

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
Second Session – Fifteenth Legislature  
4th Day

Friday, February 11, 1966

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

**QUESTION RE COPIES OF BILLS**

**Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw City):** — Today, I wonder if I might ask the government when we will be getting copies of the bills that we have just given first reading to. I don't have any copies of the bills myself, and I would like the opportunity of studying them.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If I might make a brief remark in regard thereto, the bills are in the office. However, the explanatory notes have not as yet been attached to the bills and it was thought it would facilitate the distribution of both if they were distributed together; it would help the office and the page boys. They will be out just as soon as they get the explanatory notes together with the bills.

**QUESTION RE ARRANGEMENTS FOR ADVANCE POLL MONDAY NIGHT IN  
ASSINIBOIA**

**Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — Before the Orders of the Day, may I ask the government, concerning arrangements for the advance poll Monday night for the town of Assiniboia. My information is, subject to correction, that this poll was located in a room which is immediately adjacent to the room in which there is a political meeting being held that evening. I wonder if I could ask the government to look into the propriety of this?

**Hon. D. G. Steuart (Minister of Public Health):** — Well, we are not holding any meeting there so there is no question.

**REQUEST RE QUESTIONS BEING PUT BY MEMBERS**

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I wonder if I could suggest that questions being put by members to be taken up later this day and we could now move to special orders.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It has been suggested that we defer questions put by members to a later and more appropriate time by leave of the house. Is leave granted?

Agreed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Milestone) for an Address in Reply.

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, this legislature meets at a time when the economy of Saskatchewan has never been more buoyant, nor the economic outlook more promising. During 1965, our farmers harvested one of the heaviest crops in the province's history, and for the most part that crop has been sold. At the same time, industrial growth and expansion have reached proportions that we could scarcely have dreamed of even a few years ago. Long since the Liberal party dedicated itself to creating a so-called "Opportunity State" in the province of Saskatchewan. WE promised to replace the Socialist "something for nothing" theories with a philosophy which encouraged incentive, risk-taking, ambition and sheer hard work. We dedicated ourselves to the task of helping Saskatchewan catch up economically with the rest of Canada.

In seeking to achieve these objectives, it is no secret that the Liberal government has favored the principles of private enterprise. We have done so partly because we know that those principles have given Canadians one of the highest living standards in the world. We have done so, also, because we saw at firsthand the economic fiasco which took place in Saskatchewan during two decades of Socialist government. In the last election Liberals claimed that by using private enterprise methods we could persuade new industry and mines to locate in our province. We could halt the population exodus. We could provide jobs for thousands of our young people. We could widen the overall tax base and lower the taxes paid by the average citizen. When we made those assertions, the Socialists, almost without exception, scoffed and jeered. Today they are eating their words; Liberals don't claim that in 21 short months we have accomplished economic miracles. But we do suggest that in that period the Liberal government has started Saskatchewan on a new road to prosperity and expansion.

From being one of the poor relations in Confederation, one of the have-not provinces, we are gradually becoming one of the thriving partners in this nation. From being a province, which under the Socialists year after year, had heavy unemployment, today we have virtually full employment. From being a region which lost thousands and thousands of its young people each year due to a lack of job opportunities, we are now experiencing a major labor shortage. There is a new feeling abroad in Saskatchewan today. It is a feeling of excitement, of expectancy, a feeling of confidence. It is a feeling that arises in people who see major challenges ahead.

Members on this side of the house will contend that these much needed changes have come about, at least in part, because of the positive and constructive policies of the new Liberal government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The Throne Speech indicates

a few of our proposals to keep Saskatchewan moving and developing in 1966. I intend to use this debate this afternoon to outline some of the government's hope and aspirations for the period ahead.

I turn first to agriculture, because in the foreseeable future, Liberals believe that agriculture will continue to remain the major foundation of the Saskatchewan economy. In the past decade, wheat production has accounted for 70 per cent of the cash income of Saskatchewan farms. Nineteen sixty-five was one of the best years in our history and as I said a moment ago, virtually every bushel of wheat has been sold, and last Friday for the first time in more than a year, the price of Northern No. 1 wheat went up over the \$2.00 level again, basis Fort William.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — So, the government believes that our people may view the wheat export picture with optimism. That optimism may be based primarily on the explosive population growth in most parts of the world. I doubt whether ever again in Saskatchewan we will see huge quantities of wheat piled in the fields through a lack of sufficient export markets.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that over the past five years, Saskatchewan farmers have increased their use of fertilizer by 65 per cent. It is also significant that an estimated 365,000 acres of new land was broken last year in this province. The livestock industry also is in a healthy state. During 1965, \$203,000,000 was realized by Saskatchewan farmers through the sale of livestock products. The price of beef has been quite satisfactory during 1965. Future prospects are even better. Our beef herds have continued to expand. At present we are the second beef province in Canada, with slightly more than 2,300,000 cattle on our farms. But we must do better. Traditionally, Canada has been a surplus producer of beef. However, as our province and our country have grown, the domestic market has gradually increased to a point where today it is absorbing most of our beef. Today we are in the position where our cattle population must be expanded rapidly merely to keep up to Canadian demands. In addition, of course, the rapidly growing and lucrative American market is at our back door.

The provincial government believes that livestock production offers boundless opportunities to our farmers. We believe that additional diversification will do much to promote agricultural stability. Thus our department, this year, is taking numerous steps to promote and assist expansion. In the past year, for example, three new community pastures were set up. Existing pastures in many cases, were expanded. This year another seven will be opened. The department is stepping up its program of acquiring top grade bulls for these pastures in an effort to steadily improve quality. This year approximately 125 bulls will be purchased by the department for community pastures, about three times as many as a year ago.

**February 11, 1966**

The department is planning to rapidly expand small irrigation and hay projects. Working in co-operation with the P.F.R.A. and ARDA, a top priority will be given to these works in an effort to increase fodder production.

Other farmers have had major problems in wet years with flood control. Our department will step-up assistance during 1966 to help cope with these contingencies.

A modes beginning last year was made by the government to provide provincial assistance in the construction of hay shelters. During 1965, 99 of these hay shelters were constructed. In the 1966 estimates, we are doubling the money made available for this program and it is our hope that farmers and ranchers will make greater utilization of the program. We are anxious to help farmers with clearing of brush. This has been a real problem, Mr. Speaker, especially for some of our smaller farmers in the forest belt. We are making provision of \$150,000 shareable with ARDA to make small grants to these farmers.

These are some of the programs which the government has in mind to help with livestock production. I regret to say that the hog picture in Saskatchewan is not nearly so satisfactory. While prices in 1965 reached their highest level in history, our provincial hog population dropped by a whopping 20 per cent. Today we have the lowest hog population since 1948. I think this is serious because Saskatchewan farmers are losing out on an opportunity to make some much needed income. The Saskatchewan drop in production has had a number of disturbing results. First of all, it has impeded the drive towards diversification. Secondly, it has seriously impeded employment in our packing houses; Thirdly, it has curtailed farm income. I wish I could tell the house that the government had some formula for increasing our hog production. About 10 months ago we asked our SEDCO organization to begin making loans to sound intensive hog operations, but the demand for these loans has been extremely unsatisfactory and the results have been discouraging.

Sheep development in Saskatchewan leaves much to be desired. We think it is strange and undesirable in Canada that we should be a net importer of sheep products year after year. There is little doubt that sheep ranching can be profitable for many of the farmers in this province. Last June we had only 150,000 sheep, far fewer than two decades ago. We feel that it is desirable to expand this number considerably. Therefore, a few months ago the government made plans to open the first community pasture for sheep in the Crooked River area (near Tisdale). The department at the same time, is seeking additional locations which would be suitable to open up additional community sheep pastures.

During 1965, the government has spared no effort to improve living conditions in our rural areas. We are continuing to bring sewer and water to farm homes. During 1965, 5,000 farmers took advantage of that particular act. We are continuing to bring electricity to the farmers, 1,250 additional farms were added to the system last year. Today approximately 79 per cent of our farm population in Saskatchewan is served by the Power Corporation.

The Crop Insurance Program was increased from about 2,300 contracts in 1964 to 3,100 contracts last year. We are endeavoring to promote a further expansion in this stabilizing program during 1966.

We have provided for the installation of a soil-testing laboratory in the University of Saskatchewan. We expect this to be self-maintaining in a few years, but until it is further grants will be required. We believe that next winter farmers will be able to have their soils tested and will receive specific recommendations as to the best fertilizers to use.

During 1965, the government found wide-spread acceptance of the legislation which permitted farmers to burn purple tax-free gasoline in farm trucks.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — In the past year this reform saved the farmers of Saskatchewan approximately \$4,000,000. I am sure that farmers in the Bengough constituency will recall how bitterly and often the Socialists fought this legislation over the years.

Mr. Speaker, as the debate proceeds other government members will discuss various measures designed to help agriculture. I can assure the house that we intend as a government to continue making whatever investment in agriculture that is necessary for the public good. We know that when the farmer prospers the rest of the country also is prosperous.

I turn now for a moment to the South Saskatchewan Irrigation Project. The Throne Speech indicated that legislation will be introduced pertaining to this vast development. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the original federal-provincial agreement was signed in 1958 by the then Prime Minister Mr. Diefenbaker, and the then Saskatchewan Premier Mr. Douglas. Under the provisions of that document the government of Saskatchewan is required to have works, canals, pumps and so on, constructed to irrigate 50,000 acres, one year after the completion of the dam. This government believes that the South Saskatchewan Irrigation Project is perhaps the most important development ever to take place in this province. We expect it to literally transform many of the economic aspects of our economy.

When we took office we found that the former administration had taken no steps whatever to acquire the land which was required under the agreement. Thus, a year ago, this government of Saskatchewan initiated steps to purchase as much as possible of the 50,000 acres from the farmers who did not wish to irrigate. We have been paying prices which our department tells us are considerably above market prices for the land. Indeed, the land could have been purchased for one-third to one-half of present values if the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) had been on his toes when the agreement was signed.

At this date the house might be interested to know that ap-

**February 11, 1966**

proximately 12,750 acres have been purchased in the Broderick area. Some farmers are objecting to the whole irrigation project. My understanding is that there are about 80 farmers in all who are affected. Stirred up by a few opposition politicians, they are calling for a vote of the farmers in the area before any action is taken. Well, obviously such a step is not feasible. If at any time a vote was desirable, then surely it was the responsibility of the previous administrations which signed the agreement. This government intends to honor commitments which were made. What is the use of investing \$150,000,000 in an irrigation project and then not use it. In carrying out the agreement between Messrs. Diefenbaker and Douglas, we are only carrying out a legal responsibility, and personally, I think it is a sensible responsibility. Failure to proceed would simply mean that the people of Saskatchewan would be prevented for years from deriving the major benefits of the irrigation scheme. We therefore intend to proceed in much the same manner as did the province of Alberta a few years ago. No land will be expropriated, other than that required for ditches and canals. However, the new legislation will provide for a water rate or irrigation levy. It will be applied against irrigable land on a scheduled basis in the area whether or not the irrigation facilities are used.

Those who are not interested in irrigation can sell their land to others who are, or to the government, at a fair and equitable price. Those who wish to use the irrigation facilities will simply remain, prepare their land for irrigation, and pay the water use levy. We are not going to be pressured into paying unreasonable prices for the land. Comprehensive credit facilities will be set up by the government to help individual farmers finance the new facilities and work.

I say again that our government believes the South Saskatchewan River Dam area will become one of the great farming and industrial centres of western Canada. We intend to do everything practicable or feasible, to help it develop as rapidly as possible.

