

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
10th Day

Wednesday, February 17, 1965.

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

STATEMENT RE RIGHT OF MLAs TO CONSULT GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Hon. David Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to take a moment to make a statement to the house. It appears some members misunderstood my statement about MLAs contacting government employees. I would make it clear I recognize the right of all members to consult with government employees but I do not feel MLAs have the right to order government employees to give them information, nor to ask for privileged correspondence or material. I repeat, I recognize the right of all MLAs to consult with government employees.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. G.J. Trapp (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to recognize some visitors. We have with us today, from Quill Lake, Mr. Chekley and Mrs. Krieke and their grade eleven and grade twelve students. I hope they will enjoy their stay this afternoon in the house.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to welcome, on behalf of yourself, Mr. Speaker, and members of the legislature, members of a grade seven class from the Bate School in Saskatoon. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Cook. They came down on the rail-liner this morning and I have just spoken to them. They have had a pleasant day in the capital city. I am sure that every member in the house will hope that their stay here in the assembly will be both enjoyable and constructive and that they will come down again.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Well, well. You are back!

ANNOUNCEMENT RE BUILDING OF HIGHWAY NO. 165

Hon. Gordon B. Grant (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an announcement. Last Monday the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) was partially answered in a question he directed to us. One of the questions was a matter of tendering for the road from no. 102 to the Hanson Lake Road and I indicated at that time that the policy of the government would be reported in due course. I would like to announce now that the road will be known as no. 165, and that tenders will be advertised this weekend, and will close on March 2nd, for 800 acres of clearing. In the same advertisement there will be a notice of intent for grading tender call.

QUESTION RE REGULATION COMMITTEE

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wonder if the Premier would give some indication of the government's intention with regard to the setting up of the Regulations Committee that used to sit inter-sessionally in the previous legislature. Is it the intention of the government to set up such a committee at this session, to sit inter-sessionally?

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, answering the hon. member, we are giving consideration to setting up the committee and I am hopeful that it will be set up at an early date.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca) for an address-in-reply.

Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned last evening and I was given the privilege of adjourning the debate, I had several problems that I wanted to deal with in about forty minutes, but, due to reasons beyond my control, I was not able to speak last night. For this reason I will have, to abbreviate my speech today and keep it within the fifteen minute radio time limit.

I want to repeat congratulations to you, Sir, and to all those who have spoken before me. I want especially to congratulate the hon. member for Turtleford, (Mr. Wooff) and welcome him back to this house. I am sure that the speech that he made yesterday was a breath of fresh air, compared to some of the speeches that we have heard from the representative of that constituency (Mr. Foley) in past years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I also want to make special mention of the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) who, after some difficulty, secured a seat in this house, in fact a much more secure seat than some of those who were elected earlier.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the results of the Hanley by-election were gratifying to this side of the house and I might say that never in the political history of Saskatchewan has a political party been rejected by so many, so soon.

I have had very little time to scan this barren sheet of paper that has been presented to us as the Throne Speech. I will, however, endeavor to raise some objection and voice some of my opinions as the member for The Battlefords in this regard. Before I do, however, I would like to thank the Premier for continuing with the bridge program in my constituency, and on behalf of north western Saskatchewan I would like to thank him for the other two or three bridges that he promised between North Battleford and Lloydminster. One of these days he is going to become really enthusiastic and promise a bridge from Lloydminster to North Battleford lengthwise.

However, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, looking at the speech from the throne, that you have to start at the beginning and never has any government in the history of this province, or any other province, taken office and taken over a treasury and various departments of government in so good a shape and in so good a financial condition, and with such a prosperous outlook.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — They should be able to do the things they intend to accomplish and well they should, because they certainly are in a wonderful position to start off with all the debts paid, all the old mortgages paid off, and a lucrative and bountiful treasury.

In the first paragraph of the speech from the throne, they talk about their inheritance. Many of us have seen new heirs come into an inheritance and then dissipate that inheritance in an unwise and extravagant fashion. I am sure that the heirs who inherited this particular inheritance, the government of this province, are no exception. They couldn't wait, they couldn't wait to let their friends in on that bountiful surplus that they found in the treasury. They couldn't wait to let their friends in on all the goodies, and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, they couldn't wait to impose new taxes on the people who were least able to pay.

Coming from a constituency that is both rural and urban, Mr. Speaker, I take exception to that slim line that has to do with agriculture. I take exception to a government that would say in this year, Mr. Speaker, referring to agricultural prices:

That good prices and ready markets prevailed.

And this was even after the reduction in the price of wheat, to say nothing about the prices of cattle and eggs and other agricultural products. Where have these so-called representatives of agriculture been, Mr. Speaker? Where did they go? Have they all been off to Montana or somewhere on holidays? Do they not know that there are a good many areas in Saskatchewan that didn't even get a crop? If I had time I would say a few things about P.F.A.A. and its administration. I certainly think that these people and their colleagues at Ottawa ought to take an awful good look. I raised this question in the house many years ago and I raise it again now. There is hardly a constituency in this province where every poll worker and every executive member of the Liberal party is not now, once again, in the employ of the P.F.A.A. They have so many inspectors inspecting inspectors in the P.F.A.A. this year, Mr. Speaker, that they haven't got around to paying the farmers in most cases.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — . . . where . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Now, Mr. Speaker, we will go on. We will look at a few more of these little items.

They talk about the Johnston commission. Well, so far, there has been nothing but hot air, as far as the Johnston commission is concerned, and I venture to say by next year, Mr. Speaker, that the much touted savings will wind up just as one more dream from the hon. Premier's office.

We will be interested to know how car purchases and one thing and another are going to be made in the future, rather than on a bid basis. With reference to tax reductions, well, certainly there have been tax reductions and there are going to be more, tax reductions to the C.P.R. and so on. Who will benefit, Mr. Speaker? Will the farmers benefit by the reduction on the mineral rights tax of \$4.50 or \$4.80 per quarter section? Millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, will be saved by the C.P.R. and Hudson Bay, the friends of these people opposite, and it is not surprising.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier) —: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This government has never said there would be mineral tax reduction on Hudson Bay and so on. This is a figment of my hon. friend's imagination.

Mr. Kramer: — What about the tax on mineral rights, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad the hon. Premier interrupted my . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . they will be on farm lands not on the other companies . . .

An Hon. Member: — Come on, sit down. Sit down.

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — Nuts.

Mr. Kramer: — The hon. Premier suggests that reductions will only be on farm lands. We will wait and see. But if you follow the pattern that this big business operation across the way follows, there will be tax concessions for big business the same as there have been tax concessions in oil royalties and so on, Mr. Speaker. We are wise to these and so are the people of Saskatchewan wise to you, Mr. Premier.

Now, after having done all this, after having put this tax on the people again, those who are least able to pay, Mr. Speaker, the poor people, the old age pensioners, and so on, living on \$75 per month, they can hand out millions. They can hand out millions to the people who are able to pay and at the same time transfer these millions of dollars of taxes to the people who are least able to pay.

I will tell you how it affected my constituency, Mr. Speaker. We have a trading area around the city of North Battleford and Battleford of some 35,000 to 40,000 householders. Basing my argument on these 35,000 householders, the people of this area pay some \$750,000 in extra taxes this fall. That was \$750,000 taken from that area, funnelled off to the ever ready fingers of the new government, taken out of the tills of businessmen and retail merchants. These people are supposed to be the friends of businessmen. Taken out of the hands of farmers who didn't even pull a combine

out into the field this fall in that area. Three quarters of a million. They talk about bringing in industry. I would like to tell you what this means. A \$750,000 payroll to industry in my constituency would mean a great deal, Mr. Speaker. A \$750,000 industry would almost come somewhat near the payroll of the Saskatchewan hospital in that area. That payroll is a boon to businessmen. But this government can not possibly allow these low income people to go off tax-free. They must raise the head tax in order to keep their promises to their friends and cut down the one per cent. Who benefits from the one per cent? The man who buys the most. The man who puts up a \$3,000,000 building will benefit tremendously. The man that buys a \$10,000 Cadillac will benefit tremendously, but the man, Mr. Speaker, who buys a second-hand car will not benefit.

The \$20 increase on a family is the equivalent of about 250 shirts in a family. It takes a man a long time to buy 250 shirts. So, Mr. Speaker, these tax concessions that have been promised have been nothing but a hoax, with the millions of dollars that they inherited in surplus, millions of more dollars in tax concessions from Ottawa, the millions of dollars in extra royalties that have been secured, not by this government but through the actions of the previous government, with all of these increased taxes, Mr. Speaker, these people have no right whatever to increase the medicare taxes.

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — . . . nuts . . .

Mr. C. MacDonald (Milestone): — They have been increased before.

Mr. Kramer: — Certainly the taxes have been increased before, as the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) says, but they have never been increased when the taxes were buoyant. They have never been increased when the need was not there. The need was not here this year, Mr. Speaker, and this government is ill-advised to increase taxes on those least able to pay.

Now, I turn to highways. We welcome increased spending in highways, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that there is going to have to be increased spending on highways if they follow the policies that have been apparently adopted by this government. I will give you one instance. I am very glad that the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), the Minister for Social Welfare, withdrew his dictatorial edict before this house resumed, before the orders of the day. I refer to the order that no M.L.A. could visit government offices without his permission.

I am sure that members in the back benches prevailed on him to see to it that democracy prevailed, because I saw no sense of shock on the smiles of the front benchers. They were self-assured until they heard the reaction, and had time to think about it. I appreciate the pressure from behind because I certainly did not expect the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) to change his mind without some pressure.

