

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session – Twelfth Legislature

11th Day

Thursday, February 23, 1956

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

On the Orders of the Day

CORRECTION

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a correction. In the 'Leader-Post' I am quoted as saying that farm electrical rates are even less than those in the city of Regina. I am aware that the power rates are less in the city of Regina, therefore the news item should read: "I have examined power bills in the country", (I am not sure if I said bills or rates, but the intention was 'bills', Mr. Speaker.) I haven't had a chance to check my script as yet, that is, the transcript, but I do want to point out that in the case of power bills, I have interviewed many farmers whose monthly power bills were in some cases less than my bill in Regina but for an equivalent amount of power, say for 750 kilowatts, the monthly difference for rural power would be about \$1.70 more, so our rural power rates compare, I think, quite favourably with those of the city, considering all factors.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 22, 1956, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Brown (Last Mountain) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. L.F. Mr. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I have found it rather difficult, which is probably quite natural, to follow the arguments put forward by the Provincial Liberal Party in radio addresses, public addresses and in their addresses in the debate in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would appreciate very much, as far as I am concerned personally, if it was possible for me to get some idea of what policy they have in mind to govern the province of Saskatchewan.

I have here a report from the 'Prince Albert Herald', July 27th, of an address given there by the hon. Leader of the Liberal Party in the province of Saskatchewan. It says:

"On northern development the Liberal leader said it was closely linked with the proposed construction of the South Saskatchewan River Dam. Until such time as the north is developed there is no need for the project, he said."

Then a little further down he makes reference to a pulp industry in the north. He said:

February 23, 1956

“Premier Douglas talks about the province being ready to contribute \$73 million towards the South Saskatchewan Dam project; but if this Government has that much money to fool around with, why doesn't Douglas build a pulp mill.”

Premier Douglas: — That's socialism!

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Mr. Speaker, I take it that the Liberal Party is opposed to government in business, from what they have said in this House and elsewhere. Then a little further down he says:

“The reason a pulp and paper mill has not been located in the Prince Albert area has nothing to do with the freight rates. Pulp and paper companies know in advance the freight rate situation and this talk was sheer ‘poppycock’, he said.”

And this is the interesting part, as quoted by the ‘Prince Albert Herald’:

“Why do we have pulp and paper mills located in Alberta, Manitoba and British Columbia, where freight rates are high, he asked. There are two reasons why you have no pulp mill here, and these are, first, because of lack of electric power; and second, because of the tax rates.”

Yet at the same time he opposes the development of hydro power at the South s Dam, and yet gives that as the basic reason why we haven't such industries as a pulp mill in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What comes first – the chicken or the egg?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — And a little further down he makes mention of the Government spending \$160 million, and I suppose that sum is gathered up from odds and ends, such as hospitalization tax, etc., in order to reach that sum. He said:

“They will spend \$160 million, and at \$1 million per bridge . . .”

He was belittling me and the Government for not having a bridge across the North Saskatchewan River at Prince Alberta.

“ . . . the C.C.F. could build 160 bridges.”

Now that is one reason why I find it rather difficult to analyze the policy of the Liberal Party of the province of Saskatchewan; and I find that the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr), in speaking in this debate, yesterday, states that he would vote against the motion because the Government had not solved the economic problems confronting municipalities.

Mr. Danielson: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Then he went on to mention that some few years ago a

consideration had been given by a special committee appointed by the Government to study the boundaries of municipalities, and stated that that was the only indication (and a very weak one) the Government was struggling with the problems confronting the municipal governments in the province of Saskatchewan.

In October, 1943, there was a Committee appointed by the Liberal Government of the day, and they made this report in August, 1944, a report of the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council. It is rather interesting to note that some mention has been made in this report, and I might hasten to say the personnel that made up this commission was chosen by the Liberal Government of the day. Under the heading of 'Municipal Boundaries' this statement is made:

“Difficulties of rural municipalities in fulfilling their responsibility was brought to the attention of the council in a number of submissions. The R.M. of Chaplin, No. 164 stated that the income of municipalities was too unstable and the municipal units too small to enable it to look after roads.

“The municipality of Mantario, No. 262, proposed adjustment in municipal boundaries to include larger areas as a means of properly financing health services, the problems of school financing, hospitalization, medical services and so on.

“Further, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities stated that proposals of changing municipal boundaries were worthy of careful consideration.”

It is also interesting to note that:

“The council therefore recommends that a committee be set up to investigate the problem of adjusting of municipal boundaries. Its membership should include a representative from the University of Saskatchewan, organized farmers, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, and the Urban Municipal Association.”

The committee referred to by the hon. member from Rosthern, (Mr. Carr) who did make some study of municipal boundaries in this province a few years ago, were made up very largely of the personnel that was recommended by a Committee appointed by the Liberal Government in October, 1943, and brought in the report known as the Saskatchewan reconstruction council report.

I also find it rather interesting to note there is a suggestion by members opposite that the Provincial Government should take from the funds of the provincial taxes certain sums of money to meet educational costs, to meet municipal expenditures, much in excess of the sums that are not devoted by the Government of the province to the municipalities, to assist them in taking care of their responsibility as a junior government.

I refer to an address by Dr. Robert M. Clark, Associate Professor of Economics, University of British Columbia; a very well-known professor in the

February 23, 1956

fields of municipal governments. He had this to say:

“I suggest that there are some disadvantages apparent in any approach to provincial-municipal financial relations that concentrates almost exclusively on procuring ever larger grants for municipalities. The chief of these disadvantages, and the only one I shall have time to discuss briefly is the loss of independence that is likely to occur.

“I never realized the practical impact of this maxim until I spent the year 1953-54 in Britain, and studied the financial relations between the national and local governments there.”

