the south of us. When they are hunting game on this side of the line they are also leaving considerable money in our smaller towns.

Many of our own people enjoy this hunting as well. So I would urge the Department of Natural Resources to increase their grants to the fish and game league and to the game hatcheries to make it possible to restock the population of the upland game back to the original level, at least, of 1964.

I believe it is important to have good provincial and regional parks to enjoy some hours of relaxation, but we must also look after the game which help to make these parks beautiful, and of more benefit to the tourists and to those who have time to enjoy relaxation and hunting.

No matter how much money they set aside for the building of highways, Mr. Speaker, the government must bear in mind the resources of the province and take measures to protect and replenish them. This in turn, will entice tourists to travel our highways, bringing greater revenue to the province.

I noticed in the Throne Speech that the government is prepared to give grants to aid the development and the growth of arts and culture. I think this is an area in which a great deal of consideration can be given. I believe that in the field of sports Saskatchewan does not need to take a back seat to anyone. But there are large groups of our people who do not participate or take part in sport activities who are vitally interested in drama, ballet, opera, painting, handicraft, things of finer art and culture. I have had the opportunity of visiting and attending Shakespearian plays in the Stratford theatre in Ontario, and I must say it was truly an experience in itself. I am convinced that judging from the groups of interested people from the Weyburn constituency, some of whom have already been elected to the Saskatchewan Arts Board, that there is room in our province for a theatre similar to that of Stratford.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having been a farmer all of my life I am concerned about the lack of legislation that is being provided for the farmer in the recent Throne Speech. This also applies in the field of municipal affairs. For many years agriculture has played a major role in the economy of our province, and I might say that this will continue for years to come. The farmer is finding it very difficult, at least difficult enough, to compete with other organizations and now that he is caught in the cost-price squeeze, the cost of the things he has to purchase are going up and up by leaps and bounds, and the prices of the things that he has to sell are dropping steadily. It is only good management on the part of any government that they provide protective measures for the farmer in the purchasing, particularly of machinery, that is necessary for him to carry on his farming operations. However, I am afraid in the recent announcement of the transfer of the senior staff and the specialized equipment of the Agriculture Machinery Administration Branch to Saskatoon, that this is taking away some protection that the farmer had when it was being provincially operated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — This was a service, Mr. Speaker, that was set up under the CCF government to test and farm this machinery under actual working conditions. Farmers interested in buying implements which were for sale in the province could obtain reports on the tests that were made of this machinery. In 1964, there was some 16,000 names on the mailing list, which proves that this abandoning of comparative tests, from the farmers' point of view, destroyed the main value of the A.M.A. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to be constructive as well as critical but I find that I cannot support the motion, but I will support the amendment and the sub-amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on

the Throne Speech, I wish first of all to congratulate you upon your election to the high post of Speaker of this legislature. I know that you come to this position well equipped to handle the affairs of the legislature, having studied the rules and practices of the legislature in the way that I know you have, and knowing of your honesty and integrity.

I am certain that during this legislature you will prove yourself one of the most able Speakers the government legislature has ever had.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — I think on this, the occasion of our Diamond Jubilee of Saskatchewan, it is interesting to note that a former member of the area that you represent was the first Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature in 1906, in the person of Tom McNutt. During the past few months the government of Saskatchewan has been honored by having presented to it the first Speaker's Chair which was occupied by Mr. McNutt, and was presented to the government of Saskatchewan by his son, Russ McNutt, a former member of this legislature.

I would like to express to the mover and the seconder, my sincere congratulations on two jobs well done in moving and seconding the motion that is before us. The member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy), one of the younger members of the legislature from the far north, brings to this house knowledge and experience of the northern part of this province which will be of extreme value to the government and to the legislature during the life of this house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — The native people of Saskatchewan have in the member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) a champion who will serve their cause in the coming years which are going to be so important to this group of our Saskatchewan citizens.

The lady member for Saskatoon indicated in her initial offering to this legislature that she was going to be a worthy replacement for the lady member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). She is probably one of the best known women to sit in the legislature of this province. Her position in television in the northern part of the province has made her known to most of the people in the northern areas of this province and particularly in the areas surrounding the city of Saskatoon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Again a bit of history comes to mind in the fact, as she recalled to us, that her father had sat as a member in the legislative assembly from 1934 to 1938, and he was, thirty years ago, one of those members who defeated the government at that time and thirty years from that date his daughter took part in the defeat of another government in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — I am quite certain that he would be very proud of the victory that she met with in April, and very proud of the fact that she is today sitting in the legislature of this province.

In this our Jubilee Year, I believe it is well that we in the legislature should take a few moments to look back over some of the political history of the province of Saskatchewan. We, in Canada, have probably been remiss in recording the history of our country for future generations to read. One of the members of the first cabinet in Saskatchewan still lives in our province in the person of the hon. W.F.A. Turgeon, who is resident in the city of Prince Albert. The second Premier of our province in the person of the hon. W.M. Martin, former Chief Justice of this province, still lives here in the city of Regina.

The youth of our province has been indicated today and has been in the last few sessions of this legislature by the fact that in a few

cases the second generation are beginning to come into the legislature of our province. We have in the present house, three that are succeeding or perhaps even in one case sitting in the legislature with his own father, the junior member from Saskatoon, in the person of Mr. Brockelbank, the lady member for Saskatoon, and myself, who of course, had a father who sat in this legislature as well.

I enjoy the honor personally, I believe, of being the first son of a former cabinet minister, a premier, to be a member of a Saskatchewan cabinet. I . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — I fully appreciate the responsibilities that this places in me, and I hope that I will be able to carry out the responsibilities that have been entrusted to me in a way which would bring pride to my father.