The member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) must be fairly valuable. Going back to highways, I would like to point out that the government is going to need a great deal more in increased taxes because in order to accommodate the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) which will cost the public at least \$3,000,000 over the next twenty years, by diverting the proposed highway. Instead of going directly into the west side of Saskatoon, they are coming into Avenue A on the north. They have lengthened this highway by two miles and it actually means 3.1 miles more construction. If you analyse this extra cost to the travelling public, this will be \$116,000 a year and over a twenty year period will come to \$2,233,000, based on a 1,200 vehicle per day traffic count at the Borden bridge. So in order to accommodate the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), Mr. Speaker, Mr. Grant, the Minister of Highways, has apparently seen fit to make this concession and to subsidize the popularity of the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) in the town of Langham to the tune of \$3,000,000 over the next twenty years for the travelling public. This is a figure that I challenge the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) to deny.

I am sorry I am going over my time, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to encroach on anyone else's, but in order to make my point, I would like to quote a little item in the Radisson Comet:

In appreciation, the council of the town of Langham wish to publicly express their appreci-

ation to the present Liberal government and in particular, to the Hon. David Boldt, for the decision to build no. 5 highway, abutting the town of Langham.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Yes, you will not be clapping any more after there is a reaction from the public,

. . . abutting the town of Langham. The council has been working ceaselessly for the past four years with the previous CCF government to try to keep this highway for Langham . . .

For Langham, for Langham, not for Saskatchewan, for Langham.

. . . but without any success whatever. The present administration are giving consideration to the needs, desires, and aspirations of smaller communities. For this we are deeply grateful.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yes. Keep on applauding over there. That is fine, but, Mr. Speaker, can travelling public afford to pay \$3,000,000 over the next twenty years for the popularity of the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt)? I doubt it, and they will need more money in the highway budget if they are going to revert back to the old Liberal system of dog-legging across the country looking for political supporters the way it was twenty years ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say that . . .

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — Hurrah!

Mr. Kramer: — . . . this government has failed to keep its promises. It has increased taxes instead. If they have not increased them, they have transferred them from the rich to those least able to pay. They have discontinued programs which are also an increase in taxation. There has not been any construction whatever to amount to anything in the north western part of Saskatchewan. Where is the Technical School that was budgeted for in the North Battleford area? It was thrown out by these people opposite. Because of withdrawn services and because they have not kept their promises, I cannot support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, in joining the debate this afternoon, I would like to add to what has already been said in the way of congratulations to yourself over your accession to the high position of Speaker of this house. I believe that your earnestness of purpose and your ability will help all the members of this assembly and benefit us as a whole. I wish you, Sir, the utmost of success in this high post.

In the limited time at my disposal, I want to avoid repetition. This debate has been a long one and much has been said. I would like to come directly, Mr. Speaker, to the person who started this debate, the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). I would like to say that I was frankly disappointed in his speech. Not only in its content but in the railing, negative, and abusive tone, that seemed to be evident throughout.

There seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be an implied responsibility on the mover of the Address-in-Reply to assume a positive note in tune with the asserted posture of the government. This was a discordant note, I suggest. I think there were many good speeches on both sides of the house after this message. That was in spite of, not because of the speech of the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

The member from Athabasca, (Mr. Guy) it will be recalled, said that the previous speeches from the throne when we were in the government, were full of "verbiage, platitudes, and self-praise". That he proceeded, Mr. Speaker, in the same vein, peppered with purple expletives throughout almost the entire course of his address, is significant enough in itself.

I suppose the member may have followed the military dictum that the best defence is offence, as a means of distracting people from government actions and policies during the last ten months. Mr. Speaker, portions of the member's speech echoed and re-echoed the tone that we have heard throughout the years from the Liberal party in this house. I am speaking now about his remarks with regard to the labor movement.

You may recall that the hon. member (Mr. Guy) was very critical of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. I want to say this to the hon. member, that everything that the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour had to say to the new government of Saskatchewan would have been said by any provincial federation of labour, in any part of this country or by any state federation in the United States of America.

For him to attempt to isolate what was said by the Saskatchewan Federation as political opposition was just pure rubbish. The hon. member said that the Federation of Labour had the nerve, I think that was the word he used, to submit a brief to this government on items that had been turned down by the previous government. Well, if this shows anything, Mr. Speaker, it shows the consistent policy of the federation. It was not prepared to ask anything of this government that it was not prepared to ask of the last. If this is considered strange by the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), I say it is a revealing commentary on his own attitude.

Over the last twenty years I have known of many employer, many farmer, and many municipal organizations, Mr. Speaker, submitting briefs and opinions to the previous CCF government. Many of these opinions and representations were in opposition to government policy. But on no occasion did the CCF government ever suggest to these organizations that they should "clean house" in the words of my friend from Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if a suggestion of that kind had been made in the year 1959-60, there would have been left no executive of the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, because in that year the honorary president was Mr. D.G. Steuart, Mayor of Prince Albert; Mr. J.H. Staveley, Mayor of Weyburn, was President; Mr. Sid Buckwold, Mayor of Saskatoon, was vice-president; and the second vice-president was Leslie C. Sherman. He could add to this list the name of Mr. J.B. Hooker, now the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch.

An Hon. Member: — He's out.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — I say it was the right of these organizations, Mr. Speaker, to make their representations, but the tone and the suggestion of the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), I say is significant. His words will be justly viewed as an attempt to over-awe, intimidate, interfere with, and silence the labor people of this province and to dominate their inner affairs.

Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks earlier, you will recall that the government got a very sharp reaction from a number of municipalities when it sought to reduce social aid food schedules for large families, and only the other day in the house, the Premier hinted at measures that would be taken in this connection.

I say these are two examples of Liberal government interference and pressure. First, on individuals as evidenced by the speech by the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), and secondly by the government, through the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt), on local government, in the exercise of their duties.

This is strange fare indeed, Mr. Speaker, from a party which in and out of this house has bugled so loudly its concern for the individual and for local government autonomy.

I want to make a brief mention of the question of civil liberty, because, Mr. Speaker, at this time the civil liberties of some 55,000 people in this province are affected, if we include public employees of all kinds and all stripes. I say that this has been brought about through the position taken by the government in regard to the so-called Basken case. This, Mr. Speaker, was after the solemn promise of the Premier, just a few weeks after this government took office, that no civil servant would be disturbed in the enjoyment of his political liberties as long as this was outside of working hours. I say that this promise has been broken. I say that the civil liberties of 55,000 employees and their families have been endangered by the government stand.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. gentleman is dealing with the Basken case. Certain phases of the Basken case have been before the courts and a decision was reached by the Court of Appeal in respect to a certain phase. A Board of Conciliation has been set up, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is being dealt with by conciliation and therefore the hon. gentleman insofar as he is referring to that case in this chamber, is out of order at this time.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, the matters were before the court and have been disposed of. I have made reference to not one of them, and there is nothing about a Board of Conciliation which is sub judice, and the hon. member knows it.

I say to the government, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. gentleman well knows that the matter could still be sub judice. The time for appeal has not expired; either party could appeal the hearing of the Court of Appeal and it could still be sub judice and the hon. gentleman is out of order and he knows it.

An Hon. Member: — That's rubbish.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest this is, as my friend to my right says, pure rubbish, but I have come to the end of this reference and I am prepared to leave it. I would just say this, on the general question of civil liberties, I say that the government should make an end of their persecution. I will say that if the government does it, they will get some credit for it. And above all, you will be letting public employees in this province know that they are not second-class citizens; that civil rights for this very large section are still valid in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, just very briefly, again to say something about Saskatchewan progress and development. You know it's rather abusing and perhaps somewhat ironic to see the position of the new government. To deal with what they are saying now, they are all loud and enthusiastic about the forward march of Saskatchewan after twenty years of religiously repeated statements about stagnation, ruin and depression. You know the Premier always accuses us on this side of the house of talking depression all the time. It seems to me that no one has talked more about doom and depression than he and his colleagues when they were in the opposition. But nothing in any case could be more illustrative of the shifting and the shifty stands of the Saskatchewan Liberal party than their quick change during the last seven or eight months.

But you know, now and again, the Premier reverts to some of the threadbare old phrases. On February 10th in this house, he said that for too long had our resources remained dormant and underground. I could not help thinking about those half a billion barrels of oil that have been produced since 1944, and the more than a million tons of potash which have been produced just in the last few years. Not one barrel or pound was produced during a Liberal regime.

The lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) said thirty-five out of the first forty years were taken up in this province with a Liberal regime. She might have added another four or five years to make the term thirty-eight or thirty-nine which was I think, the complete term of Liberal rule in this province. One can not help but ask why weren't all these dormant resources developed during this thirty-eight years, almost twice that of the CCF administration, of Liberal control. Why wasn't something done about that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all rejoice in the fact that the province has had development. We all want it to continue. We know what this development can mean in terms of services to the people of this province. But I want to say here this afternoon, that any sober judgment must tell us that the province must really proceed to more dynamic action in concert with the federal government and other public agencies, just to meet the demands for new jobs that we in this province are going to face in the next five years.

I think the provincial government must face the position that has been enunciated by the Economic Council of Canada, in their report tabled in December of last year. I think that anyone having read these conclusions must decide that it is not enough for a government to say that it wants to be and is going to be the "most dedicated private enterprise government in North America". It is not good enough to solve the very vital economic questions which are on our doorstep now, and have to be solved within the next five years. And I say that if this government says otherwise, it is just burying its head in the sand and throwing the same sand in the eyes of the people of this province. The Economic council in brief has said, that if governments do not do a much better job of planning — public planning and in policy areas — for people, we are all going to be in for some pretty rough sledding.

And I will tell you why. I will tell you why they say so. They point out that the level of unemployment was 139 per cent higher during the five year period ending in 1962, as compared with the period ending in 1953. They point out that this level of unemployment is taken on a much larger labor force increased by about 2,500,000 people in addition to the ones that were present in 1946. They tell us that even to maintain a rate of three per cent of the labor force unemployed, we are going to have to find 1,500,000 new jobs by 1970. That figure assumes 244,000 unemployed in that year. They conclude this analysis by saying that this will need a growth in new jobs just twice, just twice, that which took place from 1956 to 1963. If I may quote briefly a conclusion which I think sums up this part of their conclusion, they say:

that we are on the threshold of a period in which the pace of expansion in jobs will need to be very substantially better than our longer run experience if we are to avoid severe social and economic problems and strains.