The Throne Speech indicated that the government is giving major attention to industrial development. For twenty years after the war the Dominion of Canada advanced as rapidly perhaps as any other country in the western world. But because of the philosophy and policies of Saskatchewan's Socialist government, our province lagged far behind. Year after year, thousands of our young people have to leave Saskatchewan because there were no jobs here for them. Denunciation of businessmen in general, and of successful businessmen in particular is the stock in trade of CCF orators. These Socialists make it plain that, if they ever come to power again, they will not encourage but rather penalize industries and corporations. Since the Liberals took office a year and eight months ago, we have been trying to improve the investment climate because Liberals believe that the investment of capital is the one vital step toward the achievement of virtually every economic and social goal which we hold dear. Instead of harassing, impeding and discouraging business in the Socialist manner, we believe we must nourish our investment climate, take care of our investment worthiness, and improve our methods of at-

tracting new capital. Thus we have worked diligently to persuade new industries and new mines to locate in Saskatchewan. Everywhere we found enthusiasm for the change in attitude. In the first twenty months, Liberals do not claim a complete transformation. It may take years to repair the damage done by two decades of Socialist government. It may take years for Saskatchewan to catch up.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — However, the facts clearly indicate that we have made some major progress along the road to industrial diversification. I propose to briefly review some of that progress. Upon taking office we were concerned about the hesitancy of the oil industry to invest in petroleum development in Saskatchewan. We found keen resentment at some of the province's rules and regulations. There appeared to be a major question about the willingness of the previous administration to permit private capital to develop our oil wealth. We have tried to change all that, Mr. Speaker. Shortly after we assumed office, we met with representatives of the oil companies in order to assess what problems existed and what solutions could be offered. As a result of those discussions they government amended the oil and gas regulations so that petty harassments have been removed and major incentives offered to development in Saskatchewan. The results have been most encouraging. Dozens and dozens of new companies have moved into Saskatchewan since the Socialists left office. Others which had left returned. Three new pools have been discovered, the first since 1957. Eight hundred new oil wells were brought into production in 1965. Revenues to the Provincial Treasury from the oil industry for the fiscal year 1965-66 are estimated at \$38,600,000 as compared to \$24,300,000 in 1963-64, the last year of the Socialist government.

Now, what about timber? Development of these resources has commenced in earnest. During the Socialists regime the Government Timber Board had a virtual monopoly on the production of timber. Private companies were not only unwelcome, they were usually prevented by the Socialists from moving into most northern areas. The results were little short of disastrous. During that 20-year period, forest production fell drastically. Thus, our government discontinued the Timber Board monopoly. Moreover we have vigorously sought out private enterprise companies to go into those areas and develop them. In 1965 we saw some major breakthroughs. In October, for example, I was very happy to cut the ribbon at the opening of the new \$2,000,000 plus Hudson Bay Stud Mill owned by the Simpson Lumber Company of Seattle. Last session the Socialists and the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) laughed at the whole project. "Why", he said, "it's got a capitalization of \$400. It is a joke". This winter that plant will employ 350 people in the plant and in the woods.

I was happy to see the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) present at the opening. I hope he learned a little about economics when he listened to Mr. Henry Bacon, the president of Simpson Lumber Company. Mr. Bacon said this, among other things:

**February 11, 1966**

We were attracted to Saskatchewan by several circumstances. First, we were greatly impressed by the friendly and businesslike attitude of your government.

Then, Mr. Speaker, down a few blocks in Hudson Bay, there is a MacMillan Bloedel plant. This is the old Wizewood plant which lost \$300,000 of the taxpayers' money in 1964. The Liberal administration sold the plant a little over a year ago and received full value for the assets which remained after five years of disastrous operating deficits. MacMillan Bloedel have taken a virtually bankrupt company and put it on its feet. They have increased capacity, production, wages and employment. The same kind of story is taking place in Meadow Lake with Primrose Lumber Company. With an initial investment of \$1,000,000 it is expected that about 150 men will be employed in that plant when it goes into production. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals were fortunate in obtaining the first pulp mill in northern Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — This government approached about 30 companies on this continent before we finally interested Parsons and Whittemore of New York to go into northern Saskatchewan. As I said yesterday, the total investment will be \$65,000,000. Parsons and Whittemore will have 70 per cent of the equity capital and the government 30 per cent. The government is guaranteeing \$50,000,000 of the bond issue. We are doing so because we wanted that plant to go there. We receive one-half of our 30 per cent equity capital for rendering this service. It will employ 1,500 men in the construction phase. It will employ 500 in the plant when it is going and another 3,000 in the woods. We think this plant will go a long way in helping to solve some of the social aid problems in northern Saskatchewan among our native population.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to you this afternoon that every one of those four new lumber and pulp mills is a private enterprise company invited to Saskatchewan by the new Liberal government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Socialists can criticize all they like but as I said yesterday, it is simply sour grapes.

What about metal mining? When this government assumed office we were concerned about the almost complete lack of new metal mining development and exploration in northern Saskatchewan. The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) called in the mining representatives from across the continent to discuss their problems. Once again, we found that the main trouble in the ailing industry was fear of the Socialist philosophy and its dislike of Socialist regulations. Out of the discussions a new formula of incentives was arrived at under which the government pays a portion of prospecting costs. The estimated expenditure on those prospecting costs in the past year was about \$650,000. We are



going to increase them again this year. These new policies are beginning to show results. More than 50 companies, many of them the giants of North America, are today doing exploration work in Saskatchewan. Last year they spent in excess of \$2,000,000 for this purpose.

Three new metal mines are either in the construction or production stage. The largest one, Anglo Rouyn, the one that my friend from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) called a “peanut” mine, is now employing 260 people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — This government is giving top priority to the problems of our north because for too long under the Socialists northern Saskatchewan was a forgotten area. During the past year plans were made for three new sodium sulphate mines. One of them is at Alsask, a private enterprise company which will employ 20 men. It will produce about 50,000 tons per year. Another sodium sulphate company at Ingebrite Lake will employ 25 men. A third sodium sulphate plant by Tombill Mines at Cabri, a \$2,500,000 plant will employ about 25. This again is a private enterprise company.

I would like to say a word about potash. Our federal Department of Mines has told us that we have half the potash reserves in the whole world here in Saskatchewan. Well, during 1965 a third company came into production and six additional mines are now under construction, bringing the total to nine. Shortly, we hope to announce a 10th in the city of Yorkton. I can tell you that the government is negotiating with four or five additional potash producers. As I said a short time ago within perhaps five years the railroad will be taking out of Saskatchewan more carloads of potash than they are taking carloads of wheat. Our people believe that within a five year period there will be 8,000 new jobs in the potash industry directly, another 25,000 jobs indirectly.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) claimed on television the other night that no government could have kept the potash industry out of Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, his party did well for 20 years.

Every effort has been made by the government to promote secondary industries. Incentives of various kinds have been and are being offered. During 1965 a substantial number of new plants were established in Saskatchewan and we expect the record this year will be even better. Official figures show that in 1965, 1,423 new companies registered in Saskatchewan. This compares with 915 in the last year the Socialists were in power. So I say that these are a few of the exciting developments that are taking place in Saskatchewan since the Socialists left office.

**February 11, 1966**

Even though we have years of catching up to do, Saskatchewan has had a major breakthrough in 1965, and our economy today is booming as never before in history.

Instead of exporting thousands of young people, as I say, we have a labor shortage. I think it is fair to say that in Saskatchewan today there is a job for any able-bodied young man or woman who wishes to work. Where is most of the investment capital coming from for Saskatchewan's industrial development? The major part is American capital and I think it should be realized also that in the future we must continue to look for American capital.

There are some, particularly my friends across the road, who say that this is a catastrophe. They say we are selling out our resources to the Americans or to "Big Business". I believe that such arguments, Mr. Speaker, are little more than economic nonsense. What good are our potash reserves a mile underground? What value are the timber resources of Prince Albert and Hudson Bay unless some use is made of them? How can oil fields help our people unless they are developed? The Liberals believe that Saskatchewan's natural resources should be opened up and used for one main purpose – to provide good jobs and a better way of life for our people.

I think that in the main the people of Saskatchewan are interested in having full employment at high wages. If American capital is needed to ensure such employment, then most people will wish the government to continue seeking it out. The Socialist claim all this new expansion and development in Saskatchewan would have come about anyway without a new Liberal government. The hard fact is, Mr. Speaker, that during the 20 years of CCF-NDP government it did not come about. Private investors avoided Saskatchewan like the plague. Only when the dean hand of Socialism was removed did private capital move to this province in a major way. If investors thought for one moment that there was any danger of the Socialists getting back into power, development would slow up in a matter of weeks. To sum it all up, Mr. Speaker, private enterprise in Saskatchewan is achieving what Socialism failed to achieve.

]

What does industrial development mean to the average citizen? First, it means jobs, good jobs at home. Secondly, it means an expanded tax base. Thirdly, it means utilization of our natural resources. The government is determined to pass some of the benefits of industrialization on to the average citizen in a tangible way.

We have felt for years that our tax levels in Saskatchewan are out of line with the rest of Canada. At least they were out of line until the Tory government in Ontario brought in so many tax increases a few days ago.

Sales, tax, personal income tax, corporation tax are much higher than they are elsewhere. At the last session we began to do something about it. Mr. Speaker, we reduced the sales tax from five to four per cent; we eliminated the minerals taxes on

farm land; we let the farmers use purple gas in farm trucks. In other words we cut taxes by about \$12,000,000. And this year when the Budget comes down we are going to do a little more about this thing.

Now, we are particularly concerned about property and land taxes. The 20 years the Socialists were in power they were increased by 400 per cent and they are still going up. We feel that we have no choice but to use some of the additional revenue from this resource development to lower property tax. So at this current session we intend to begin doing something about it. First of all we propose to pay direct Home-owner grants to most rural and urban homeowners on an annual basis. The figure will be \$50 per year. It is hoped that as the Liberals stay in office and as this prosperity continues, that this sum can be gradually increased. And I may say that this \$50 grant will become payable as soon as the individual pays his local taxes. The various indications of opposition to the Home-owner grants by the CCF-NDP will be noted with interest by the people of Saskatchewan. Yesterday, after the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) talked against it for about five minutes and said of course we haven't got the guts to go against it so we will go along with it.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — He's just not telling the truth.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Secondly, we intend to increase provincial government grants to the municipalities and cities, in the hop that at least a portion of this assistance will be passed on to the property owner. In offering assistance to the municipalities, the government decided that it was essential first to consult with the three major municipal bodies. From the outset, we were gratified by the spirit of co-operation and the grasp of the problems to be discussed. The government made it clear that any proposals we put forward were merely proposals. They came to me after and said: "Thatcher, what a difference from the last conference we had with the Socialists ten years before".

We asked delegates for their priorities. We said we think we may have a little money because of the growing economy and we will pass some of that money on to you. What were these priorities?

1. There was a general agreement that the most pressing financial problem at a local government level was financing education.]
2. The rural municipalities felt that equalization grants to be used chiefly for grid road construction and maintenance would be of next priority.
3. All participants felt that adoption of a Saskatchewan Assistance Plan was of high importance.
4. It was also indicated that increased provincial assistance in the clearance of snow on grid roads was highly desirable.

These, as we understood the situation, Mr. Speaker, were the

fields the local governments in Saskatchewan felt required the first attention of the government.

Now, what can we do to help the municipalities at this time? Our government must always keep in mind our own provincial responsibilities such as health, social aid, highways, education, and so on. We must naturally look after our own fields first. However, as the Throne Speech indicates, we intend to bring new financial assistance to local governments in the next budget year. We propose first to increase grants for education. We propose, second, to make additional equalization grants to municipalities – something the Socialists never did. We propose, thirdly to help pay a portion of grid road maintenance and fourthly, to help local governments with their problem of snow removal. Fifth, we will remove from the local governments some of the costs of assistance to those in need in matters of health and welfare.

These proposals are no cure-all or no final solution to meet the tax burden of local municipalities. However, combined with the other measures that we have already taken, and combined with additional measures which we propose to take, it is hoped that they will be of major assistance to the average citizen.

The Throne Speech mentions the urgent need for Saskatchewan to take action to conserve and properly utilize our water resources. Over the past decade, more and more people in North America have come to realize that water is probably our most valuable resource. We read where there are regions in the United States that now face critical shortages of water, hampering agricultural production and industrial growth. Our province has not yet reached that critical position, but there is a need for a long-range program of water resource development. With population increases and vast industrial expansion, the demand for water is increasing to staggering proportions. Saskatchewan has always been a province where we have been short of water, in the sought sometimes desperately short. About two years ago the Saskatchewan legislature recognized the problem involved. It unanimously set up a Saskatchewan Water Commission which has since undertaken a comprehensive survey of the province's water resources. It rapidly became apparent to the Commission that the most critical water shortage in the province exists in a huge area southeast of Saskatoon. Here there are enormous new demands for water fro several reasons:

1. Water for perhaps eight or ten potash mines is required over the next several decades. The magnitude of the demand can be realized by the fact that one solution mine uses as much water as the city of Moose Jaw which has 35,000 people.
2. Water is needed for the rapidly expanding and modernized urban centre, which are springing up adjacent to the potash developments.
3. There will be huge new requirements for electricity, most of which will have to be generated by hydro projects on the South Saskatchewan River.
4. Finally, there will be almost unlimited new demands for water to be used for irrigation purposes.