Another event of historical importance is the first occasion on which a member of the Progressive Conservative Party has been represented in the legislature of this province. Some hon. members have welcomed the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) and I am sorry he is not in his seat, as the first Progressive Conservative to be represented in the legislature in thirty years. However, this is wrong, as the members of that party in those days called themselves just Conservatives and were proud of the name. It will remain to be seen in the weeks ahead whether the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) is a Conservative or a Progressive, or half of both. It is unfortunate that the Conservative party in Canada is not prepared to accept its traditional role of Toryism in place of a role of trying to be all things to all men as they have tried to do over the past twenty years.

Their party has had a great past, although one that I have never believed in and cannot agree with their policies of the past. The Conservative party, if it fulfils its place in history can still play a valuable part in Canada's history and also the history of Saskatchewan. It would be my hope that in the not too distant future a real Conservative party will replace the official opposition who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, and we will see the end of Socialism for all time in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — I would also like to take this opportunity of extending my congratulations to the Premier of this province in attaining his high position. He has received a mandate from the people of this province and I believe in the last few months he has been carrying out that mandate in a way in which he told the people of Saskatchewan he would in the election campaign.

This has not been an easy task, nor at times a pleasant task. The Premier has at all times indicated the resoluteness of purpose which is part of his make-up and has been prepared to take the knocks from the opposition in order to place our government in a position of being able to carry out the promises made to the people of this province. I want to also congratulate him on the address that he has made in this debate and to assure him that the people of Saskatchewan are proud of the Speech from the Throne that has been presented by the government, and are prepared in the months ahead to support the actions of a new Liberal administration.

In the few moments, Mr. Speaker, before adjournment for the evening I would like to take the opportunity of making reference to some of the remarks that have been made by other speakers in the debates.

I remember the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) in his usual way give instructions to the members as to how they should conduct themselves as they were coming into the legislature. This he has been doing for many years now, sometimes his advice is accepted, many times it is not, and I would indicate that as far as reading speeches is concerned there is only one reason why the member for Kelsey doesn't have to read his speech, that is because he has made it so often in the last twenty-five years that he has got it memorized.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — It is moldy with age. Of course, when you stand up and you only want to quote from old newspaper clippings, it isn't very hard to make a speech without having to read it, because, of course, as we all noticed the other day, most of his speech was involved in reading quotations from newspapers. I often wonder about my friend across the way and other members of his party, who all the time say that they don't believe anything printed in the Leader Post and other papers in this province, when every time they get up in the house they are quoting from clippings that they have cut out of the Leader Post or the Toronto Star or some of the other terrible newspapers that we have from one end of this country to the other.

I noticed that some of the other hon. members across the way are also accepting the same method and are reading messages from periodicals from one end of Canada to the other, largely written by Socialist writers, and of course, this is par for the course as well.

The only unfortunate thing about the Acting Leaser of the opposition is the fact that he is living in the past. He has forgotten that it is time that we have to move ahead and forget the past, not only the past of his government but the past of other days as well. However, the only past that he can remember is the unfortunate part of the history of our province. He never deals with the early years of our history when the pioneers came to this province from 1905 to 1929, and I want to make this reference because of a sneering remark made by the former Attorney General this afternoon, regarding the progress of this province from 1905 to 1929. I want to remind him, and to remind my hon. friends sitting on the other side of the house, that from 1905 to 1929 this province grew from a province of 100,000 people to a population of 930,000 in those 24 years, and it has taken twenty years of CCF government to get even to the 930,000 we had back in 1929.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — During these 24 years and I have mentioned this fact and I am going to recall it again tonight, during those 24 years the government of that date had less money to spend than was voted by the members of the legislature in the last session in 1964, and yet they developed all the institutions, almost all the institutions that exist in the province of Saskatchewan today. They were started in those 24 years by the pioneer people of the province of Saskatchewan and when the Liberal government went out of office in 1929, they didn't leave, as the former Attorney General (Mr. Walker) would like to indicate, a poverty stricken province. They left a province which had come through the most prosperous era that we have ever seen in the history of our province up to 1929 in the few years that preceded that election.

There has also been a suggestion that when his government took over the reins of office in 1944, they had to take it over in difficult times, but they didn't. They took it over at a time when prosperity was facing the people of this province. Things were on the way up not only in this province but from one end of Canada to the other, after we had gone through some of the most difficult years in our country's history. I say here tonight that if the government claimed to have difficult days, they don't know what difficult days were. I give credit where credit is due to the governments that were in office in the years 1929 to 1934, both federal and provincial. Those were difficult days, and the days that followed up to 1939 were difficult for governments. Then there were six years of war when thousands of people sacrificed their lives for freedom. Our friends across the way here were bickering and shouting and today they go back to those years and say the governments of those days did nothing.

I am afraid that if they had had to look after the government of this province during the thirties or during the war years, that we would be in much worst shape than we are at the present time in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, it has been indicated to me by the Leader on the government side of the house that there are other items of business which we would like to complete tonight if possible. I have some other remarks which I desire to make that I am going to leave until

tomorrow on radio, but I do want to indicate to my friends across the way, before closing tonight, that tomorrow I will indicate to them and to the people of this province, why the statements that were made by the Premier of this province in regard to Mr. Woollam, the former employee of this government, are not only true and the aspects as presented to us by the Premier but are much worse, and the letters that I will read tomorrow to the people of this province will, I am sure, bring thoughts of shame to the minds of every citizen in this province, as to a government who would employ such as Mr. Woollam. I can assure you that tomorrow, when I complete reading these letters, that there will be many on the other side of the house who will wish that they had never been associated with the gentleman and will wish that their government had never hired people of that type to work among the native people of this province and others that we have been bringing to the province of Saskatchewan. And so, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The assembly adjourned at 9:45 o'clock p.m.