The Council points out other things, such as the fact that in this decade there is going to be eleven times the number of young people between twenty and twenty-four years of age appearing in our midst, than appeared in the previous decade where there was an addition of some 25,000 young people in this age group.

Now, I am submitting these facts to the house, Mr. Speaker, because I say the major shortcoming of the speech from the throne is that it mentions nothing at all about this. The government has proceeded on the basis of the outworn and discarded notion, (that even many old party people have discarded), that a blind reliance on the capricious forces of corporate enterprise will make everything come right. I say the best minds of this country in both labor and business and government have said that this just is not so.

I do not say there is not a place for corporate enterprise, Mr. Speaker. I do say they won't do the job by themselves. I say that without the guiding deign from elected and public agencies neither adequate economic or social progress for Canadians, can be brought about. And I urge the government to strengthen our own Provincial Economic Council, to do all of those things that need to be done in the realm of education so that we can meet the sort of challenge that the Economic Council has pictured for us.

I wonder when we talk, for example, about technical education, do we know how many carpenters, how many plumbers, how many technicians we have in Saskatchewan or anywhere else in Canada? I say we don't, Mr. Speaker. I say we don't have the statistical information or the teams of people that can get this information. I say, as positively as I can, that this must be done.

Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage has been mentioned in the speech from the throne. I want to say that I will support any movement upward in the minimum wage. I hope that the one that is to come, or the one that is promised, will be a substantial one.

I want to recommend to the government that they use the services

of the Canada Welfare Council, in ascertaining what is a rate necessary for cost of living and apply this or recognize this, so far as a minimum wage is concerned. You know the Minimum Wage Act, Mr. Speaker, says the Minimum Wage Board is empowered to set a rate to furnish the necessary cost of living. I think this is just about the exact quotation. Well now, what better way of finding what "that necessary cost" is, but by employing people who can give us the information that could be useful in establishing this kind of rate. Above all, Mr. Speaker, this is an unorganized section of people. They do need protection. I hope that the increase will be a substantial one.

In the time that I have left before I yield the floor to another speaker, I want to deal with a number of other matters that have to do with my own constituency. First of all, I would like to say on Jubilee projects, that everyone in this house everywhere in this province wants them to succeed. I want to ask the government to give the maximum assistance to any Moose Jaw project which is finally selected.

I understand that a vote is to be held on the Zoological Park in Moose Jaw. The government has promised the contribution of \$500,000 to this project. I would like to voice a regret however, that the government did not support Moose Jaw's plea to have part of the special federal grant for Moose Jaw. The previous government asked for a grant of \$500,000 for this purpose. This was not supported by the present government. I would also like to urge that the stand of the present government on assuming part of the deficit of the Zoological Park be reconsidered, because a commitment was given by the previous government that the larger part of any deficit in a Zoological Park would be met by the provincial government. At this time, I understand that this commitment has been withdrawn. I hope that some reconsideration can be given to this point.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — . . . money . . .

Mr. Davies: — Well the money was there insofar as the federal project was concerned. It was merely the kind of division that we are talking about in this case.

Mr. Thatcher: — We didn't find . . .

Mr. Davies: — I would like to give an example of the Denver Zoo if I may. The Denver Zoo trustee, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Feucht, who is also a banker of that city, has said that if they could keep the \$48,000,000 worth of tourists that Colorado gets each year in that state by attending the Zoo, for just one day, it would mean another \$48,000,000 worth of tourist revenue. I suggest that what we want to do with the Zoological Park, if it is built in Moose Jaw, is to create the kind of thing that will be worthwhile, that won't be skimmed on, that will provide something that will keep tourists within Saskatchewan as they pass along no. 1 highway.

Mr. Speaker, may I also make a brief reference to the provincial building at Moose Jaw which this administration has "deferred". I don't know what other word to use, perhaps I will just use the word "deferred" for the time being, in hopes that a change of heart may take place shortly.]

I would like to make a plea though that this consideration be quick and that the building be constructed. Moose Jaw is the third largest city in this province. Moose Jaw, I suggest, on the bare bones of the argument alone, is entitled to this structure apart from the fact that a large number of government employees are housed in old and antiquated accommodation. I don't object, by the way, to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. J.W. Gardiner), putting his best foot forward in terms of a building survey, or even his best foot forward in his own community. But I couldn't help notice this little piece in the Melville Advance of August 19th, remarking that there had been a breakfast meeting attended by Mr. Gardiner and the Chamber of Commerce. They talked about a provincial building. This was in the middle of August. But the same news item goes on to say:

Early in June, 1964, at a previous meeting of local officials, Mr. Gardiner, who is a local MLA as well as a cabinet minister, said he was convinced this city needs a public building.

Well, I am much more convinced that Moose Jaw should have precedence, Mr. Speaker. I suggest in any case that I hope his enthusiasm for his own constituency doesn't outrun the survey itself.

On highways, I believe the government is aware of the problem that needs to be solved near Moose Jaw, the entrance from no. 2 highway south into the city. I hope that work can start here on the basis of the city's choice. I would also hope very much that the four-laning of no. 1 highway east of Moose Jaw, together with the work on the interchange at the alternate that enters Moose Jaw, proceeds just as rapidly as possible. I believe it should begin this year.

There is terrific congestion on this road. Many lives, I think would be saved and certainly greater convenience provided the travelling public, if this work was begun at once. I would also like to refer to the overpass on no. 2 north of Moose Jaw over no. 1 highway, in hoped that some work might be done at this point as well. I think the Moose Jaw Safety Council, Mr. Speaker, has had a word with the government on this particular area. To save time, I would simply refer the government to the suggestions that have been made by that body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is much more I would like to say, but I do not want to use up the radio time of the one who follows me. I will say this briefly about the speech from the throne.

I say that it does follow some of the policies of the previous CCF government. I admit that it does break some new ground, and these are measures that I have always tried to support. But, Mr. Speaker, it also advocates measures that are not forward-looking and it does offer inadequate steps for the future. In the implementation of programs, in the tenor and in the general course of government administration, as contemplated by the hon. members opposite, I can also find some major objections. And finally the economic and the social path that they outlined, is just as similarly sparse and threadbare. I say as a last word, that in my opinion, the guiding philosophy of this government will not work best for this province or its people and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the motion.

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, as you know this is the first occasion that I have had the opportunity to speak at any great length since this session of the legislature began. I have been on my feet on one or two previous occasions and perhaps on one or two previous occasions have been out of order and I apologize to you for that.

At the outset of my remarks I want to congratulate you, Sir, on being elevated to the high position that you now hold, and I think as other members have said, that this brings great honor to the people of Saltcoats and I know that they will share the honor that has been bestowed upon you. Your actions to date have demonstrated, in my opinion at least, Sir, that you have all of the qualifications necessary to make a good speaker and I am sure that when history is written, that you will be remembered as one of the better Speakers of this house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — I would also like to take this opportunity of congratulating all members of this house, both new and old. There seem to be more new faces in the legislature this time than we have seen for some considerable time. My congratulations go to all of those members who have been re-elected and those that have come into this chamber for the first time. I would sincerely like to congratulate you on the success that you had at the polls last April. I hope that your stay will be enjoyable. Some of you, I do not expect, will stay very long. Others, I expect, will be here for some considerable time.

I would also like to take the privilege of congratulating the mover and the seconder of the Address-In-Reply. It was not my privilege to be in the house when the Address-In-Reply was moved and seconded, but I did have the privilege of hearing most of those addresses on radio and I think both the mover and the seconder did themselves and the people that they represent proud. And I am very . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . pleased to be associated with them.

It has been a long time since I have had the opportunity of speak-

ing near the close of a debate. In the last ten years, it seems that it has been my prerogative to speak at the beginning of a debate, either the speech from the throne or the budget debate, as the case maybe. Of course there are certain advantages in speaking first, and that is the field is new and open to you, and many of the thoughts that you may have, you have the opportunity of expressing before other members have brought these opinions to the house I do not find myself in that position today, as many of the thoughts that I would like to have expressed to this house and to you, Sir, have been expressed by my colleagues, and I think their contribution to this debate has been very worthwhile.

However, at the close of a debate, you do have the opportunity of answering some of the nonsense that has been perpetrated by hon. members who sit opposite. And we had two good examples today. You know I never cease to be amused by the action of the member from Battleford (Mr. Kramer), — I notice he is out of the house as he usually is — but his contribution today was similar to the contribution that he has made on many previous occasions. He referred to part of the speech from the throne, which dealt with marketing conditions and farm prices, and I would like to remind the hon. member that over the last crop year, Canada was very fortunate, I think, in selling the amount of wheat that we were able to sell on the markets of the world. It was not as good a year as the year before, for the simple reason that the year before, our sales followed very severe crop conditions in most of Europe and Asia, and we were able to enter into market of the Soviet Union that in the past had not been available to us, and in all probability in the future will not be available to us to the same degree, unless that country has another series of crop failures. We welcome the opportunity of supplying their needs in the future, should these needs arise again.

He then attempted to convey a message to this house that the P.F.R.A. inspectors throughout the province were Liberal heelers. Well, Mr. Speaker, the only complaint I get is that they are Tory heelers. If he has any complaints, he should have levelled them at some of the people he had in his own department when he was a minister of the government — some political heelers that are no longer here and others that will not be here too long in the future.

He asked about car purchases, and he indicated that this government would not be purchasing cars on a bid basis. Where did he get this information? The trouble with this man is that he not only sleeps when he is in bed, but he must sleep when he is in the house as well. The hon. gentleman ought to be well aware that it is the intention of this government to make all purchases on a bid basis and to purchase from the company that gives the best price, taking into consideration the qualities that they have.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — And where has the hon. gentleman been for the last number of years?