The government has decided that something must be done to solve our water problems of this area. The Commission was instructed to investigate the needs and recommend a solution to the government. As a result, a project has been designed which will adequately provide for the water required for both the potash industry and for other users in the area. This is multi-purpose project comprising a series of channels, reservoirs and pipelines, to convey water from the South Saskatchewan River throughout the area.

Some of the potash companies would prefer to have their own private pipelines, but in the opinion of the government, it makes good sense to provide a project that meets the requirements of all the users, at a lower cost than could otherwise be achieved. It is not our intention that the potash industry or any other industry pay more for water than it would cost through a private development. But as I say, it does seem reasonable that the potash companies should be prepared to obtain their water requirements from the project in order to enable the government to bring benefits to the entire area. The project proposed will not be completed entirely for some years, and cannot be put into operation until the reservoir behind the South Saskatchewan River is full. However, the government has decided to proceed with the multi-purpose development and legislation will be introduced later this session to give effect to this proposal. I may say that over the years, the government hopes that this project will be economically solvent.

The Throne Speech indicates that our government will continue to give a top priority to highway construction. In the fiscal year 1965-66, the government spent the largest sum by far in the history of the province on highways. The figure, including municipal road assistance, probably will exceed \$42,000,000. Capital expenditures, without supplementaries, were more than \$28,700,000 last year as compared to \$14,900,000 in the last year of Socialist government. In this past 12 month period, the department encountered major difficulties with highway construction due to climatic conditions, a shortage of equipment and a shortage of labor. Despite these problems, a total of 21,000,000 cubic yards of earth was moved. That is a larger figure, Mr. Speaker than was moved by either Manitoba or Alberta. Our government will propose in the coming year another massive increase in highway spending. We hope to proceed with building almost to the extent of the road construction industry's capacity, because we believe that the day has come when the people of Saskatchewan are no longer willing to travel on dirty, dusty, muddy roads. We are going to proceed with all haste to gradually hard surface or oil our main arteries. This government believes that good roads are a necessity and Mr. Speaker we are going to build them.

I think I would like to say a word about the Roads to Resources program. We thought that this joint federal-provincial program was a good one. We are one of the few countries in the western world which have not a national highway building program, and we would like to see one proceeded with in this country. We would like to see a second Trans-Canada Highway built with federal help on a fifty-fifty basis, including assistance in building four-

**February 11, 1966**

laning in many areas. Above all we would like to see the Roads to Resources Program continued on a fifty-fifty basis. I must say as I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, we will never be content to spend such puny sums on our highways as did the Socialists over 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly mention the government's plans for development of the arts in Saskatchewan. Last year, as you know, we increased spending by 70 per cent. We did this because we believe that in Saskatchewan our new prosperity will have little meaning if we cannot develop a capacity to enable all our people to appreciate the arts. In the year ahead we propose to increase further our assistance to the arts again. We hope there will be a number of festivals held in our major cities. We are also proposing to hold a large festival in Regina which would feature internationally famous ballet and symphonic companies. At the moment we are hoping that the Royal Winnipeg Ballet, the Vancouver Symphony, the Montreal Symphony and a number of others will be able to be with us in the summer months. Our program particularly envisages help to various bands, particularly school bands in the province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I think if there is one thing the government of Quebec has done in recent years, it is to develop culture and the arts in that province. Mr. Shaw, Director of the Saskatchewan Arts Board visited the province of Quebec a few months ago. He was indeed impressed with the originality and the vigor of the support which is being given to the arts by the government of Quebec. And ultimately, I hope, this government will be able to emulate some of the things being done by Quebec in this field. I hope we will have our own Department of Culture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on this government's most important single program, the providing of adequate educational facilities for our young people. No one seriously doubts today that both our present and future as a province and as a country are determined by the extent and quality of our education. We all realize that in 1966 if you haven't got a good education. You are likely to find difficulty in becoming employed. We know that about 90 per cent of the people who were employed in recent years were people with a Grade eight education or less. That fact together with an increase in the school age population called for our government to meet the demand for enlarged school facilities. Therefore, as the Throne Speech mentions, the government plans sharply increased aid to all levels of education:

- (a) There must be millions more allocated for ordinary educational costs.
- (b) Huge new sums must be found for additional new technical and vocational schools.
- (c) The government must continue to allocate ever-increasing amounts for university expansion and operating costs.

Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) cried copious

tears for the plight of education in Saskatchewan. He called for a transfer of education costs from local to provincial government. He called for a massive increase in school grants. How different his recommendations yesterday were from the actions of the Socialist government the 20 years they were in power.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — In 1943, before taking office, the Socialists right from little Tommy down claimed that they would pay the full costs of elementary and secondary education if they were elected. The municipalities will be relieved of their burden. They had 20 years to do it and they failed to do so. Most of the time they were in office they paid about 60 to 75 per cent of educational costs; the remainder was paid by the municipality. The last two or three years they got their figure up to a little over 40 per cent. I want to say, as I did yesterday, that the Liberals in their first year of office gave more in school grants than the Socialists did in their first 8 ½ years in office. I also want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal party spent \$11,000,000 more on education in the past year than was ever spent in a single year by any Socialist government. This year we shall probably spend \$25,000,000 more on education than was ever spent by a Socialist government. In this field, as in so many other, the Socialists talk, the Liberals act.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — And another promise they made about 20 years ago was that they would give free text books in elementary and high schools. But there was not a single step taken to honor that pledge. This year. .

**Mr. Lloyd:** — On a point of privilege, that statement is incorrect and I think the hon. member must retract that.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I will leave that to the people of Saskatchewan. As far as I am concerned the Liberals this year are beginning to pay for free text books in Grade nine, and in subsequent years will do it in ten, eleven and twelve. The Leader of the Opposition complained about the building of technical schools. Why, we will build more technical schoolrooms in the next year of two than they did in their whole twenty years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Oh, he cried for the university. Last year we gave the university more than \$20,000,000. The highest annual grant the Socialists ever gave them was \$11,600,000 and that was in an election year. Their second largest grant was \$5,700,000. And then, as I said yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition really cried

**February 11, 1966**

for the poor university students. Their fees, at least in the first year, should be wiped out or sharply decreased. Yet, when there were in power what did they do about university fees? In 1948—49 they increased them 39 per cent, 1949-50 they increased them 40 per cent, in 1955-56 they increased them 6 per cent, 1958-59 they increased them 8 per cent, and in 1964-65 these Socialists. Who now say we should abolish fees, increased them by 32.5 per cent. One more case, Mr. Speaker, of the Socialists talking one way but acting entirely differently when they are the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the last election the Leader of the Conservative party (Mr. Pederson) even out-Socialized the Socialists where education was concerned. This, of course, isn't unusual because he always votes with them anyway, nine-tenths of the time. But I am sure his policy on occasion must concern some of our Conservative friends. He suggested that the province should pay all of the education costs. Now, in view of the fact that that might have cost the taxpayers this year about another \$55,000,000, that's the provincial taxpayers, I suggest that his proposal is just a little bit unrealistic. However, I know that fact wouldn't affect the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson). He can afford to be a big-time spender. He knows that as long as he leads the party his Tories will never be in power in Saskatchewan. Including him, in the last thirty years, they have elected two Conservatives to this legislature on their own. It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that when the Conservatives are the government they do not save the taxpayers very much money.

I suggest to the electors at Bengough that they compare the tax policies of the Tories in Ontario, wealthy Ontario, to the tax policies of the Liberals in Saskatchewan. I have a clipping here in yesterday's Leader Post. The Tory Budget came down a few days ago in Toronto:

Sweeping Tax Boasts Jolt Ontario Taxpayers. The Ontario government jolted the taxpayer Wednesday with sweeping tax increases.

The retail sales tax jumped from three to five per cent. A penny a gallon was added on gasoline. Cigarettes and liquor went up. A five per cent service tax was placed on telegrams and telephone calls. Provincial Treasurer Allen warned that income tax would likely go up. The tax on highway diesel fuel is increased from 1 ½ cents to 22 cents. The land transfer tax is doubled, Mr. Speaker, in wealthy Ontario, this past week a Budget was brought down which increases taxes by \$200,000,000. The Liberals in Saskatchewan are continuing to reduce taxes. In judging a political party surely actions speak louder than words.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how much time I've got. I think I will get on to a couple of other subjects then I will come back to some political ones if I have time.

I want to say a word about British trade. Aside from a sen-



timental viewpoint, I think there are very good reasons why our people should buy more goods from Great Britain. The United Kingdom has been a long, steady and faithful customer for Saskatchewan wheat. Actually, the British buy six or eight times as much from Saskatchewan as we buy from them. It is a well-known fact that Great Britain has had serious exchange problems in recent years. Many of their leaders have indicated that, unless they can increase sales in Canada, they may be obliged to cut back purchases in this country. Our government feels that it is in our interest to increase buying in Great Britain. Everyone pays lip service to the need to "Buy British". Even the Socialists did that. We think the time has come to translate that sympathy into concrete action and we feel our government should set the example.

Several months ago we asked one of our civil servants in the Trade Department, Fred Mullin, to spend a major portion of his time spear-heading a campaign. Instructions have gone out to various government branches to endeavor to place concrete orders in Britain for summer delivery. For example, the government is going to buy 30 cars and trucks on its own. We are also systematically canvassing the various automobile dealers in the province with some success. We are asking the large wholesale outlets, the large industrial plants, to co-operate with us in this campaign. And we propose to bring this British merchandise via the Hudson Bay route. Again, for many years, we have heard a good deal of lip service as to the need to use the port of Hudson Bay. Yet, year after year, there are huge outgoing shipments but very small incoming shipments. The whole matter was studied by the Prairie Economic Council in its first meeting last year and the three Premiers agreed that wherever it was feasible they would instruct their departments to do what they could both for the "Buy British" campaign and the via Port Churchill route.

Now, I want to discuss another subject for a moment, something that the federal government must act upon. That is freight rates. Successive Saskatchewan governments have complained bitterly over the years about freight rates. The problem has become much more serious in recent months because of our pulp development, our potash development and our other industrial developments. Because of the long haul for inbound and outbound freight, Saskatchewan is more vulnerable to high freight rates than any other province. Moreover, railway rates affecting the prairies are much less subject to water or truck competition than is the case in other areas of Canada. It is a hard fact that industry after industry located on the prairies simply does not receive the same freight rate treatment as a similar industry in Eastern Canada or British Columbia. Now the Saskatchewan government will continue to bring all possible pressure on Ottawa for the removal of freight rate discrimination. It would be most unfortunate for all concerned if the freight rate controversy of the last few years were to go on and on without end. These controversies have led to great expenditures of time and money, to expensive delays in the making of rate adjustments and to the maintenance of an unhealthy feeling of unjust treatment in large sections of the country's population. People of the prairies should no longer

**February 11, 1966**

find themselves in such an unfavorable position as far as freight rates are concerned.

Some years ago, the MacPherson Royal Commission recommended changes. The time is long since passed when those changes, most of them at least, should be implemented. We shall continue to work with the governments of Alberta and Manitoba, bringing whatever pressure we can to seek a permanent solution. We can no longer permit this freight-rate sore to fester.

Now, before resuming my speech this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about federal-provincial relations. We have watched with some apprehension the deterioration over the past few years of relations between Quebec and the rest of Canada. To most of us a Canada without Quebec is unthinkable. We have understanding and sympathy for the so-called quiet revolution taking place in that province. We have sympathy for the legitimate aspirations of our French Canadian fellow-citizens. However, I must express our fear that Quebec demands if carried too far would weaken our Confederation or indeed end it.