Hon. D. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Where is he now?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Where is he now? Probably in the same place.

An Hon. Member: — Sleeping.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — When he starts talking about the repeal of the mineral tax, the Liberal party, over a period of many years, has been committed to a repeal of the mineral tax from farmer owned land in the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — It will not be repealed from companies like the Hudson Bay Company, Imperial Oil, B.A. Oil, Shell Oil, or any other oil company. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party have made it abundantly clear for many years that it would be repealed from land that is held by bona fide farmers in Saskatchewan and it will be done this session.

He talks about handing out millions in tax reductions. What millions? Where does he get this figure? He not only refuses to attend the sessions of the assembly, but he apparently can't even read, and if he can't read, he can't understand. He talks about bringing industry to the province

and what these taxes that were used to establish industry in North Battleford would do for the people that he represents. What industry did the hon. member get into North Battleford when he sat on this side of the house? I suggest to you that the industry in North Battleford looks about like the industry in Moosomin, and that isn't very great. He went on endeavoring to tell us the province has no debts, when this government took office. Mr. Speaker, the debt of the province of Saskatchewan the day we took office, was the highest it has ever been in the history of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — If the hon. gentleman would lead this house to believe that we have no debts, Mr. Speaker, we could have implemented most of the programs that had been asked for by the hon. gentlemen opposite, even most of those programs that were suggested by His Worship, the Mayor. Everyone knows that would cost an awful lot of money. Then he went on and said that the policies of the previous government were to be carried out as far as construction of highways were concerned. Then we would have to increase expenditures on highways. Mr. Speaker, we are not only increasing expenditures. This year those expenditures have been doubled.

Mr. Thatcher (Premier): — Capital expenditures.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Capital expenditures, in order for this province to catch up to the rest of Canada.

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — This year . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Do you know, this year that the expenditure on highways in Saskatchewan was about one-third of the expenditure on highways in the smallest province in Canada, namely Newfoundland.

Mr. C.G. Willis: — Federal.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — And then, he went on to criticize the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) for building a road to serve Saskatchewan people. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is about time that the taxes of the people of this province were used to implement programs that will serve the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — And we have no apologies for implementing policies and programs that will bring better services to the citizens who have lived in this province, in many instances, for fifty and sixty years. There are many people in Saskatchewan today, who were residents of this province the day the province was formed, who to this very day have not got a road, let alone a highway. It is the express purpose of this and the intentions of this government to give some consideration to providing transportation facilities for these people. So much for the absent member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer).

Now the one for Moose Jaw has left. I suppose he is out at a meeting with some of his friends with whom he normally associates. Where did he go? He makes a speech and runs. He said that what had been said by the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, after this government was elected, would have been said regardless of what political party had been elected.

If my hon. friends opposite had won the election, I wonder if the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour would have said that they would spare no effort to defeat that government? I don't think so.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina East): — The Federation never said that.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — The Federation did say it.

Mr. Smishek: — They did not.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — They certainly did. Then he complains about the make-up of the SUMA a few years ago. Certainly every person in the Saskatchewan

Urban Municipal Association was not a CCFer. They were good, honest, citizens, held in the highest respect by the communities which they served, and I think the people of Saskatchewan benefited because of the service that these people gave.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Then he went on to talk about civil liberties in the civil service. My friends often imply that they are the party that keep their promises. What were one of the promises that they made in Saskatchewan in 1944 and never kept and never had any intention of keeping? They committed themselves to taking the civil service out of politics and now they are trying to defend the position of some civil servants who are in politics. Mr. Speaker, a civil servant has the right to vote as he sees fit and as far as I am concerned, I couldn't care less how they vote. This is their business. This is their prerogative but, in my humble opinion, any civil servant who fools around in politics is a very foolish individual.

An Hon. Member: — What about the liberals? What about Dojak . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Civil servants are appointed to serve, not a political party, but to serve the people of the province of Saskatchewan or the people of Canada, as the case may be. And in this country . . .

An Hon. Member: — Hypocrisy.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — And in this province . . . Why should I waste my ammunition on that teal while there are a few honkers in the house?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, civil servants of this province and of this country, by and large, are of the highest calibre. I want to say that I think I have, in my own department, some of the finest civil servants that one could acquire any place in this western world.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — And I believe that the great bulk of our civil servants, whether they are provincial or federal, have a keen desire to serve their province or their country, as the case may be. They are not interested in playing politics during the period that they are serving the general public. And I admire them for it. I want to say that in my own department, my problems would have been much greater had it not been for the loyalty and ability of the employees in the Department of Agriculture.

The hon. member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) who is still absent, wanted to know why the Liberals had not developed all the resources in the province of Saskatchewan in the thirty-eight years they were in power. Mr. Speaker, let us just review a few of those years. Let us look at the period from 1905 to 1929. Would anybody opposite say for one moment that Saskatchewan did not have great development during that period? Would anyone say that?

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Public Health): — They would.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Who built the institutions of this province? Who built our school system? Our municipal system? Our hospital system? Every system you want to name, Mr. Speaker, was brought into existence by a Liberal government in that period, 1905 to 1929.

Mr. Kramer: — What a system!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — This was followed by a term of a Conservative government under Dr. Anderson. Further progress was made. Those were difficult years. They were not caused by a political party or by provincial or federal government, in my opinion. These conditions were virtually world-wide. Saskatchewan made progress. The Anderson government went into the money markets

of the world, borrowed large sums of money, and built a good highway system for the day, throughout the province of Saskatchewan. Ad I say, more credit to them.

My friends opposite are still complaining of the fact that some of these borrowed monies had to be paid back when they came into power. Mr. Speaker, some of the money that these people have borrowed will never be paid back in my lifetime and it will be fortunate if we pay it back in my children's lifetime.

And the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) also made a great appeal for a public building for his city and I give him credit for asking for facilities to be added to those that already exist in the city of Moose Jaw. The same, of course, is true as far as the city of Melville is concerned. But I would like to get my little spoke in. What about the town of Moosomin? I think we should have a public building.

An Hon. Member: — Where is it?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Somebody asked, where is it? Well, of course, they have not been out of their own constituency in the last twenty years so they wouldn't know where Moosomin or any large community in our province happens to be.

What happened in my community and my home town when my friends opposite were the government of this province? Did they construct some buildings in Moosomin?

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — No, they tore them down.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Oh, they tore them down. They came in and just for spite, against the wishes of the people of that constituency, tore down a provincial institution that was serving this province and serving it well. It was the cheapest penal institution in the province of Saskatchewan. The year before they tore it down, they spent over \$50,000 on some new buildings. The next year they went in and wrecked them. These were the builders. In addition to that, what happened to the land title building and the court house? Oh yes, they made progress. If it had been allowed to continue, most of the communities in this province would have had fewer buildings in the future rather than more.

I want to turn, Mr. Speaker, for a moment to the speech from the throne itself. Speaker after speaker on the other side of the house, has stood in his place and has said that he was going to vote for the amendment to the address, and against the adoption of the speech from the throne. And yet, prior to the opening of the house, some of those people, who sit opposite sometimes — now I see the Acting Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Brockelbank) is gone too — said they were going to support policies that were in the best interests of the province. They were going to suggest an alternative program. In all of the speeches that were made between that period of May 22nd and the opening of this legislature, these people were going to be so constructive. What has happened since they came into the house? The speech from the throne, Mr. Speaker, surely includes many constructive programs, and my friends opposite have all said they are going to vote against it.

Let us review some of them. They are going to oppose an increased expenditure on highways. They are going to say this is not in the interests of Saskatchewan. They are going to stand up and vote against it late today. They are going to oppose a department for youth. The member for Moose Jaw who just took his seat, and then disappeared, made great appeals to this government to spend more money on educational programs to prepare our youth for the problems that will confront Saskatchewan and Canada in the future. And yet he is going to vote against setting up a department which will be charged with the responsibility of trying to improve the lot of our younger people. My friends are going to vote against increased grants for education. Don't you believe we ought to be spending more money on education? Again, the member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) who just left, appealed to this government to spend more money on education, and then when he gets the opportunity to vote for such a program, he said, before he took his seat, he was going to vote against it.

Then what about pensions for teachers and civil servants? My hon. friends opposite and especially the ex-minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Nicholson) made great appeals yesterday for those that are less fortunate

than ourselves. This Throne Speech makes provisions for giving a decent pension to people who made a considerable contribution to the province of Saskatchewan. But he and everyone of his colleagues are going to vote against it.

Mr. Thatcher: — Refused to do it for years too when they were in.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — And not only are they going to vote against it now, but they sat here for twenty years with the problem on their desks and would do nothing about it.

What about the Indians and the Metis? My hon. friend from Moose Jaw was talking about unemployment. The most critical unemployed areas in the province of Saskatchewan is in the north where thousands of our native people live. They are not under-employed because they haven't any employment. This government intends to do everything that is humanly possible to see that these people have the opportunity to be gainfully employed. And my friends opposite are trying to vote against it.

What about minimum wages? Well, the members opposite have said, "this Liberal government not only should increase the minimum wage but you should increase it enough so that the people will have a rebate for the money that they ought to have been paid over the years when we did not have courage or audacity enough to increase the minimum wage". But now that we are going to increase it, they are going to vote against it.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Not enough.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Not enough. A little bit is better than nothing, Bill.

Mr. Thatcher: — It is a lot more than you fellows were paying.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — They are even going to vote against the proposal of this government to make wire-tapping illegal. Do they want to continue to wire-tap? We don't think it's in the best interests of Saskatchewan.

They are going to vote against amending the Election Act, so that citizens of this province will be equal when it comes to voting at the polls. Do you believe that some citizens are better than others? That some are second class citizens? Do you believe that veterans are not entitled to vote if they have the same qualifications as other residents of our province? Of course, we know they do not think so because they voted against it a year ago and are going to vote against it again later today.

We will come to lease lands after awhile, but they are going to vote against this policy, which makes it possible for land to go to the farmer whose need is greatest, regardless of what his political affiliation is.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — He sounds like what he looks. A jackass.

And of course, they are also going to vote against provisions that will make it attractive for more tourists to visit our province. They are going to vote against the construction of eleven new regional parks. They are going to vote against Canada having the opportunity to amend her own constitution. They are going to vote against Saskatchewan's participation in the Canadian pension plan. Well, what are you going to vote for?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Not for you.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — For your own amendment, I presume. Let me turn, Mr. Speaker, to some other problems that have existed and do exist, and I suggest to you that part of the reason for many of these problems existing today is the fact that my friends opposite, a few years ago, lost some of the best members that they ever had sitting on their side of the house. And then those people moved out of this legislature, what happened? The government of the day began to disintegrate. The CCF-NDP party began to move further and further left until they find themselves in the position today

where the left-wing element of their party is in complete control.

Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — The same story.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — And I note from the speeches of some of the members that have joined this legislature for the first time, that they are members of this extreme left-wing group. The people of this province and the people of Canada, and the people of this continent, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, did not favor extremism, either left or right. All one has to do is to look at the voting pattern of Canadian people or of our American cousins. Our people will not support extremism and I suggest to you, the main reason that you are sitting on that side of the house today, is because of the fact that the extreme left-wing element have control of your party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — During this debate, many statements have been made by our friends opposite, referring to the progress that Saskatchewan has made over the last twenty years. A moment ago, I said that, in my opinion, there had been progress, but progress did not start in 1944. And I think, if we are worthy of the trust of those people who supported us and sent us here, then surely to goodness we should give credit where credit is due. Some members who served in this legislature before any of us that are here today, made tremendous contributions to the development of Saskatchewan and her resources. We have had progress. This is our Jubilee Year, our sixtieth birthday. And what better time is there to stop and reflect the progress that Saskatchewan has made?

Give credit to the past governments, irrespective of what political party they may have represented. I am prepared to do that. But I am also prepared to say that if the party that sits opposite, Mr. Speaker, had not lost their zeal for reform, and had not moved to the left, as far as they have, they might have still been sitting on this side of the house. But they lost contact with the people of Saskatchewan. They thought that they were the only political party which had the ability to administer the affairs of this province. And this province, like the people of Canada, has a way of dealing with people who have this attitude.

I want to refer, for a moment, to a statement that was made the other day, by one of the members from Regina East. And he is in his seat, I am pleased to see. He was talking about a commitment of this government to provide 80,000 jobs in the next four years. He referred to the International Minerals and Chemical Company and the fact that they had a \$40,000,000 investment and employed some 400 people. Then he stated that the Kalium Company had some \$50,000,000 invested in Saskatchewan and they were employing 250 people. Mr. Speaker, why didn't he complete the story? Does he believe that these two industries will only supply a total of 650 jobs? Mr. Speaker, you know as well as I do, the International Minerals and Chemical Corporation are located in your constituency. They do not have an investment of \$40,000,000. The \$40,000,000 figure was the original investment in that plant. The original investment has now been increased from \$40,000,000 to \$60,000,000. A second shaft is being sunk that will cost some place between \$10,000,000 and \$12,000,000. A second plant is being built which will cost another \$60,000,000 and the total investment in that area will be some place between \$110,000,000 and \$125,000,000. The employment of people will not be 400. The number of people employed in that mine will run between 700 and 800 people. And there will be 1,000 or 1,500 people employed during the construction period.

Let us turn to some of the other potash companies. What about United States Borax? It has an investment of \$60,000,000, will employ 500 people permanently and will employ 700 to 1,200 people during the construction period.

What about Alwinsol? — \$50,000,000 capital investment, 500 permanent jobs and a similar number of additional jobs during the construction period.

What about Consolidated Mining and Smelting? — \$65,000,000 investment, 500 permanent jobs created, and again 1,000 to 1,500 people will be employed during the construction period.

Mr. Thatcher: — Private enterprise.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Again, for the information

of my friends opposite, additional potash companies will be announcing their participation in this industry in the very near future.

Mr. Thatcher: — Private enterprise.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Again, my friend who holds himself out as some sort of a labor wizard, talking about the capital that is necessary to provide one job. And he talked about the foreign control of our industries. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age, it is necessary to have huge sums of money in order to create employment. But if we, in Canada, or if we in Saskatchewan, attempt to develop our resources from Saskatchewan and Canadian capital, you and I will never see the day when these resources are developed.

How can a province like Saskatchewan, a province that is only sixty years of age, with a million people, have savings enough to develop the resources of this province? It is impossible. How can a country like Canada, let alone Saskatchewan, with a population of 20,000,000 people, but, only 100 years of age, — how can their people possibly have savings of sufficient quantity to develop the great resources of this nation?

As the premier said when he opened this debate, we welcome investment in Saskatchewan from America, from Europe, and virtually anywhere in the world, to develop our resources, to provide the investment capital so that there will be jobs for the people who live in this province. For we have no apologies to make to anyone for having adopted this attitude. When we look at the great country to the south of us who are spending millions in Saskatchewan and in Canada, to develop our resources, to build industry and to employ our people, where did they get their capital? Who developed the resources of the United States? Well, if my friends do not know, I will tell them.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Farmers.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — It was British capital that developed the resources of the United States and thank goodness their resources are large enough now that some of this money can come into Canada and into Saskatchewan to develop our resources.

But then, my hon. friend ought to have gone on in another direction. He ought to know that for every job that is created in a mine or an industry, then there are additional jobs created down the line. Does he think for one moment that any one of these potash mills could be built without creating additional work for electricians, for plumbers, for carpenters, for railroad employees, for employees in the factories that are building special railroad equipment to transport potash, for ships to transport this potash to foreign lands, cement that is used in the construction industry, to build the mines, to build the homes, to build the stores, the schools, the laundries, the hospitals, — additional facilities that are needed because of the numbers of people that are employed in the industry. Does not he realize that for every individual who is directly employed by one of these companies, there will be somewhere between five and eight other individuals who will be making a living because this industry has been developed?

Mr. Smishek: — How many jobs have you created since you took office?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Well, if you would just shut up a minute I will tell you.

In this potash industry, the number of people that will be directly employed will be at least 2,350. The total number of people employed because of the development of this one single industry, will be some place between 17,000 and 20,800.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — I wonder if my friends, and I notice the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) smiling . . .

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — He's no good at multiplying.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Does he deny . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: — Like a rabbit.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Does he deny that one potash mine employing 500 people in the industry will not employ at least 3,000 additional people in the community? Does he deny it? No, he won't deny it because he knows better.

Some comment was made, I think by the ex-Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Nollet) criticizing the common market deal that Canada and the United States have entered into as far as the production of automobiles are concerned. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this arrangement between Canada and the United States will go a long way to solve some of the unemployment problems in Canada. It will go a long way to solve some of the economic problems of Canada. People opposite surely know that one of the great reasons that Canada has been faced with economic problems in years gone by, is the simple fact that we Canadians spend annually \$500,000,000 more on automobile and automobile parts from the United States than the Americans spend on automobile parts from Canada. It will open up to the Canadian automobile manufacturing industry a market, not of 20,000,000 people, but a market of 180,000,000 in the United States plus 20,000,000 in Canada, or a market of 200,000,000.

Do my friends opposite oppose this? Do they not think that our workers ought to be given the opportunity to build some automobiles and automobile parts that will be driven by our American cousins? Do you oppose Canada's saving somewhere up to \$500,000,000 a year in foreign exchange? Do you? If you do, you are entitled to your convictions. I do not want any part of it.

Now, I want to come back for a moment to talk about this minimum wage. Let us review the history of minimum wage. What was the minimum wage when my hon. friends took over the reigns of government in 1944?

Mr. Smishek: — \$16 a week.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — If you will just hush up a moment, I will tell you a few facts and you will be well advised to take your pencil out and make notes so that you will know something when I am finished.

In 1944, the minimum wage was \$16.80 a week. What is it today? After twenty years of socialism and this humanitarian government — well, the minimum wage is \$36.50 a week. Bravo! In twenty years, you increased the minimum wage by \$19.70 a week. A dollar a week a year — 2 1/4 cents an hour a year. You should be proud of yourselves. What a record!

Mr. Kramer: — You voted . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — And now you are going to vote against an increase in the minimum wage.

An Hon. Member: — How much will it be. You tell us.

An Hon. Member: — \$1.40 . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — On one hand, Mr. Speaker, they say that they are friends of labor, but I always thought that if you wanted to get a friend, give him a little more wages and it will help. But you people are going to vote against it. It is your announced intention and I notice that one of the hon. members from Regina East said it should be \$1.25 a hour. His colleague says \$1.40. Why don't they get together and make up their minds?

An Hon. Member: — We will.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Of the speeches that have been made by my friends opposite in this session, there are not any two of them that bear any relationship to one another. One would think that you, how many are there of you?

Mr. Smishek: — We make our own speeches.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Twenty-five or twenty-six different political parties.

An Hon. Member: — Each one has his own program.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Now let us turn to the Department of Agriculture for a moment. Some statements have been made and we will start off with a good one, that A.M.A. would be abolished. Well now, Mr. Speaker, whoever made that statement in the first place did not know what he was talking about. The answer I tabled in the house today indicates that the A.M.A. has not been abolished. Part of the work that has been carried out over the years by the A.M.A. has been transferred from its present position to the Family Farm Improvement Branch. The balance will be transferred to the University of Saskatchewan. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our university can do as good a job in this regard as could be done by any branch of the provincial government. I have some faith . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . and some confidence in the ability of our university. Apparently my friends opposite haven't.