Year after year here in Saskatchewan we have watched Quebec walk out of many federal programs. Year after year we have watched provinces in Confederation making ever greater financial demands on the federal treasury. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan needs and wants federal assistance just as much as any other province. We don't want those funds at the expense of the national interest. Surely the steady erosion of federal taxing powers must cause concern to all Canadians. People in this province feel very strongly that the federal government has a job to do in ensuring stable economic growth. We believe the federal government must have adequate financial resources to cope with unemployment and economic recession. Above all we believe that Canadians regardless of where they were born should have certain minimum living standards and, as a matter of right, basic standards of education, health and welfare services. Ottawa can fulfill these responsibilities only if it is able to retain adequate taxing powers.

Now, our people believe in a strong Canada. We want the people of Quebec to have every right, every privilege, every advantage that other Canadians have. We want them to have no less, Mr. Speaker, but equally we want them to have no more. And we would be strongly opposed to people of Quebec or of any other province for that matter being given special privileges which are not given to the people of Saskatchewan. And I repeat what I said earlier, Confederation without Quebec is unthinkable, but in this part of Canada we hope that the people of Quebec will not make demands which are unfair or unrealistic. If they do make such demands, Mr. Speaker, we will expect our federal government to take a firm position to resist them.

From my remarks, Mr. Speaker, you will realize that the government faces the future in Saskatchewan with keen anticipation and boundless optimism. We believe a new economic era as well as a new political era has commenced in this province. As I said, instead of being one of the poor relations, Saskatchewan will

soon be one of the prosperous and active partners in Confederation. This government came to power 20 months ago on the strength of a number of promises made during the last election campaign. During the current session we will continue to implement those promises as our financial position permits.

It is fashionable today, Mr. Speaker, to refer to political parties as being parties of either the right or the left. Liberals believe that neither extreme is needed in this province. In the months ahead the Liberal party will endeavor at all times to provide middle-of-the-road government, right in between the Socialists and Communists on the one hand and the Tories on the other.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I need hardly say that I support the motion before this house. We will have a very crucial by-election in Bengough constituency on February 16th. I remind the people of that area that for 20 long years the Socialists were elected because the private enterprise voters split their vote. This must not happen again. As long as the private enterprisers get behind the only party which has a chance of defeating the Socialists, that is the Liberals, we will have, and I confidently expect, a very decisive win the evening of December 16th.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising at the conclusion of the Premier's campaign speech for Bengough and still basking in some of the reflected glory of some of the kind things he was saying about me a few moments ago, I find that I am at a loss for words to express my gratitude to the Premier for feeling for one moment that I, as the one lone Conservative member in this legislature, am responsible for, as he called it, the wealthy province of Ontario and its government taking the steps that it did. But for fear anyone might be of the opinion that the Premier intended his remarks to be kind, I want to tell you this that I have only been given the opportunity to speak by radio and to this legislature through the courtesy of the NDP group in this house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — I want it to be very clear and on the record that the government party in this house flatly refused, in view of the black-out due to the Bengough by-election, to accord my party an opportunity to speak in this debate on radio time and it was only through the courtesy of the NDP group that they relinquished 15 minutes of their times so that I could in fact be heard. And I want to tell them how much I appreciate that.

**Mr. Steuart:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the speaker, that he is now speaking on time that is ordinarily the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan's time and if it hadn't been for us he wouldn't have been heard today. And what he is saying is a matter of falsehood and he should withdraw it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — ORDER! ORDER!

**February 11, 1966**

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The statement which the Minister of Health made is inaccurate.

**Mr. Steuart:** — It is not inaccurate. This is the time allotted to the Liberal party and you know it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — ORDER! ORDER! The member for Arm River will now thank other members not to interrupt him.

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that if I have offended my friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) that I withdraw the remark. I merely want to point out that the allocation of time was 135 minutes for the government and 105 minutes for the opposition, 15 minutes of which the NDP group have accorded me. Not a minute of the 135 minutes was given me by the government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Having got through with the preliminary hassle and my friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) taking up two or three minutes of my time which I presume we can not allot to the government side, I want to join with those who have spoken ahead of me in this session to offer my word of welcome to our clerk, Mr. Bradshaw, who has recently arrived from our mother parliament in London. I hope that he will enjoy his visit here and that we don't have too many occasions such as we have had in the last few moments to disrupt the normal routine of this legislature.

I also want to extend my congratulations to the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner). I note from his position where he is sitting that it is probably as lonely a one as mine and that he sits all by himself by the back door. I have had some experience being in a lonely spot. I cannot offer him any hope of having any company after next Wednesday and I'm afraid he will have to just sit there by himself for a long time. However, I would hasten to add that my friends on this side of the house also have no room at the back for their candidate so they might as well forget about that. I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that arrangements will have to be made after Wednesday to place a seat beside me here on the front row when Mr. Spicer takes his place.

Now, I have been rather amused, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member from Prince Albert, the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart), taking very strong issue with the fact that I, as a lone member of my party in this province, had some assistance from some of our federal members. I am referring to a statement or a reporting of a speech that he made in Coronach as reported in the Leader Post of February 5th this year, under the heading "Steuart criticizes PC MPs". And he said, amongst other things:

Perhaps they should be forcefully reminded they are paid

\$18,000 a year each plus \$3,000 to \$4,000 a year in expenses to look after federal matters.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, surely this is a prime example of Liberal inconsistencies. A policy of do as I say but not as I do. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that my Liberal friends are still stinging from the events of last fall in this province, events in which my hon. friend had a considerable part to play. As I understand it he was very active in the campaign, very active in the federal campaign, both in his capacity as a Minister of the crown and as a MLA. I noticed that he took part in the constituency of Prince Albert quite extensively and I think the results there show the success of his actions in that regard, with no doubt about that.

**Mr. Steuart:** — We also . . .

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Well, I'll tell you if you keep on long enough you might actually get up to 5000.

Now, I had the opportunity during lunch hour just to bump into the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) and he tells me that he was confused. It was in connection with some remarks that were being passed regarding my party. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that he is confused when he is talking about political parties because I have here an article from the Regina Leader Post of December 11, 1965, reporting on a meeting that was held by the Liberal party in this province. And at this meeting the statements of various prominent people in the Liberal party were recorded. It says:

Senator McDonald and Premier Thatcher from the convention platform didn't use euphemisms to make known they were angry about the federal party's lack of a good agricultural program and its failure to keep promises.

Senator McDonald accused the party of throwing its last agricultural program in the wastebasket when the 1963 return came in. Then this article goes on to explain what was taking place at the convention and it says on Liberal put it this way:

Federally we are fighting the Tories. Saskatchewan Liberals are fighting the New Democrats. Saskatchewan Liberals, although they maintain they are middle-of-the-road . . .

and I recall the Premier using this remark a moment ago,

. . . have had to lean right to woo the anti-Socialist vote in the province. Federally the party has had to lean left to woo the anti-Conservative vote. Even in areas like Toronto where the NDP has been the force to contend with, it seems that the party which leans left fares the best.

Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what is the record of the voting in Toronto? Who leaned the furthest left? When the hon. Premier

**February 11, 1966**

talked about being middle-of-the-road, let me remind him that his left-leaning party won, out of the eighteen Toronto seats, sixteen of them. And two went to the NDP. Who leaned to furthest left?

**An Hon. Member:** — The Conservatives

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Well, we couldn't have leaned very far. We didn't get any, much to our disgust.

**An Hon. Member:** — You sure tried.

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — There are other differences of opinion between Saskatchewan and Ottawa. The basic problem then has to be solved within the party, both at the national and prairie level, if it hopes to win a majority. Saskatchewan Liberals plan to make a start, and so on. But Senator McDonald put his finger on the basic problem when he reminded Saskatchewan Liberals of a certain political fact of life. He said:

Policies developed here must also be acceptable to the rest of Canada. No federal party . . .

and these are the words of Senator McDonald,

. . . no federal party will implement policies aimed at winning 17 seats in Saskatchewan if they are going to cost 21 seats in Toronto.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of the Liberal party is "nothing for Saskatchewan if it will hurt Toronto". And that I find is the philosophy by and large that is followed by some of my hon. friends opposite from time to time.

Now, to come back to this charge about our Federal MPs participating in this campaign. Surely the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) isn't that frightened of one little lone Conservative MLA that he has to object when a few more come in to help him. With his great array of 31 men, surely not. Oh, I've noticed, Mr. Speaker, little men are very brave when they are in a big gang and can gang up on one, whether that happens to be one little Conservative or some civil servant that may be up for a quick chop. But when the odds get equalled out, when you level out the odds a little bit, they are very quick to cry "foul".

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in this question of participation in federal and provincial matters that both the Premier and the hon. Minister of Health have set a precedent. I want to refer to the fact . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — How about . . .

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — I'm going to come to that, Mr. Premier, in very short order. I want to refer to a clipping from the Toronto Globe and

Mail dated October 25, 1965, where it tells about the arrangements being made for Mr. Pearson's visit to Saskatchewan and it talked about where he should go. Perhaps he should go down and help Mr. Thatcher's old roommate Hazen Argue. The heading says, "Premier Ross Thatcher helps patch up Hazen Argue's hazy hopes". And it talks about where they should put the Prime Minister and they said:

Instead the Prime Minister's advisers in Ottawa chose to have him make a ceremonial progress to Humboldt, Melfort, in what are for the Liberals, the Diefenbaker barrens.

And goodness knows that was prophetic. The story here is that the decision in Ottawa was first that Mr. Pearson should appear in a rural constituency. That settled, it was then a matter of drawing two intersecting lines through the map to find the place where it would be most convenient to assemble star-cast and a prefabricated, cheering multitude. Liberal candidates, provincial cabinet ministers and supporters were bussed and flown in from all corners of the province to make the show. Later on it says, referring to the Premier and his participation:

In all he will take ten meetings to which aspirants to the House of Commons will be invited to be exposed, to be lauded, and to bask in the sunshine of the Premier's approval.

What a rosy countenance he must have had when all seventeen of them went down the drain.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Same as you had when 49 went down the drain.

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Well, I . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Sixty-eight, I should say.

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — You better get your figures right before you start commenting.

The reason I mention these things, Mr. Speaker, is to point out that both the Premier and cabinet ministers are paid an additional \$13,000 and \$10,000 a year respectively as well as a "liberal" expense account and, in some instances, a car. This is in excess of their indemnity. That's paid to carry out the work of the province and I have never objected to any of these members participating in either a federal or a provincial campaign because I believe that if they believe in the party which they support that they should be allowed to do that. And this has always been a precedent both in this province and elsewhere in Canada. I see government cars with some of these very low license numbers running around . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Number one.

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — . . . down at Bengough, cam-

**February 11, 1966**

paigning you might say, at the taxpayer's expense. I have not grumbled about that. But I don't want to be unfair about this now because I noticed while I was down there – and I checked in the last few days to see if it still pertains and I find that perhaps all of the cabinet ministers are not necessarily supporting the Liberal candidates – because I noticed a car, a government car with license number three, which was down in that constituency, has a bumper sticker on it supporting the Liberal candidate and it still and it on this morning unless it has been scoured off since. On the other hand I noticed another car down there with license number nine carrying a cabinet minister and it happened to be carrying a bumper sticker extolling the virtues of Conservative Spicer, and that was still on as of yesterday, unless it has been scoured off.

Now, I want to be completely fair, and I'm sorry he is not in his place this afternoon.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who's the culprit?

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — I would like to suggest that perhaps you be completely fair about this and volunteer the services of the rather ebullient Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner), who also campaigns, to put on an NDP sticker. Let's give them all a fair shake with the public money.

**Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West):** — We can do better than . . .

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Well, I could take from the Minister of Health's remarks that it was planned and I want to thank him most profusely for his small token or his small gesture of help.

These are the type of inconsistencies that people of this province are subjected to from time to time. In fact, it makes one wonder sometimes if the Liberal party in fact has a philosophy any more, that they are not a party who are trying to be all things to all people at the same time. They have become a party, as I say, of inconsistencies, with no philosophy, and no objectives other than the seizing of power and the perpetuation of themselves in office, a party whose ministers are given to making promises that will not be kept, such as on the national level the two dollar wheat that we were to get at the elevators . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — We got two dollar wheat.

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Not at the elevators. I would suggest that you go back to your electrical shop and learn something about farming. Nothing about two dollar wheat at the elevator, according to Mr. McDonald, or Senator McDonald, you threw it in the wastepaper basket; no mention as yet about this famous refund of the cost of installation of power for framers. These are promises that have not been kept. And talking about the installation of power, distortion of facts, I have heard reference several times to the question of the Power Corporation and I don't feel from the press



reports, if they are accurate, or what the Premier has said, that he has in fact told the whole story about the Power Corporation and the ownership of that by Saskatchewan residents.