Mr. Berezowsky: — The farmers don't think so.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, what position did we find ourselves in as far as the A.M.A. was concerned? Last year in the budget there was a sum of \$177,110 voted for the A.M.A. to carry out the responsibilities that had been assigned to it. \$177,110, Mr. Speaker, and this money was to be used, part of it at least, to test and evaluate farm machinery.

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — 8,000 farmers . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — And you know, this organization was the off-spring of a committee of this house that I had the opportunity of serving on back in 1952.

An Hon. Member: — Did he oppose it?

An Hon. Member: — No.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — And I have a report of that committee in my hand. Where did that committee meet? It met down in room 267 in this building. Did they get out of this building and look at any machine companies, even in Regina? No. Did they travel outside the province of Saskatchewan to look at anything? No. We attempted to subpoena people to come to this committee to give evidence from the farm machine companies but we were unsuccessful in doing so. We had a few branch managers from this city and the city of Saskatoon, and I believe we had one individual, one or two, from the city of Winnipeg. But we could never get to the root of the problem, because the committee were not allowed to move outside this building and they could not get the people inside to give the evidence that the committee needed. There was also a committee set up by the province of Ontario, to study the same problem, and I have their report in my hands.

What did the committee in Ontario do? Did they sit in the provincial legislature in the city of Toronto? No! They got off their haunches and visited the farmers and the machine industry, both in Canada and the United States. And what did they say in their report? They said that they could not recommend comparative testing of agriculture machinery and why did they say it?

An Hon. Member: — They were a bunch of Liberals.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — A bunch of Liberals. Nothing. They were Conservatives and Liberals on the committee and they were a good committee. And the reason they said they couldn't do it, was because the treasury of the province of Ontario couldn't afford to do it. Here we are, with a piddly little expenditure \$177,000 trying to recommend changes in design and construction in the agriculture machinery industry.

Mr. Kramer: — . . . successful.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — There is over \$1,000,000 a year spent by the agriculture

machinery industries on this continent in research and testing of farm machinery. The ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) isn't in the house either . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Did the former Minister (Mr. Nollet) when he was in office, ever visit a farm or a major farm machinery manufacturing plant? Did he? Has any one of you, any one of you, ever visited a major agricultural manufacturing plant? Have you? Put up your hands if you have. No, you have not.

An Hon. Member: — You can't see us, you're not here.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — These people have no . . .

An Hon. Member: — Sure he is.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . have no conception of agricultural machinery today, without exception . . .

An Hon. Member: — Were you . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Yes, I was there, you bet your life I was there. I wouldn't be the Minister of Agriculture for nine months and not have done it, let alone twenty years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — There is not one major farm machinery plant on this continent today that has not research and test facilities, whose budget runs from \$12,000,000 to \$18,000,000 a year, and we are going to tell them what is right and wrong for \$177,000! How can you test any one machine and tell whether you have a good machine or a bad one? Most of you people if you don't know anything about agriculture machinery, must know something about the automobile. Once in a while you get a lemon. I have had them. So have you. And I have had agricultural machines that were lemons as well, but unless you are prepared to get at least six machines of every model, then you cannot get a true comparison.

I have no apologies for moving part of the services from the Department of Agriculture to the Family Farm Improvement Branch and the balance to the university. I have every confidence that the university will provide to the farmers of Saskatchewan, equally good or better services than ever was provided in the past. And when I say that, Mr. Speaker, I don't want, anyone to take from my remarks, that I have criticized anyone who served as an employee of the A.M.A. The main reason that we were not able to do the job that ought to have been done, was the lack of money. And if this organization was going to do the job, if the job had to be done, it would have cost not \$177,000 a year, but probably some thing in the neighbourhood of \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 a year.

What about crop insurance? My friends opposite have criticized and asked some questions in regard to crop insurance. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe there were some changes needed in crop insurance, and I have no apologies to make to anyone for making these changes. What has happened to crop insurance? In the first year of crop insurance, 1961, the Board was able to sell 194 contracts. In 1962, 1172 new contracts; in 1963, 1150; and in 1964, 680. But what has happened to these new contract holders, Mr. Speaker? Thirty-six per cent of them dropped their contract after they held it for one year. Why? Because the crop insurance program that we have been attempting to sell to our farmers, is not suitable to their needs. And certainly we have changed the make-up of the personnel in the crop insurance and the personnel on the Crop Insurance Board. They have been changed because I believe, and this government believes, that we can get a crop insurance program which will serve the needs of our farmers much better than any program that has been in existence today. Under the new set-up, we have an executive director, a supervisor of research and a supervisor of field services. They, of course, are under the control of a board which is appointed from representatives that came from the farm organization of our province.

Some reference has also been made to the delta region. Mr. Speaker,

what did my friends opposite do in the past twenty years to improve the lot of the people who live in the delta region? What have they done to improve the standards of living for the people of Cumberland House?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Took away . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — You took what? What did you do?

Mr. Berezowsky: — We took away the contracts and helped them become . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — The Hudson Bay Company? Well, what else did you do at Cumberland House?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Do you want me to tell you? I'll give you . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Nothing! Absolutely nothing! Here is a community of native people who have little or no resources that have been developed. the great bulk of them have lived on social aid, and in twenty years what did you do for them? Name one thing, apart from giving them social aid.

Now, this government has moved into the delta region already. We will be moving much further in the new year.

Mr. Berezowsky: — . . . Dumont . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Here you had a farm that was operated by the Department of Natural Resources on Farm Island. Mr. Speaker, the farm looks like a lot of other farms in the province of Saskatchewan that have been abandoned in the last twenty years. No employment for people, no revenue for people in the area and the thing was on a stand-by basis. What have we done since we became the government? Do you know this farm is on an island? There wasn't even a bridge to get over to the island.

An Hon. Member: — Have you put one up?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Yes, we have. Brand new, built and paid for.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — About time.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — In addition too that, we will be building a new residence for the farm manager. In addition to that we have bought a new tractor, not one of these little garden ones like you had up there, that you could jump over, and couldn't do anything. We have bought a new seventy horsepower tractor and taken it into the area. We will be taking in a full set of farm machinery, modern and up-to-date, into the area. We will be developing this farm as an educational farm, a training farm.

Mr. Berezowsky: — About time. Took nine months.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — We will be developing this farm as an educational farm, a training farm, to train the local people in an endeavor to get them established on farm units in that area. This is what is . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . being done in the delta region. The Saskatchewan River Development Commission have been continuing their studies of the entire area. I was fortunate enough last summer to have the opportunity of visiting the area myself. The people who sit opposite sat here for twenty years and did nothing about this area, other than set up this Commission when they had started to do some work. The work of this Development Commission is continuing. The Department of Agriculture along with the Department of Natural Resources last year carried out a survey of virtually all of the delta area region. Those of you who are familiar with that area, know that a lot of it is covered with peat-moss, varying anywhere from two feet to

fifteen feet.

An Hon. Member: — Set up a program . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Tremendous. Set up a program. You sat on your haunches. That's what you did for twenty years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — We are moving. I don't know at this moment what agricultural development can take place in the immediate future. I think it will some considerable time before the experts that are working on this Commission and the experts in the Department of Agriculture can advise the government as to how much land can be brought into production in that area.

An Hon. Member: — . . . Hudson Bay . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — I don't know why my hon. friend doesn't go and buy the Hudson Bay, then he wouldn't have so much trouble.

An Hon. Member: — . . . throw the people out.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — The other day when the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) was speaking in this house, he said there is one thing that those terrible Liberals will not be able to take credit for and that is the veterinary college. Well, I would not mind him taking credit, for the veterinary college, or anybody else over there, if they will pay for it. When I became the Minister responsible for the Department of Agriculture, within a few weeks I was in contact with our university and held some discussions with regard to this veterinary college. What did I find? I find that the information that had been given to this house by the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) a year ago was about like all the information the people opposite have given us over the years. It was full of holes. Mr. Speaker, if there is any person in this house who ought to deserve credit for attempting to get the veterinary college located in the province of Saskatchewan, it is you, Sir.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — What did my hon. friends plan to do when they were the government? They planned to build a veterinary college that would cost \$2,500,000 and would not even supply enough veterinarians for the province of Saskatchewan, let alone western Canada. This is to be a western Canadian veterinary college to serve Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and British Columbia. The new plan . . .

Mr. Michayluk: — From Montana?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . and I expect we will have some students from Montana.

Mr. Thatcher: — And they will be welcomed too.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — They certainly will be welcomed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — The new veterinary college that is now partially under construction will not cost \$2,500,000. The initial phase will cost about \$6,000,000 and when the college is completed it will cost \$8,000,000. This government of today have attempted to open negotiations with Ottawa in the hopes that we can have them lift the \$625,000 ceiling from the contribution that they committed themselves to, to the previous government. But whether we get federal aid or whether we do not, and I hope we do, the money must be made available and will be made available by this government.

Let me turn for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to farm credit. Here again, the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) who is out again trying to get a few votes, I suppose, had something to say about farm credit. He talk-

ed about the Agricultural Adjustment and Development Act that his government put on the books of this house a year ago. Well, Mr. Speaker putting legislation on the statute books won't put money in the farmers' pockets. He ought to look at the estimates that he tabled in this house a year ago and if there is a dollar in them for farm credit, I will eat his hat here in the centre of the floor. Pass the knife. Yes, it is, but not a five cent piece in the estimates to provide credit for our farmers.

Now, what had happened in the last fiscal year? There have been some changes in farm credit. The federal government have changed their policies under the Farm Credit Act, and under the Farm Improvement Loans' Act. There is no need to go into any details about these. I am sure all member are aware of the increases that have been made. But there is a need in Saskatchewan today for additional farm credit. We are in the process at the moment of negotiating a new agreement with the federal government. The ARDA agreement that is in existence at the moment expires on March 21st next, and we will have a new agreement coming into effect on April 1st next. I sincerely hope that this agreement will make provisions for some type of credit to farmers in Saskatchewan and a type of credit that is not available today. I assure this house, if this credit is not made available under ARDA then it will be made available by the provincial Department of Agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I think the provincial Department of Agriculture would have been ill-advised to have proceeded with this credit at this session, not knowing what the terms of the new ARDA agreements will be.

We are not going to sit here for twenty years and do nothing. We are not going to sit here for twenty years and watch 2,000 farmers a year squeezed off our land. What did you do about it? Nothing. Nothing.

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . went right to Ottawa.

Mr. Berezowsky: — That's last year.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — The hon. member opposite has complained because we made no reference to hay shelters in the Throne Speech debate. Well you know, there was not very much hay in this year's Throne Speech!

Speeches of the past have been filled with hay to garbage from time to time. But we do not intend to be bound simply to the announcements in the Throne Speech. Legislation and policy will be announced in the course of this session to make provision for the construction of hay shelters on an experimental basis.

I want to turn for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to crown leases. I get a lot of enjoyment out of this. The ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) makes an appeal for this house to appoint a board to allocate leases and he sat here for twenty years, he and his colleagues, and opposed the setting up of a board to allocate leases. He had a commissar of crown lands. I noticed none of my friends opposite asked when or why he was fired.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal program called for an independent board to allocate land. When the Premier appointed me as Minister of Agriculture one of the first concerns I had was to bring into effect a new policy with regard to the allocation of crown lands. We had committed ourselves to an independent board, but on being charged with the responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture, which includes the lands' branch, I was immediately convinced that this was the wrong procedure.

There are some people in the lands' branch of the Department of Agriculture who have been there for many, many years, who probably know more about land than any other group of individuals in the province of Saskatchewan. All we needed to do was to leave these people alone and keep their political fingers out of their pockets and they could allocate leases.

But we had committed ourselves to an independent board, so we said the lands' branch will make a provisional allocation and in each and every case there will be a twenty-one day waiting period so that if those people who do not receive the lease, want to appeal, then they can appeal the decision of the lands' branch to an appeal board. The appeal board is not a political board and the people on it are not political heelers . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Who are they?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Who are they? I will tell you who they are.

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife): — Who recommended them to you?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — The first individual on the board is a gentleman by the name of Tom Brooks and he comes from my constituency. He was recommended by Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Perhaps for the edification of some of my friends opposite, I ought to read the recommendation that was sent to me by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. They nominated this gentleman to the board:

He took his high school education at Grenfell and his Bachelor of Arts degree at Brandon College. In 1930, he was on the staff of Success Business College in Winnipeg. From 1931 to the present he has operated a dairy and grain farm at Grenfell. He has been active in our organization as a committee member and been committee secretary for a number of years. Since 1959 has been our delegate representing sub-district 7 of District 7. He has been active in community and provincial activities having served on the Grenfell school board for eleven years, the Indian Head school trustees association and president of that association for eight years. He was president of the Regina Milk Producers Association for nine years and was past president of the Saskatchewan Dairy Association. In addition, he was Saskatchewan Director of the Dairy Farmers of Canada for three years. He is past president of the Saskatchewan branch of the Holstein Friesian Association; past president of the Grenfell district board of trade; organizer and past president of the Grenfell Agriculture Society; and has been secretary of the Grenfell United Church for twenty-five years. He is also past Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Saskatchewan, for the Independent Order of Oddfellows . . .

and so on, and so on it goes. It is signed by Charlie Gibbings, and I think you know who he is.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — The next member of the board is Mr. McDougall, Jack McDougall from Maple Creek, who was recommended by the Saskatchewan Stock Grower's Association. The next member of the board is Mr. Stephen Surjik from Yorkton, who is recommended by the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, Stewart Thiesen.

An Hon. Member: — Against him, Toby?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — The next member of the board was recommended by the Saskatchewan Livestock Association. This letter was signed by Mr. D.H. McLeod and they have recommended Mr. Raymond Youngman to serve on the board.

This is an independent board, independent of the civil service, independent of politics. They owe nothing to anyone. They are not dependent for a living on the few dollars that they get for serving on this board. We have a court of appeal. The last minister of Agriculture, a year ago, said that the Minister of Agriculture had to be the last court of appeal . . .

Mr. Nollet: — I said the opposite.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — No, you did not. I will read you what you said.

I wish to say something about land allocations. The Liberal platform makes some reference to this.

They speak of setting up an independent allocation committee. Well, with this I must agree we do want complete independence and freedom from any political pressure from any party whatever. We have been endeavoring to discourage this responsibility and leases and allocations have been based on political patronage.

Mr. Speaker, as long as the allocations committee and his functions come directly under the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister is bound to be the court of last appeal.

That is what you said.

Mr. Nollet: — Playing politics . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — I have no desire to be the court of last appeal and I will not be. The appeal board is the court of last appeal.

Mr. Nollet: — Read the rest of that. Read my comments too.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — The appeal board is the court of last appeal. The ex-Minister seems to feel that there is going to be friction between the members of the lands' branch . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member cease quoting out of context? Would he continue? I made a . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — I am not quoting out of context. Why don't you get it and read it yourself. Don't you know what you said?

Mr. Nollet: — I know what I said.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): —

As long as the allocations committee and its function comes directly under the Minister's department, the Minister is bound to be the court of last appeal.

Mr. Nollet: — What else?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Here, take this over to him so he can read it himself. You don't know what you said. Can you read, Toby? "The Minister is bound to be the court of last appeal". I don't agree with that. I don't expect there will be any difficulty or animosity between members of the lands' branch and the appeal board.

Mr. Kramer: — Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — No, Mr. Speaker. I have used all of the time that I ought to. I would like to have said more in regard to some of my other responsibilities, namely the government insurance office and the Saskatchewan Guarantee and Fidelity Company. However, I hope that on another occasion I will have the opportunity to do this.

I would also like to have made some remarks with regard to the condition of agriculture in Saskatchewan and its future over the short and the long haul. Here again, I hope I will have the opportunity of speaking on these matters during another debate.

I think you can gather from what I have said that I will certainly be supporting the Throne Speech that was introduced a few days ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised a point. He didn't

quote the pertinent part of my remarks. May I quote them to him? He asked me to read it and I will. I have this, Mr. Speaker.

I would be happier to be free from some of the obligations and pressures that occur and I can assure the house that never at any time would I let politics interfere.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — It was your prerogative for twenty years to get out of that position and you refused to do it.

Mr. Nollet: — You are still not out of it. You are not out of it now. You are in it. You are right in the thick of it right now.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Time is passing. I understand we take a vote on this motion at 5 o'clock. There are a few comments I would like to make and a few charges that have been made in the course of this debate that I would like to answer.

Before that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) and the others who have congratulated you, Sir, on your elevation to the august post of Speaker of this assembly. Having known you for years and having known of your interests and that you are a student of parliamentary procedures, I know that these members have placed their confidence in the right person.

I had intended, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words about 1965 being Saskatchewan's Jubilee Year. I intended to remark how it should be an occasion, during all of this year, for people to meet and to pay tribute to the pioneers, to those people who have played such an important role in the development of this great province of ours. These are also occasions not only to reflect on the past, but by so doing, to draw strength for the challenge of the future.

I had hoped to dwell a bit on the challenges I see approaching in Saskatchewan during the next sixty years. One of the greatest challenges facing Saskatchewan today is the challenge to lift ourselves up, to raise our standards, to narrow the gap between the have and the have-not provinces. For too many years, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has lingered in the shadows as a have-not province. Our challenge today is to change that. If we are to do so, I believe we must meet this challenge from within. No one will impose it from without.

We believe on this side of the house, and this government believes that the greatest key to meeting this challenge is to be found in the full development and utilization of our natural resources with which this province is so blessed.

Therefore, I want to deal awhile with some of the programs and objectives that have been initiated by this government in order to get this development underway. We believe that, if we are to get accelerated development, we must call upon those people who have the skills and the know-how and the financial resources with which to do it. No government has this type of money. I am pleased to announce that we stepped out and have invited just such types of people to come to Saskatchewan to assist us in this challenge.

I was disappointed, Mr. Speaker, to hear the comments that have been made in this legislature respecting industry and business. Charges have been made with regard to this government's dealings with industry which I cannot permit to go unanswered. One cannot but grasp the significance of the theme underlying every speech delivered by the opposition. They have made a concerted effort to sneer at, to besmirch and to discredit every effort made by industry, by business, and yes, by individuals, in their efforts to play their roles in meeting this challenge.

Mr. Speaker, they have been very careful in this chamber in the manner of their presentations. They have resorted to innuendoes and insinuations, that somehow this government has sold out to big business, that we have indulged in a give-away program, and that friends of the government have received special concessions at the expense of the people. They infer that our incentive program for exploration, for deep drilling, and for mining is a sell-out of the people's resources. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, how forthright they are outside this chamber, where they are not

held accountable! Outside the chamber, they call the royalty free period on oil production a betrayal of the peoples' interest, a sell-out to big business.

They have even tabulated precisely what it is going to cost the people of this province. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), Mr. Speaker, has gone from one end of this province to the other telling the people of Saskatchewan that they will lose tens of millions of dollars if a Leduc is discovered in Saskatchewan. The junior member from Moose Jaw, a self-styled critic of mineral resources, is more definite. He claims to be an authority on the matter. Speaking in Moose Jaw, and I have the clipping here, he said:

That the royalty holiday on deep drilling will cost the people of Saskatchewan \$50,000,000.

He goes on to say to call this, "the great betrayal".

Mr. Speaker, I have only one comment and that is to say that these are irresponsible, irrational, mischievous statements. They are statements that are designed for one purpose only, and that purpose is to create fear and mistrust in the minds of the people. I propose, Mr. Speaker, to show to this assembly that there is not a shred of evidence to support these malicious charges.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Let us look at this charge, that if a Leduc is discovered in Saskatchewan that the people of Saskatchewan will lose \$50,000,000. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should give a bit of the background as to how the Leduc well was injected into the discussion of oil in Saskatchewan.