I notice in the Leader Post dated January 3rd, of this year, under "Thatcher charges small portion of the SPC owned". He says,

The people of Saskatchewan own only 7 ½ per cent of its major crown company, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Premier Thatcher said at a news conference Monday.

Further down he says:

If the people of Saskatchewan would study the balance sheet of the \$560,000,000 corporation they would be amazed at the small portion of the company they actually own, the Premier added.

Then he goes on to say that,

It is ludicrous for the opposition members to criticize the present government for trying to bring American capital into the province when they brought it in themselves in such a large total amount when they were in government.

Now, I think that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) would have in his remarks yesterday made some reference to this statement. Instead I found that, at least to my way of thinking, he seemed to approve of that statement. I may not be as sharp on figures as some people are, but if I interpret the balance sheets of the Power Corporation correctly, this statement is a long way from being accurate. I believe that when the Premier was compiling his figures to arrive at the 7 ½ per cent that he must have taken into account only the accumulative surplus of \$35,000,000 to \$40,000,000 which of course, is approximately 7 ½ per cent of the \$560,000,000 that he mentioned in his press release. But in my opinion that is only a portion of the assets that are held by Saskatchewan people in the Power Corporation. There are in fact three phases of ownership and not just one as implied by his release. The first of course, is this accumulative surplus of \$35,000,000 to \$40,000,000. The second is the one that the Liberal government has been very cautious to avoid and the one I referred to a moment ago, the ownership the farmers have in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, farmers and industrial customer investment in construction. Everyone knows that the farmers have to pay anywhere from \$500 apiece and up to bring power into the farm. That in my opinion is an item of capital expenditure which gives them an equity in the total cost of the Power Corporation, approximately 70,000 farms at \$500 apiece, something in the neighbourhood of \$35,000,000. I want to remind the government that not only have they not made a start on refunding this money as they promised, they haven't paid a cent of interest on it either. And the industrial customers who do the same thing where lines have to be erected over a certain distance have probably paid something in the neighbourhood of \$5,000,000 – making a total amount of about \$40,000,000 in that category alone of individual investment in the Power Corporation.

**February 11, 1966**

Then I find that there has been nothing said about the amount of money that is set aside in the sinking fund to retire debentures. I haven't got the exact figures because I haven't seen the latest reports, but my estimate is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000. Adding together the accumulative surplus of \$35,000,000 to \$40,000,000 that the Premier referred to in his press release plus the farmers and industrial customer investments in capital construction amounting to \$40,000,000 plus an additional \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000 held in the sinking fund gives the people of Saskatchewan, by my figuring, a total investment in the Power Corporation of something in the order of \$140,000,000 to \$150,000,000. This I believe is a more accurate assessment of what we own as individual citizens of this province in the corporation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that there may be some dispute about some of those figures. First of all I have only used round figures, and secondly, they may have altered drastically in the last year because of certain policies followed by new government. But I want to point out that in very general terms most economists will tell you that public utilities generally operate, from a fiscal point of view, at their most effective level when ownership by those served by the utilities ranges from 15 to 25 per cent. In the case of large corporations, of course, a much higher level of ownership by the principals runs between 25 and 50 per cent.

Looking back at the total Saskatchewan ownership in the SPC that I have mentioned, that is the \$140,000,000 to \$150,000,000, it is easy to see that even allowing for an error in my gross figures, that the citizens of this province own something in the neighborhood of 20 to 25 per cent of the gross assets of the Power Corporation. That is a figure that is on a par with ownership in most public utilities in Canada.

I'm belaboring this point somewhat for a specific purpose, because I think that it is wrong to distort the facts or tell only one-half of the picture in order to try to make some political capital for the party in power. I believe that it is also true that our foreign borrowing for capital expansion in the SPC are at a dangerous level and that was a fair statement in my opinion. Because when I see that our debenture issues are up somewhere in the neighborhood of \$176,000,000, I believe that is far too substantial a portion of our Power Corporation to be in the hands of even a friendly nation like the United States. This is why I believe that it is necessary for the government to take a hard look at alternative methods to finance future borrowing for expansion as well as methods to reduce foreign holdings in this Crown Corporation.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I commend the government for the things that they have already done in this direction and for stating their intent to turn back profits for future expansion purposes to liquidate past borrowings. I believe that this is the right track. But I believe that another method could be employed to help reduce American ownership in our corporation and at the same time fulfill our obligation to play our part as

Canadians in a title role of trying to buy Saskatchewan back for Saskatchewan and I'm going to come back to that proposal a little later on in my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have been most remiss in that I have not as yet extended the courtesy of offering my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I listened with a good deal of interest to their remarks, in some instances with amusement, but I certainly felt that for the first chance they have had to perform such a duty that both of them acquitted themselves admirably and I offer them my congratulations.

I must admit that I was rather amused by some of the woolly logic of the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). He suggested that just because I sit on this side of the house that it makes me one of the group who sit to my right, Mr. Speaker. I want to warn him that he mustn't follow that logic to its natural conclusion, because if he did it would be extremely dangerous for him to sit down next to a lady. He might lose his identity if he did that, if you followed that conclusion as far as he would like it to be. The only conclusion I can have to the suggestion that he made was that he must have been reading some of the past issues of the Liberal comic books, because everybody knows that the Liberal party in Ottawa has been, and still is, a pale counterfoil of the NDP, which is hardly true of Conservatives.

I noted as well the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) about the member from Milestone's mathematics. I too find that here is a teacher who cannot count. If he would check the record, and I would suggest he enlists the aid of his students so the count would be accurate, he would find that I supported the government more times in the last session than I did the opposition.

Now, turning to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I found his speech a most learned and scholarly treatise on his party's assessment of our problems and his proposal for solutions. I was very interested in his reference to the need to place ownership of Canadian industries and resources in the hands of Canadians. I believe that this is a problem that faces all Canadians, a problem that must be met immediately by all governments, be they federal or provincial. I believe that he had a very worthwhile solution or suggestion to make as to uses to which funds from our share of the Canada Pension Plan, funds that would be available to the Saskatchewan Development Corporation, could be put. I believe that this is a program or suggestion that may well commend itself to the government. But again, as I mentioned earlier on, there is another area where I feel that we do not adequately provide opportunity for Saskatchewan people to invest in Saskatchewan resources. As I mentioned, I am going to outline that proposal a little later on.

I also noticed in the Leader of the Opposition's remarks his reference to the dangers of corporate farm operations in Saskatchewan. The other day I came across an article, dated February 9th, 1966, in the Leader Post that is entitled "Factory Farms in Britain", and I want to read a little portion of it. I would

**February 11, 1966**

hope that my honorable friend from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) won't be too flabbergasted at this because I have heard him speak out very strongly against what has been referred to in this country as a vertical integration in the past. It seems that in Britain there has been a committee studying the problems of what they call the "factory farm", a committee of inquiry. I was amazed, as I am sure many other farm members were amazed, to read that the most outstanding feature of the committee's report is that it accepts the factory farming industry as a logical development in agriculture. Further on down it says:

Agriculture Minister Fred Peart . . .

This is from the British government,

. . . said the recommendations of the committee are going to be a major preoccupation in the coming months.

Now, I am like many other farmers in this province who are very apprehensive about these so-called vertical integration or factory farms that are springing up. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that part of our problem in agriculture in Saskatchewan does in fact stem from the lessening of opportunity of the ordinary farmer to diversify because too many areas of diversification are denied him by the so-called factory farm. I am referring specifically to such things as the raising of poultry. I believe that we must establish a committee who will investigate this and be prepared to make some recommendation. I would recommend to the government that they establish a committee to ascertain the harmful effects, if any, that vertical integration is having on the Saskatchewan farm economy at the present time and what harmful effect, if any, it will have in the future if it is allowed to increase unchecked.

Further, this committee should be prepared to recommend to the government legislation, if necessary, limited intensive husbandry methods of farming and having in its terms of reference the added duty of ascertaining what legislation is required to safeguard the humanitarian aspects of food production. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that many people, both in this house and outside it, are not aware of the tremendous measures that have been taken to increase food production through a crash program under a concentrated type of operation. I am sure many members are not aware for instance of the forced feeding methods that have been employed. I am certain that they are not aware of the way animals are treated, pigs, cows, and chickens in particular, penned up for their entire lifetime in an areas that is so small they cannot move, and forcibly fed, at the same time being injected with hormones so that abnormal growth can be obtained in various parts of the carcass that is being produced for food. Secondly, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) should have one of those shots.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Sounds a little . . .

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Secondly, I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that it has been demonstrated whether the injection of these hormones and the residue that remains in the carcasses do in fact make the meat produced fit for human consumption. I believe that this is a problem that is growing very fast in this province. I have seen countless instances of massive production of hogs taking place. There are most certainly tremendous turkey and chicken farms, and I believe that we have advanced far enough that it is essential at this session for the government to establish such an investigative committee that will be prepared at the next session to make some recommendation to the government.

I noticed, last of all, in dealing with the Leader of the Opposition's remarks yesterday, that he dwelt at some length on comparisons between development under the NDP and the Liberals and he quoted statistics, if you will excuse me, Sir, rather "Liberally". The only thing that this served to do for me was to prove that Saskatchewan people will forge ahead in spite of either Liberal or NDP governments. I noticed that the Premier was indulging in the same sort of thing today and again yesterday. I was rather pleased, in spite of his remarks about Conservatives in general, to hear that in order to prove his point of how much he disliked Socialists that he had to refer to a quotation from a great Conservative, Sir Winston Churchill. Then he went on to quote the Regina Manifesto of 30 years ago. He read the portion where it stated that the intention was to carry out the eradication of capitalism. Wasn't this the period, Mr. Speaker, when the honorable Premier was one of the chief supporters of that party? Then why is he using this argument at this late date? Now today — well, I'll tell my honorable friends opposite that whoever is sitting here has always been in this party. This is not necessarily true over there.

**Mr. Steuart:** — How about Dief? He started out as a Liberal.

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Well that's a story the Liberals would like. They would sure like to claim him and that's the only way they can do it.

I listened to the Premier's speech today very carefully because after the way he started yesterday, I thought maybe we were going to get a continuation of it. But I must say that I was rather pleased to see, or to hear I should say, that outside of his references to comparisons and his constant reiteration about how they are acting and how the NDP acted, that he did come forward with, what I thought, were some fairly reasonable proposals, albeit he delivered it with a tremendous amount of bombast and sweeping gestures. But I think that perhaps all of us in this house could take a little warning about trying to appear to hold too great a spotlight and trying to be too important. Whenever I think of someone trying to do this I am reminded of Shakespeare's Macbeth, where in the fifth act he says:

A poor player that struts and frets his hour upon the stage and then is heard no more. It is a tale told by

**February 11, 1966**

an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

I want to perhaps commend that little quotation to those of us who sometimes feel that we are extremely important. If the Premier's accusation that the NDP talked on way in opposition and another way in government is true, then it is equally true of him. He talks about the NDP attack on the government for their financing of the Pulp Mill in Prince Albert. He claims that this is an unwarranted attack. Well, Mr. speaker, I recall back in 1960-61 when another venture was being brought underway and I have picked up the clippings form that time on the then Leader of the Opposition's statement in connection with Interprovincial Steel. June 6th, 1961 from the Star Phoenix, I quote:

While the government poured millions down the drain on experiments of this nature, they failed to give adequate support for essential services such as education.

And then further on he said:

Governments financial dealings with Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation are approaching proportions of a scandal. For all practical purposes, the company would appear to be bankrupt.

That was his statement while in opposition in 1961, and I think for the record, Mr. Speaker, that I should quote from the Star Phoenix of June 13th, which was just one week later, of 1961, just what the stand of myself, as the leader of my party, was at that time. I said that:

'The Saskatchewan government has done the right thing in giving financial backing to Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation of Regina.' Mr. Pederson said, 'Liberal leader Ross Thatcher has directed an unwarranted attack on the basic industry. I don't believe for a minute the industry is going to collapse' Mr. Pederson said in an interview, 'I believe the government is doing the right thing in backing a basic industry'.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Who's . . .

**Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River):** — If the hon. member from Prince Albert will just hold his horses for a moment I will give you the other side of the coin. Later on in my remarks I said:

The opposition should be as keenly interested as the government in bringing industry to this province. They won't encourage industry by making heavy attacks on basic industry.

Mr. Speaker, I want to state most emphatically, that in spite of the fact that the hon. Premier's attitude has changed in four or five short years, in spite of the fact that the opposition's stand has changed in four or five years, mine has not and I repeat

the statement I made in 1961 that I support the governments move in this direction. True, I have some very strong reservations about some of the provisions that have been outlined to date on the concessions that have had to be made; and I hope that when the full agreement is provided us, so that we can have a chance to study it, that we will be given an opportunity to voice our disapproval of those particular provision. But in general, I believe, that it behooves members on both sides of the house to do what they can, both to aid the government and this province, to obtain more of these basic industries and that is the stand I take both in the past, present and future.

I want to turn to the Throne Speech itself, and specifically to the question of agriculture. I noted that the Fodder Shelter Program was going to be extended., and I want to be very accurate about this in that I feel that this program failed completely in this province to provide facilities that are going to be needed in ever-increasing numbers over the next year or two; and on into the future, of course, it will multiply many times over. I come from the area of the South Saskatchewan River Dam, and I was pleased to hear the Premier announce that we would shortly face legislation which would provide for the supplying of water for irrigation purposes. Something must be done, some step must be taken by this government, under the Fodder Shelter Program to look into the aspects of providing shelter for vast amounts of feed that will be available on very short notice once the irrigation starts. You cannot build a cattle population quickly enough to take care of the tremendous amount of fodder that will be grown in the initial stages of this project. One will not keep pace with the other. This is one of the problems that practical farmers in that area face. The fact that they will take on a piece of irrigated land which lends itself primarily to the growing of grass and yet are not in a financial position to develop a her capable of consuming this and making the whole proposition economical. This is but one of the problems that they face, and one of the reasons in spite of what the Premier said this afternoon, why some of them oppose the concept of irrigation at this time. I recommended to this legislature last winter the proposal that we should look into the possibility of the government, under the Department of Agriculture, setting up palletizing plants as a method of long range storage for surplus feed. I want to draw it to their attention again, and point out the urgency of this.

As I mentioned earlier on, when I directed my remarks to diversification, the Community Pasture Program expansion, I believe, is a good thing. But again, in encouraging farmers to diversify we must not lose track of the pressure against them to do so because of these other matters that I mentioned earlier on.

I want to refer just for a moment to the Premier's remarks in connection with irrigation. It seems to me, at any rate, that the government is going along saying that we have built this dam and we must have irrigation regardless of who stands in the way of it. At least this is the way their action appears to those people who are sitting in that area. Now, I don't believe that it is quite as cruel as that. But I do believe that where the government has failed is in performing a good public relations job.

**February 11, 1966**

I believe that the government have in effect put these people in the position where they feel that they have been offered a take-it-or-leave-it sort of an attitude. And I believe that something must be done and done quickly to smooth out the feelings in that area so that a normal irrigation program can take place without this continuous dickering and bickering. I want to just give an example of what I am talking about. In two consecutive issues of the Western Producer, one dated November 18th, 1965, the other the 25th of November, the Premier says:

We have offered to move them (speaking of the dry-land farmers at Broderick), we have offered to move them on to dry-land farms elsewhere at least equal to what they have in their present locations.

One week later, Mr. Larson, who is the spokesman for this group said, commenting on Mr. Thatcher's quotation:

This is not true. In September, Agriculture Minister McFarlane was in Outlook and we asked him if this sort of arrangement could be made and he said, no.

Later on Mr. Larson says:

It could be that Mr. Thatcher is misinformed.

I believe that here we have a perfect example of people talking at cross purposes, where a bit of public relations could have smoothed out all of the problems inherent in this dispute.

Then I want to join with the Leader of the Opposition in his comments when he noted that the Throne Speech completely lacked any reference to the so-called Fulton-Favreau formula. I recall very well last year when this came up as an item of business in this house and I recall the debate that followed when some members pointed out that his formula could not work, and in fact, pointed out that the province of Quebec, in all likelihood would be the very province who would suffer the most. I was rather interested to watch the press comments following the letter, the famous letter that Mr. Lesage sent to Prime Minister Pearson. There are various press comments referring to this formula, some saying "Dead as a dodo" and so on. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that honorable members, who do not participate in debates of this magnitude, should in future, if they are not aware of the complete implications of these types of things, at least attempt to learn something about them before you get the type of wiseacre cracks that we heard back and forth last year, simply because someone had the courage to stand up and oppose what they believed was wrong, something which has since been proven to be wrong.

I want to commend the government too for including in the Throne Speech the question dealing with the time question as well as the snow removal program that they are going to bring before the legislature. I was delighted to find that my two resolutions were both included. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that at the end of this session any resolutions I may have introduced will be treated



with the same degree of high consideration.

I did mention in my debate last year the question of tree planting as a centennial project, tree planting along the highways of this province. As yet I have seen nothing come of this proposal and therefore, I bring it before the legislature again in the hope that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) when he returns to his place, will take a look at this program to ascertain if in fact it is not an excellent program to undertake for our Diamond Jubilee next year. It certainly should be started and it would certainly receive a tremendous amount of support.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the question of investment by people in the province in its natural resources. I have long felt, Mr. Speaker, that tens of thousands of ordinary men and women on modest salaries, on modest incomes, would from time to time have liked to have had an opportunity to invest in some of these programs and in some of these schemes or some of these developments that would make them something more than the small amount of interest that they get in the bank. I find hundreds of people who say to me, almost with a tone of envy in their voice when they read in the press about so-and-so becoming very wealthy through investing a relatively small amount in some mining venture and so on, 'I wish that could happen to me'. In this province and in fact in this nation there has not yet been such an opportunity provided for the ordinary man and woman. Too often we find that the average wage earner, if he finds at the end of the pay period he has a five or ten dollar bill left over, will spend it in some fashion other than through investment or savings. I believe that there are tens of millions of dollars in the province that could be accumulated over a period of time into a fund, a fund that I would refer to as a Saskatchewan Growth Fund. Its sole purpose would be for investing in new developments, developments of the natural resources of this province, such as the Pulp Mill in Prince Albert, giving people an opportunity to partake directly, not only in part of the risk but in some of the profits of these great ventures. The form I would suggest it would take would be that it would be established by statute as the Saskatchewan Growth Fund. It would be under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Treasurer and responsible to him, and through him to the legislature. I believe it should be operated by a Board of Directors, and I believe that their duty would be (a) to issue investment certificates which would be placed on the market for the ordinary man and woman to purchase. Denominations probably from five, in even numbers, five, ten, and on up, with no limit on the number that could be purchased. I believe such a fund could have a guaranteed basic interest rate of say three to four per cent with a declared dividend at the end of the year on the net profits accruing through the investments that were made. I also feel that guide lines would have to be laid down as to where this money should be invested.

First of all, of course, I think it would be reasonable to say that a portion of it would have to be invested in gilt-edged securities such as government bonds and so on. Secondly, a portion could be invested in established business to give a sound

fiscal base for this Growth Fund. But I would suggest that a very substantial percentage, probably as high as 60 per cent of the total amount of money available could be used for borrowings by companies investing in new developments, again such as the Pulp Mill. This would give our people in this province an opportunity to invest in a secure fund and at the same time have an opportunity to avail themselves of some of the profits that might result from some of these risk ventures. This is not an entirely new concept. My party and committee have been studying this for a matter of two years, and we had hoped perhaps to introduce this as part of our program later on. I believe that it is necessary, in view of the amount of capital borrowing that we are doing abroad, to commence on such a program immediately, and I would recommend to the government that they move in this direction as soon as possible to establish such a fund. The government of Alberta have announced only in recent weeks that they too are establishing a fund such as this to do precisely the sort of things that I have just outlined. It is a practical program and I think that it is a further opportunity for people to share in the profits made in the development of our natural resources and increase the probability of guaranteeing Canadian ownership in Canadian resources and industries.

Mr. Speaker, I only have two or three other short items that I want to deal with before concluding this afternoon. One of them I would comment to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), and I would hope that he would take it upon himself or his department to take a look at the apprenticeship training program that is being carried out particularly in the field of plumbing and electricians. I have had brought to me numerous instances of where management in these various firms are taking advantage of the apprenticeship program to find cheap labor. In other word, they are allowed under the program to hire young lads on an apprenticeship basis at a very, very low salary on the understanding that, when the time comes in their training for them to attend a technical school, they will be carried through and then taken on and get the increase accrued to them. But over and over again I am finding that many of these firms are keeping these lads up to the time when they are due to go to the school and then, under some pretext or other, they manage to dispose of them – fire them or get rid of them – and then they take on another bunch who have to carry on even further. Now, I only mentioned this for the first time. I want to suggest that I am going to speak to the Minister of Labour separately about this because I have actual instances of where this has happened.

I also want to just comment very briefly on the question of the \$50 Home-owner grant. I think most members of this house are well aware, and if they weren't the Premier certainly brought it forcibly to your attention this afternoon, that our platform or our program does in fact, perhaps not word it the way the Premier did, but does suggest that the responsibility for education can no longer rest, as it has in the past, in large measure on the back of the property owner; that it has generally become accepted that responsibility of paying for the cost of education must more and more fall on the hands or the shoulders of provincial and federal governments. In moving in this direction, my party did

in fact pledge that, if we were elected to office we would move in this direction as fast as possible to remove the total cost of education from the property owner. I make no apology for that type of platform, regardless of what the Premier may term it. For this reason, I believe, that the Home-owner grant as such is a desirable method of moving in this direction. I do object, Mr. Speaker, to the statement of the Premier that he is going to give it directly to the taxpayer. I would have suggested, and I am going to do so when the bill comes before the house, that this money should be made available to the municipalities and allow them to allocate it to the individual property owner rather than have the situation that we have now. The Premier is trying to create the father image saying "You be good little citizens and pay your taxes and daddy will send you 50 bucks". Now, I want to suggest that the Premier along with several others of us in this house, perhaps can project a father image, but I don't think he'll make it in this particular instance. I want to say that to use this \$50 pledge, coming from the Premier in his dual capacity as Premier and Treasurer, in effect says vote for me down at Bengough and I will send you \$40. I object to that. Well, I hear people saying "Oh", but I have heard some of your campaigners saying that.

I don't want to take up much more time in this house this afternoon, and I notice my hon. friends opposite applaud when I say that, except to reiterate something that I have spoken on, on numerous occasions in the past in this province and also in this house, and that is on the question of economic unity of our western provinces.

I was delighted to see that a step has already been taken in this direction in a meeting between the three Premiers of our western provinces because I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of the jeers and catcalls from some of my friends opposite last year, when I placed this before the legislature, that this is something that is a must. We must move toward economic unity as quickly as possible in the prairie regions, if we are to obtain our fair share of national growth and development, be it industrial or on the level of natural resource development. And I say, I was delighted to see press reports suggesting that prairie economic union is a desirable objective.

I just want to quote from another man with a very wonderful name of Peterson, but this one happens to have misspelled it. He's got it with a 't'. But this Mr. Peterson happens to be the president of the Investors Syndicate of Canada. Speaking in Saskatoon this is what he had to say as quoted in the Star Phoenix of October 28th last year. He said:

While I hesitate to prejudge what a commission might conclude following a study of the prairie regions, I will say that it is my own belief that Canada's mid-west could well become tomorrow's industrial giant.

He said:

Four Maritime provinces were now considering a proposal

for a study of the advantages which might derive from an economic union of that region.

This, Mr. Speaker, is precisely the point I was trying to make last year and although, as I say, I received nothing but catcalls from those who have no understanding of these matters, I was delighted to note that the Premier though the recommendation was good. Perhaps he already had it in mind because I see that he went along with the proposal and attended meetings that would work towards this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to turn just for a brief moment to the amendment to the Address in Reply that was moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) yesterday. I find that the working of this amendment implies, at least to me, that the government has not outlined priorities, insofar as the field of education is concerned, sufficiently to suit my hon. friends in the NDP group. I find that he has also mentioned that need for substantially reducing property taxes for education. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that in the Throne Speech itself there was more than one item dealing directly with the cost of education and the reduction of taxation insofar as the property owner is concerned. For these reasons I find that I am unable to support this amendment because until the budget comes down and until we have had an opportunity to see precisely how much, I fail to see how this amendment can in fact reflect the views of the party that I represent and in fact my own views.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to oppose the amendment. I will support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — During the introduction of bills a point of order was raised in regard to the fact that the printed bills were not as yet on the member's desks. I draw your attention to Standing order No. 61:

No bill shall be read the second time until it has been printed and distributed to members at least one day previous and has been subsequently marked 'printed'.