The first thing I undertook when I became Minister of Mineral Resources was to conduct an inventory of Saskatchewan's mineral resources. We set out to assess the status of the oil industry, the gas industry, and the other mineral industries. In assessing Saskatchewan's oil picture we found that Saskatchewan enjoys an enviable position in regards to world demand for oil. The demand for Saskatchewan crude oil exceeds our production and our capacity to produce. The amount of oil Saskatchewan can sell in the world markets is governed solely by our capacity to produce. Each month new records in production are set in an effort to meet this demand. This is good news to the people of Saskatchewan. This is the bright side of the coin.

The other side of the picture, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat disturbing. Saskatchewan has not had a new oil discovery since 1957. In eight years we have gone without finding any new reserves of oil. If production continues to increase at its present rate, our reserves of oil will be depleted and Saskatchewan will be without oil within eight years.

Mr. Speaker, let me assure you that this government does not intend to stand by and see this happen. This government believes that it is urgent that we induce the industry to undertake an exploration program immediately in search of new reserves of oil in this province. In order to encourage the industry to undertake this exploration program we are providing incentives for exploration in the unknown areas of the province. Montana and Alberta have had success in finding new reserves of oil at the deeper horizons, at depths of 10,000 to 12,000 feet below the surface. Now, Mr. Speaker, we do not know if Saskatchewan has oil reserves at these depths but we do intend to go down and find out

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — All of Saskatchewan's present known reserves of oil are found in the upper horizons, in depths less than 6,000 feet. This government recognizes that deep drilling to these depths is expensive. One well to the 10,000 foot level would cost anywhere from \$500,000 to \$750,000. Such a program of deep drilling would cost the industry many millions of dollars. Industry has assured us that they are prepared to risk this money, to risk it, Mr. Speaker, not only in their own interest, but in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. Industry fully realizes that if this search is not successful, they are the ones that will have lost the millions of dollars. In order to compensate the industry for this risk, we have assured them that if they are successful in finding oil at those great depths, this government will exempt them from royalties on production for this depth for a limited time in order to permit them to recoup part of their capital costs.

before being taxed with royalties. The industry will be exempt on production of oil from this depth until December 31st, 1970. This is pleasing to you. Let me continue.

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — Shame.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Shame.

Mr. Cameron: — Shame, the lady member from Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) says. I wish to make it very clear that this royalty free period applies beyond the 10,000 foot level. The companies pay royalties, and the companies will continue to pay royalties on every barrel of oil presently produced and on every barrel of oil that will be produced in the future from the upper horizons.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — That is not what the regulations say . . .

Mr. Cameron: — This production comes from the present reserves or future reserves, so long as those reserves are less than 10,000 feet, royalty will be charged on every gallon of oil that is produced in this province.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Sit down, will you? I would point out also . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Cameron: — No, you can not. May I point out also, that if in the course of drilling to the 10,000 foot, the company finds reserves shallower than 10,000 feet, the production from this oil likewise is subject to royal ties.

I want to reiterate that the government will take its royalty on every barrel of oil presently produced and every barrel of oil produced in the future so long as that oil comes from the depth of less than 10,000 feet.

What if the industry strikes a Leduc at 10,000 feet? Well, if they do they are exempt from royalties on that production until 1970 . . .

An Hon. Member: — All of it . . .

Mr. Cameron: — This is what the NDP claims is a sell-out of our resources, a betrayal of our people.

An Hon. Member: — So it is . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — And they all say "yes". They claim that it would cost the people of Saskatchewan \$50,000,000. Does the member for Moose Jaw say "Yes" to that again today?

Let me deal with these charges. To obtain information on the history of Leduc, I went to the greatest authority on the matter, namely, the Department of Mines and Minerals of Alberta. I got an answer to this question, what would be the loss in revenues if production from the Leduc enjoyed a six year holiday. We took the production record of Leduc from 1947 to 1952 and we analysed it. You will note that this is the first six year period. Accumulated royalty to the crown from Leduc during this six year period was not \$50,000,000, not \$40,000,000, not \$20,000,000, not even \$12,000,000. The accumulated royalty from the Leduc discovery in Alberta during the first six years totalled in royalty to the government \$10,900,000. Mr. Speaker, let me point out this is only part of the story.

An Hon. Member: — You bet. . .

Mr. Cameron: — The Leduc discovery caused crown land sales in that area to soar to a record high, and during this six year period land sales in this area netted the Alberta government \$14,500,000.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — What was the royalty at that time . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Lease rentals netted an additional \$7,000,000. Bring this Leduc to Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — When you bring it, what will be the net result to Saskatchewan? Under the royalty free period for six years, the province on the pattern of Leduc, would give up \$10,900,000 in royalty in exchange for \$21,500,000 in increased land sales for a net gain to the people of Saskatchewan of \$10,500,000 during that six year period.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — You know that is not true.

Mr. Cameron: — . . . in addition to this, it would assure Saskatchewan oil production for the next forty years. This, Mr. Speaker, is what constitutes, in the eyes of the NDP, a sell-out of the peoples' resources. It is this government's fervent hope, Mr. Speaker, that industry will find a Leduc in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — . . . and should this happen, Mr. Speaker, these prophets of doom and gloom will scurry for cover. If we strike a Leduc, Mr. Speaker, we in the province will have cause to be embarrassed that we gave so little in return for so much. In view of these figures, we will watch the reaction now of the CCF regarding the "betrayal of the people".

Turning to other things now, I want to deal for a moment with some other statements. This house witnessed what might be considered as two points of view in regard to risk capital. The member from Regina East went to great lengths to create fear and mistrust of foreign capital and particularly American capital coming into Canada. The member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) on the other hand launched an attack to discredit a Canadian based mining firm in which Canadians may invest and warned the people not to invest . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Cameron: — . . . in a Canadian based company. The implications of his remarks . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Cameron: — . . . were that this company, was a company of shysters and racketeers out to fleece the public. One might ask, Mr. Speaker, what point of view does the opposition subscribe to? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, they subscribe to both points of view.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Cameron: — In addition to this, the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) went out of his way . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — On a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I recognize your point . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — The point of privilege is that words that I did not say have been put in my mouth. The only charge I made is that the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) took part in propagating a mine up in the north, and I said it would hurt the government. I did not say . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, the member went out of his way . . .

Mr. Walker: — Quote his words. Quote his words . . .

Mr. Cameron: — . . . to besmirch the name of a man as a member of the Canadian Parliament who won the respect and admiration of Canadians from coast to coast. Nothing can more truly indicate why risk capital has not been coming to Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: — How about Dumont?

Mr. Cameron: — This gives the answer to why Saskatchewan in 1963 got less than one per cent of the \$35,000,000 spent on exploration by the mining firms in Canada.

I have never lived in northern Saskatchewan. I am from a constituency in the south west of Saskatchewan. Today, Mr. Speaker, I have some sense of pride in that I have played some small part in placing the needs of northern Saskatchewan at the top of the priority list . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — While the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and his associates may not approve, I am confident the people of northern Saskatchewan welcome the news that the mining industry has responded to our call. Since our incentive program for the north was announced, twenty-five mining firms have undertaken the program of exploration and development of the mineralized areas of the northern Saskatchewan . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — . . . and among these are some of the largest mining companies in the world, and may I say, Mr. Speaker, more are coming in. We believe that Saskatchewan must look northward if she is to achieve her true measure of economic growth. The challenge here is to push back our northern frontiers and in this, the mining industry must be in the vanguard, and given due recognition. I am confident the mining industry will play its full part.

Mr. Berezowsky: — How many?

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I have attempted in these short minutes to give some information as to the role the government will play in the development of Saskatchewan's resources. I regret that the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) questioned the number of press releases from my department. We believe the public is entitled to a full disclosure of the exciting facts pertaining to development in Saskatchewan today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Dealing with these facts, Mr. Speaker, in the next few moments, I want to tell you something which I think all members of this house will be interested in.

An Hon. Member: — . . . talk to the member for Shellbrook . . .

Mr. Cameron: — In October, this government set up regulations governing the exploration and production of oil from oil shale. It induced a company to come in and launch a program of exploration in the development of oil shale. Mr. Speaker, this is the first such venture in Canada and the first

in the north American continent. These companies responded to our call to find reserves of oil. In the Pasqua Hills area they have been working since October. Two of the major oil companies are in this area. Some 2,000,000 acres are under lease. Activity is taking place in field work, drilling, testing, and soil analysis. Their reports, Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the house, are most encouraging.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — We have oil shale in the north that will yield anywhere from twelve to twenty-five gallons per ton of rock. It will take considerable research, exploration, and analysis yet, but if it is found to be an economic undertaking Saskatchewan can look forward to reserves of oil in this rock shale, in the neighborhood of 3,000,000 gallons per acre.

This may lead to the establishment of a refinery costing in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000 and producing in excess of 50,000 barrels per day. Mr. Speaker, I thought the members would be interested in this exciting story and I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 32

Thatcher	MacDougall	Bjarnason
Howes	Gardiner	Romuld
McFarlane	Coderre	Weatherald
Boldt	McIsaac	MacLennan
Cameron	Trapp	Larochelle
McDonald (Moosomin)	Grant	Asbell
Steuart	Cuelenaere	Hooker
Hald	MacDonald (Milestone)	Radloff
Guy	Gallagher	Coupland
Merchant (Mrs.)	Breker	Pederson
Loken	Leith	

Nays — 25

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Whelan	Wooff
Cooper (Mrs.)	Nicholson	Snyder
Wood	Kramer	Brotten
Nollet	Dewhurst	Larson
Walker	Berezowsky	Robbins
Blakeney	Michayluk	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Davies	Smishek	
Thibault	Link	Pepper
Willis	Baker	

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. A.H. McDonald):

That the said address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor by such members of the assembly as are of the executive council.

Motion agreed to.

The assembly adjourned at 5:29 o'clock p.m.