The office will make every effort to see that the bills are placed on the members desks as usual. But I would draw to your attention the fact that there were no infractions of the Standing Orders on this occasion.

It was previously agreed by unanimous consent of the house that we should defer the questions until a more convenient time this day. Will the house give leave to proceed to the questions?

**An Hon. Member:** — We've not completed the debate this afternoon, have we?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, I presumed that by leave of the house we could

interrupt this in order to facilitate the work in the office. Is leave granted.

**Hon. Members:** — No.

**Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley):** — Your Honour, I bow to the house's desire to adjourn as shortly as possible, and I certainly have no thought of unduly prolonging the afternoon proceedings, and since I shall be asking for the privilege of adjourning the debate, I would like to just say a few words, if I may, between now and 5 o'clock or thereabouts.

I would like to first of all congratulate Your Honour on the assumption of his second year as presiding officer of this assembly. I note that Your Honour has not suffered any of the disabilities that commonly come with age. I am not suggesting Your Honour is ageing, but I notice that Your Honour is still as scrupulous as ever about the conduct of the chamber. For this I applaud you. I would say, however, that I took the occasion last evening when I was at home, to read some of the debates of previous years and I would suggest that Your Honour should stay away from reading the debates of the years 1960 to 1964, particularly of one member of the assembly of that period, otherwise Your Honour might unduly mellow in your approach to the correctness of parliamentary practice in this house, and no one would want to see that.

I also want to congratulate the two new members who have come to the house as a result of the proceedings, both in the constituencies and in the courts of the last twelve months. First of all, I heartily congratulate the new member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner). His predecessor entered this chamber on the same date as I did in 1949. I was just casting my eyes about and there are only, I think, the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) and myself of that unhappy lot who came in here in 1948. I think there are only four or five other members who came in here prior to that. The new member for Moosomin will have his task cut out for him if he is going to live up to the expectations of the people of that constituency based on his predecessor's record in this assembly. I was one of his, I shan't say admirers, but I was one of those who were willing to tolerate him in good spirit. I think that if the new member for Moosomin can thus win his way to my heart, he will have a real task ahead of him because there are very few on his side of the house who have succeeded.

I want to say a word or two in regard to the member for Canora, if I may. The member for Canora (Mr. Romuld), I had thought was not going to be here, and I must say that I felt a certain bond of sympathy for his predicament last August or September, when it became apparent that his tenuous hold on the seat of Canora was slipping from his grasp. I must say that I was a little interested in the way in which he thought to extricate himself from this difficulty. I hadn't read that section of the Act, or I might have perhaps been tempted to plan some way of getting back here without having to have an election myself.

**February 11, 1966**

**An Hon. Member:** — He's scared.

**An Hon. Members:** — Didn't know . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — ORDER! Both sides have now been allowed an oblique reference to this case. Matters of subjudice are not matters fit for discussion in this house.

**Mr. Walker:** — Yes, Your Honour, I make no comments on the merits of the case. I would comment, however, on the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Romuld). I suggest to him that many of my friends, and I am sure many of his, are asking how he happens to be sitting in the assembly this session. I hope that he can answer them better than I can because I haven't been able to give an answer which I think is satisfactory to this question. I am sorry that the member is missing out on what I consider was one of the greatest satisfactions of my life, and that was that I was able to clear up this kind of question without resort to technicalities and without resort to law.

I suggest that as far as I am concerned it is one of the great satisfactions of my life that when my constituents found that they had bumbled the situation in April 1964, they correctly put by speedy dispatch a solution on record.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the member of Canora might give some consideration to this approach to the problem. I am sure that he would get quite a thrill out of coming back here with a big majority . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — I listened with a good deal of interest to the speech made by the Premier. I thought that his speech was filled with the usual kind of loose generalization about conditions in Saskatchewan on which he has built his fortune in the province. The kind of loose generalization which is lacking in hard kernels, but which is abundant in empty chaff. He made the statement that . . . he made a number of wild statements which I am sure are difficult to deal with because they lack particularity. They were just wild unfounded assertions. He suggested that the Liberal government had started Saskatchewan along a new road to prosperity.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition pointed to the economic realities in the Bureau of Statistics, which show Saskatchewan has failed to maintain its lead over the pack, over the rest of the provinces of Canada in the past year or two years, the Premier did not seem to feel competent to rebut these facts. Instead he let loose in wild, shouted, woolly statements, wild assertions, which he was unable to bolster with any hard substance. He says that Saskatchewan has now become a province where there is no unemployment, where everybody has jobs and so on.

Well, he tried to bolster this by reference to the population

figures. Unfortunately he didn't point to any particular figures but the particular figures are a matter of record and this house and the public are entitled to know what they are. From 1951 to 1961, the populations of our province rose from 832,000 to 925,000. That, Mr. Speaker, is an average increase of 9,300 people per year. These were in the days of Socialist stagnation, an increase in our population of almost 10,000 per year. If you take the period from June 1st, 1963 to June 1st, 1964, the last year of socialist stagnation, the population rose by 10,000 to a total of 943,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are hard facts. The members opposite can't ignore them, and if they do ignore them they ignore them at their peril.

What has been the situation since this great new free enterprise capitalistic government has taken office? Well, what has happened? In the first year of Liberal government, from June 1st 1964 to June 1st, 1965, the population of this province rose, according to the D.B.S. by only 8,000. In the current population year which will end on June 1st, 1965 the figures are not yet available. But if you take the 12 month period comprising the calendar year 1965, which overlaps with the figure which I have just given, you find that the population increase has been only 7,000, so that there was a decline of 2,000 in the population gain in this province in the year ending June 1st, 1965, and the decline has increased since that time.

So, Mr. Speaker, it may be that the unemployed have jobs, that they have left the province, they have got fed up, they just got disgusted with the situation that they see here in Regina, and have gone elsewhere, 3,000 of them who would have stayed if the population figure had been maintained at the figure that it was in the average for the last ten years under the CCF government.

That, of course, takes no account of the natural increase in population. All I say is that 3,000 people more left Saskatchewan in the last full year of Liberal government than the average of ten years under the Socialist stagnation, which the Premier talks about.

So, you will find, Mr. Speaker, that he will become increasingly vague about the population. Finally when these figures get to be known, as they will eventually penetrate the impervious wall of the newspaper blackout on these facts, the Premier will start arguing that the population figures are not really a relevant fact at all. He will try to distract attention from the population figures. Well, these are the facts on which you castigated the previous government. I say that those facts now turn and condemn him for the shortsighted ineffectualness of his government policy.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, although the more news media of my city sent more coverage to Regina to cover the session than in any previous session, for some reasons the facts of the Leader of the Opposition's speech did not penetrate. When I sat and listened to the

**February 11, 1966**

news last night on radio and the television, we heard great publicity given, reams of it, to the replies the Premier made to the Leader of the Opposition. Yet, although this day, yesterday, was traditionally the day of the leader of the Opposition, the public was left in the dark as to what the Premier was replying to. There was no information as to what he said. I don't say, Mr. Speaker, the new media are particularly dominated by the Premier over there. I simply say that the news media and the Premier are both dominated by the same power interests in Canada. They are both dominated by the same interests, and it doesn't serve the interests of either of these gentry to make the true facts known.

I have, like every other Saskatchewan citizen, felt a flow of pride every month when I hear the figures of the increase in retail trade in Saskatchewan, the increase in construction on permits in the city of Saskatoon, the city of Regina, the province of Saskatchewan. I have a feeling of pride when I hear those figures. But I recall that in almost every year for the last twenty years new records have been set in these areas, and for twenty years there was a blackout on these facts, I am only sorry that these facts have not been made known with the same diligence, with the same enthusiasm as they are now made known by the news media of this province. You can't have a long run success from this kind of one-sided presentation of the facts. It simply means that those of us on this side of the house who have the true facts to put forward will have to work that much harder. We did it in 1944, we did it in 1956, and 1948, 1952, 1960 and we just narrowly missed doing it in 1964. Discharging the heaviest burden of responsibility for the dissemination of public information that falls on any political party anywhere in North America, we will have to do it without any assistance from my friends opposite, or from their friends, the minions of the big business press.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would have thought it would have been significant, - here is a government which ties its whole reputation for success on the booming Saskatchewan economy - and I should have thought it would have been an interesting piece of information for the public of Saskatoon or indeed of Saskatchewan, to have had the fact that Saskatchewan, placed second among the provinces in new investment per capita in 1963, had dropped to third place in 1965. I think that the very measure which the Liberal party chooses to apply to itself shows them wanting in their administration of this province. I think that the public should have got that although I notice it isn't in the Leader Post anywhere.

The Leader Post reports yesterday's proceedings, speeches, both by the Premier and by the Leader of the Opposition. I don't blame the government for this fortuitous circumstance by which they enjoy a virtual one-sided monopoly in the news. I simply say that this is part of the problem which the people of Saskatchewan have got to cope with. They have to cope with a situation where those who purvey the news have an interest which does not coincide with the interests of the ordinary people of this country. The people of this movement have long been fighting that



Battle and will continue to fight that battle. These facts should have been of interest to all readers of newspapers and to listeners to radio new programs.

We were told that this government would bring more investment to Saskatchewan. Indeed, that was the pledge on which it was elected in 1964. What are the facts? The facts didn't merit one single word of copy in any media in Saskatchewan. The fact is that in 1963 Saskatchewan was 23 per cent above the Canadian average and in 1965 was only 11 per cent above the Canadian average. This is a significant fact which I suggest the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know when they judge this government on its own chosen ground, Mr. Speaker. We are just going to have to take whatever means we can to get the facts over to the people of Saskatchewan. Naturally we don't expect aid from those who thrive and prosper on the same economic slogan, the same economic philosophy of "Dog eat dog" and "The Devil take the hindmost". We don't expect those people to promote the real facts about the failures of Liberalism and the failure of their free enterprise economy.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier said that Saskatchewan, when he was a member, when he first went to Ottawa, was the third largest or the third most populous province in Canada. Well, the Bureau of Statistics gives him the lie. The Bureau of Statistics shows that in 1942 when there was a Liberal government in Saskatchewan, British Columbia surpassed Saskatchewan in terms of population. The Leader of the Opposition used to be selective in his choice of statistics, now he tries to ignore statistics altogether. Pardon me, I mean the Premier, the gentleman who is out of the house.

The Premier has been going about showing . . .

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Next Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley):** — Well, I'm prescient. I am looking ahead. The Premier goes about saying that in the period from 1945 to 1964, Saskatchewan had a population increase of only about 13 per cent, while Manitoba had a population increase of 32 per cent and Alberta had a population increase of 77 per cent. He goes about saying . . . Well, why doesn't he look at all the facts? The facts are that if he takes the last period of the Liberal government in Saskatchewan, roughly one cited in the census period from 1931 to 1945, he will find that in Manitoba there was a population increase of four per cent, in Alberta a population increase of 10 per cent, in B.C. a population increase of 37 per cent but in Saskatchewan a population loss of 10 per cent. Or if he wants to take the year of the present Liberal government, the period from June 1st, 1964 to January 1st, 1966, and compare the four western provinces again, he will find that on the basis of the first eighteen months of Liberal government, Manitoba's population increased one-tenth of one per cent, Alberta's by two per cent, B.C. by six per cent, Saskatchewan by one per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are the figures on which the Liberal party

**February 11, 1966**

chose to base its claim to office; those figures now leave the Liberal party bereft of any substance of support. They don't support the Liberal party, they don't support the position that the Premier takes. The Premier can only escape the consequences of this nemesis by floundering wildly in generalities and cotton fluff like he did here this afternoon.

Well, he said here this afternoon that Saskatchewan turned off Socialism when it was elected in 1964, when the Liberal Party was elected. Now, we find it a little difficult to find out what he has done about Socialism. We find it a little difficult to know what he has done about the transportation system. A friend of mine now says when you want to go to Saskatoon from Regina, you have to go away around Wynyard or Lanigan. It is not very good for business. The rail liner is more crowded than it has ever been. What is the Saskatchewan government's policy about promoting the Saskatchewan Transportation System? What is their position on socialism? Have they shut it off? Or have they just thrown some sand in the gears? Let's get the answer to that. What is their position with regard to sodium sulphate? Well, they haven't committed themselves except that they are giving the plums to private enterprise. I just wonder what is their position with respect to the Sodium Sulphate Plant? What is their position with respect to the government insurance industry?

**Mr. Stuart:** — Cleaning it up, Bob.

**Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley):** — I don't know whether it will ever be possible to ever get any kind of a rational type policy from the government, or from the minister who is presently in charge of it. I think that would be expecting a little too much but I think we ought to expect him to say what are their long range intentions, what are their immediate intentions with regard to this Socialist measure, as it was described by the opposition when it was introduced. We can't find out what their views are on health service. They were elected on a pledge to increase health services by providing drugs, drug care. This was voted upon in this legislature last year. The Liberals all voted against it. We can't find out what their policy is on that, on medical care, or on many of these Socialist issues that they say they turned off.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think they know. I think they are waiting for their directions as to what should happen to these worthwhile projects. Well, he says it may take many years to repair the damage done by twenty years of CCF government. I sincerely believe, Mr. speaker, it may never be possible to repair the damage that is done already by this present free enterprise, capitalistic government that has fallen into office in this province. Many of the deals that have been made will, I submit, not be easily corrected or remedied over the years to come. The Premier I noticed, quoted some oil statistics, and he made the statement that a number of new pools of oil had turned up in Saskatchewan. Well, I think he should consult with the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) who gave a report to the Leader Post, December, 1965. I notice that the report says

that there were no major discoveries in Saskatchewan in 1965 but the province expects to find enough oil in Saskatchewan in 1966, at least to keep pace with growth of demand.

Well, just like the other facts, just like the other so-called facts of the Liberal government, it doesn't really have any substance . . .

**Hon. A. C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources)** — On a point of privilege, when the member is quoting something that I have said, there were seven new pools found in Saskatchewan. That is a fact, but none of them were of world-shaking proportionate amounts of oil found. We . . . producing eight million barrels more now.

**Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley)**: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of Mineral Resources for bringing it to my attention, to the attention of the house. I agree with him they are not of earth-shaking importance, although I must say that my ears were almost deafened by the importance which the Premier seemed to give it when he said it here a few minutes ago in this chamber. I agree with the Minister of Mineral Resources it was not of earth-shaking importance, but I wish he would brief the Premier a little better if he helped the Premier to write that part of his speech.

**Some Hon. Members**: — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley)**: — Now Mr. Speaker, I only want to refer to one other area and that is the whole attitude of this government to the legislature and to the democratic institutions. First of all, I want to say that I was a little disappointed this year when the speech read by His Honour was not distributed to the members as it has been done every year in the last twenty sessions that I have attended in this house. We had to get it, I had to borrow mine from one of my friends in the press gallery — and it wasn't until the next day when we got the Votes and Proceedings that it was placed on my desk. At least, some members may have had it sooner but the practice has been in this house that it has been distributed here. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if we really wanted to know what was in the Speech from the Throne we would have been better off not to come here at all but to have picked up a newspaper. We would have got it sooner and we would have got it in writing. This, I suggest, is a minor matter, but I suggest that it does somehow signify the regard which the new so-called Liberal government has for the rights of the people as represented in this chamber.

I want to say too, that I would have thought that yesterday would have been an excellent opportunity for the Premier to come clean with the people of Saskatchewan about the terms of the Prince Albert Pulpwood Agreement. He has done a great deal of talking about the terms. You can never quite pin him down. You think you have him there and he is over here. You never know where he is at on this because he won't make the information

available to the assembly. I would have thought that instead of weaseling out of it, as he did yesterday, that he might have, if he was going to talk about it, if he was going to extol its virtues and discuss its content, put a copy on the house table that we could all have had the opportunity, which he has, to know what is in it.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it isn't always easy to get these pieces of information from the government. It has been traditional in this house that public documents, once concluded, once past the negotiation stage, ought to be made available to the representatives of the people. I agree that whilst contracts are still being negotiated and while the terms are still uncertain, there ought to be nothing done which would in any way prejudice the negotiations or damage the interests of the province. But once the agreement is reached, it ought to be made a public document and available to the public. That is the way parliamentary institutions are conducted. I want to say that I am astonished at the fact that there are still a large number of missing returns. This is information which I for one, would like to have had in the preparation of my remarks on this Throne Speech debate. So I say that this is a remarkably relevant comment which I want to make. I don't recall any government being unprepared after a year has passed, or almost a year has passed, to table returns that have been asked for in the previous session. Here we have returns, none of them requiring any difficulty about answering – they may cause a little difficulty to the Premier about the publicity that might be given to the answer – but this doesn't constitute any excuse for hiding these returns from the legislature. What are they? We would like to know what Order-In-Council appointments have been made by this government. We don't know. Since this government took office we have no record of them. The people of Saskatchewan only know what they read in the newspapers, and that is not a very reliable source of information.

We have asked the Premier if he will signify what is the maximum allowance for travel and sustenance for the Premier and Cabinet Ministers in and out of Saskatchewan. I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that I do not cavil in any way at the Ministers of the crown spending money to do their duty, but I say that the people who pay the bill have a right to know on what basis it is reckoned. Is it \$50 a day or \$10 a day, or somewhere in between? We have no way of knowing although I notice that the Premier's own expense account is several times higher than it was for the previous Premier in any year . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — You get what you pay for Bob.

**Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley):** — But I don't know what he is getting. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what it is and I think the people of Saskatchewan ought to know what this is that he is getting more of . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Keep working on it . . .

**Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley):** — This is a minor matter, Mr.

Speaker, but I think it close to the integrity of government. This government ought to be just as jealous as any member of this house in preserving this relationship. We have asked for the vouchers for Bob's restaurant. You remember, Mr. Speaker, you didn't make the grade quite, but there was a special program put on "to meet the cabinet" just after the new election, after the election last April. Here were these cabinet ministers being paraded on television as though they were celebrities, and this was being sponsored by Bob's restaurant. Now, of course, the public has a right to know . . .

**Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member may not realize it but that return to which he referred was filed this afternoon.

**Mr. Walker:** — Well, I am pleased to hear that.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — There have been no returns filed this afternoon yet. We haven't come to that order of business.

**Mr. Heald:** — Mr. Speaker, I laid on the table at the start of the session, 14 returns this afternoon, that is a total of 40 in the last three days.

**Mr. Walker:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister may know that it is going to be tabled, but that hardly is available to the members of this house.

**Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca):** — If you would sit down . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — I am pleased to hear that it is going to be tabled later today. I am delighted to hear that. I think that it is remarkable what kind of pattern these late returns fit into, Mr. Speaker. They all have to do with the relationship of the cabinet with the government, with the taxpayers, and with private industry.

Here is another one. What company directorships were held by cabinet ministers? I should think this was something that, if the Premier had taken Mr. Pearson's dictum to heart he would have been more than eager to make known to the legislature. For some reason the government is hanging on to this information. There is probably nothing wrong with it. I say that the government ought to make it available, ought to have answered this question as quickly as possible, not a year later. We still haven't got the agreement re the sale of Wizewood, that is a year ago now . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You'll be sorry . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, as representatives of the public, we do not ask these things for our-

**February 11, 1966**

selves, we ask these thing for the people we represent. This government has the same duty to those people that we have, and ought to live up to that duty.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we sometimes do get returns which don't seem to jibe with other information which the government has given us. I notice that the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) and the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) ought to get together and put the same facts to this house. They oughtn't for one to tell one story and the other to tell the opposite story. And this is what we are getting. Now, at this state we don't know whether the return is untrue, or the statement made by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) is untrue, but one of them is certainly untrue. I think I should make a motion for return, asking which one is untrue, because . . .

**Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture):** — You should be the last one . . .

**Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley):** — You see, the Attorney General, the Provincial Secretary, was asked for returns setting out the copies of any agreements or agreement providing for or relative to the announced sale of Saskair. Now, that motion was moved on the 25th of March, 1965. Three days before that the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) got up in the house and he said:

Having made this known, we then invited interested parties to consider the purchase of Saskair. I wish to inform the assembly that negotiations for the sale of Saskair were concluded late Saturday. A contract for the sale of the corporation has been entered into with North Canadian Air Limited, a company comprised of a group of Prince Albert and La Ronge businessmen. The contract is subject to ratification by the Air Transport Board, and accordingly the contract is being submitted to the Board for approval.

Now, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) says the contract has been entered into, but the Attorney General doesn't know anything about it. Now, there may be an innocent explanation for this, Mr. Speaker, if there is I think the house is entitled to have it. I haven't carried on an examination of all the returns that have been tabled but this return just happened to strike my eye. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can likewise have full and implicit confidence in the statements which are made by ministers on the Order of the Day as to what has taken place in their department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say some other things about the Speech from the Throne, and I would, therefore, ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### QUESTIONS RE TRANSCRIPTS

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I have on my desk the first of the transcripts and I find on it a note saying:

Please check return to the general office as soon as possible. Nellie Johnston.

I ask, does this mean, has Mrs. Johnston been re-employed by the government

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No.

### QUESTIONS RE NEWS PROGRAM

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, there is, I believe, a news program which is sponsored by the government, paid for by the government of some five or ten minutes of the proceedings of this house. May I ask, is it the intention of the government to allow this to continue during the days of Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of next week when the legislative broadcasts have been shut off? This is the one that stars on Bob Hill, who's name is well known to members opposite?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — If it is legal, it will continue. If it is not legal, it will be discontinued.

### QUESTIONS RE RETURNS

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I just say it is somewhat unsatisfactory to allow this to continue.

One other question. I think we have played games long enough, Mr. Speaker, with this matter of holding up returns to the house which were ordered one year ago. By my count, and I want to know if the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) agrees with me, not counting those which he may have given today, but of which no information has been passed on to the house, there are, or were still, at the beginning of today's session, 21 returns and addresses passed at the last session not yet tabled. I want to ask the Premier what possible explanation can there be for not having tabled at this time the kind of returns which were referred to just now by the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker)?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney General pointed out, about 40 returns have been passed or brought into the house in the last few days. Some of these returns take two or three people to get all the material prepared for them. We have important things to do in this legislature that sometimes require doing, and may I re-tell the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) that it is now one year and nine months since he has been running this legislature.

**February 11, 1966**

We are preparing the information that has been requested. It will be tabled, all of them, in the next few days.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on this, I never ran this legislature and neither should the Premier. The legislature should run itself.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The comment is entirely uncalled for. The hon. member asks a question. He got a reply.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — May I follow up my question, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Speaker:** — When the hon. member asks a question, surely the other hon. member he asks it of, may reply.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I agree, Mr. Speaker, if the other hon. member does reply. My question is what reasonable reason can they give for not having tabled orders which require two lines of typing when they are almost a year to do so? I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is a violation of the rules and the principles of the legislature and we are entitled to some reason other than the ones that we have had.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — To the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), I think I can tell him that by Monday all of the returns except possibly one will be tabled, and all of the addresses — there are three or four addresses where the information is not completed yet. For the Leader of the Opposition to say because it only takes one word or three or four words to answer, this isn't the whole story. It sometimes takes a great deal of information to say "No" and this is the position of some of these returns because you have to go through all the departments, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition understands, before you can say "No". This is the situation with respect to some of the addresses and with respect to one of the returns. But I can assure my hon. friend that by Monday all of the returns except one and all of the addresses except possibly three or four will be tabled.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I thank the Attorney General. I know it takes a lot of research to get the rate of expenses of the cabinet.

**Mr. C. G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Mr. Speaker, a follow-up question. How many returns which were tabled today could not have been tabled yesterday?

**An Hon. Member:** — None were tabled today.



**Mr. Willis:** — Mr. Speaker, we understood that quite a number were tabled today.

**Mr. Heald:** — I laid 14 on the table.

The assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.