Further on he says:

“If you or I were a provincial treasurer, or minister of finance we would be bound to exercise control over the amount spent by municipalities, or provincial aid in services. Any provincial treasurer who permits his government to pay say 60 per cent of the cost of whatever local school boards chose to spend on education would be asking for trouble.”

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, that is a government of this province should appoint a commission from among members opposite to study and report on provincial-municipal relations, would they recommend what they are advocating in this House? We take a look at the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report, and I think we can say they are very eminently qualified to study social, economic and other problems relating to the welfare of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. It had this to say, (and this report was presented to the government some few years ago):

“In view of the responsibilities already assumed by the province, and those imposed through implementation of recommendations 5, 6, 7, 11, 12 and 13 above, in particular, no specific allocation of Dominion-Provincial tax agreement income to the municipalities should be made.”

And finally that,

“In view of the present high level of commitments, and the precarious nature of the present revenues, no future commitments of any kind should be undertaken by the province without careful appraisal of the financial position of the province.”

I might say that the recommendations they referred to have been carried out almost completely by the Government since receiving this report, and I might say in addition, too, the Government of the day has made substantial additional contributions to municipalities and to educational boards throughout the province of Saskatchewan, and I will deal with that just a little later.

Mr. Speaker, 10 year ago this coming June there was a very important international conference which convened in London, England. It was the first international conference of primary producers, and there were representatives there from 44 nations of the world, gathered for the purpose of considering what boiled down to be three basic questions affecting the primary producers of agricultural commodities throughout the world. One question they asked themselves was this: Can the cultivated acres of the world give to the peoples of the world a standard of living envisaged by the late President Roosevelt in the Atlantic Charter?

Two: In the opinion of this conference, what is the best method of distribution of the foodstuffs from the surplus-producing nations to the deficiency nations?

There were three basic conclusions arrived at after some 12 days of deliberation on the part of the delegates attending this conference from some 44 nations of the world:

- (1) National marketing agencies in the countries with surplus foods.
- (2) Inter-national wheat agreements between the exporting and importing nations.
- (3) A world's food bank.

On Monday of this week, Mr. Speaker, a very important conference convened in Geneva; a conference for the purpose of considering the future of the International Wheat Agreement. This conference is of vital importance to the social and economic welfare of the Dominion of Canada, and in particular, the three western provinces. The future of the International Wheat Agreement, one of the basic recommendations made at the conference I refer to is at stake. Canada produces 80 per cent more bread grains than she finds is needed within the boundaries of the Dominion of Canada for domestic consumption; or between 350 million and 400 million bushels annually, of the finest bread wheat produced in the world.

We recognize that there are very well qualified advisers to the Federal Government sitting in at the conference in Geneva at the present time, but I am somewhat concerned that we do not have representing the Dominion of Canada, some of the top-flight cabinet ministers closely associated with international trade, and the marketing of agricultural produce in attendance at that conference. The whole basic principle of the Atlantic Charter, and the conclusions arrived at at the first international conference of producers is at stake at the present time, at the conference in Geneva.

Mr. Speaker, a brief history of the development of municipal government in what is now the province of Saskatchewan. In 1905, on the formation of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan from part of the area that was, at that time, the Northwest Territories, a provincial government was established in each of the provinces. The first session of the first legislature of the province of Saskatchewan was held in the early part of the year 1906. At that and the following meetings of the legislature, a commission was set up for the purpose of studying the organization of municipal government, as it would apply to the people and to the province of Saskatchewan.

So we find in 1908 and 1910, the Acts governing cities, towns and villages, and rural municipalities were assented to. Thus, the pattern of municipal government was formed, and during the intervening years a number of changes in organization and administration has been deemed advisable, in order to increase the efficiency, and what is more important, to ensure a more democratic working of municipal government. The pattern of settlement on the prairies of this province was very closely associated with the development of municipal government, and over the past 50 years, since the formation of the province, we now have in Saskatchewan 296 rural municipalities; 377 villages, 98 towns and 8 cities, or a total of 779 local municipal governments representing the people of the province of Saskatchewan, in the municipal field.

It is rather interesting to note that one of the first considerations of those who pioneered the prairies of this province was education for their children. Over the years there were over 5,000 local school districts organized to bring education within walking distance of the rural children of the province. There were also some 500 trading centres organized in this province. So from 1882 to 1907, the local governments' responsibilities within the province of Saskatchewan were taken care of by those administering the Northwest Territories Act, which was the responsibility at that time of the national government at Ottawa.

It was only natural that, during that period of time, when little or no revenue was derived from taxation, the Federal Government at Ottawa, under the Northwest Territorial administration, would become responsible for some of the public works in the rural areas in this province, and to a lesser extent in the urban centres. Consequently, what the hon. members opposite say from time to time, that many of the bridges that we have in the province of Saskatchewan, or had, were built by governments, either federally or provincially. Because after all, it was 2 years from the time of the first settlement before there was any rural or provincial government to speak of in what is now the province of Saskatchewan.

It is interesting to note that as we go down through the history, the pattern of settlement from homestead, to homestead and pre-emption, homestead pre-emption and additional land purchased under an Agreement of Sale. Until about the middle 'thirties', we found that we had some 150,000 farm units in this province, and at one time our rural population out-numbered the urban population two to one. While there has been a steady decrease in the number of occupied farm units until today they number just slightly in excess of 100,000; the cultivated acres and the tonnage of foodstuffs produced, Mr. Speaker, in recent years far exceeded the acres under cultivation and the tonnage of foodstuffs produced when we had in the neighbourhood of 150,000 occupied farm units in this province. So today we find that approximately 50 per cent of Saskatchewan's population is in rural areas and 50 per cent in the urban sections of this province.

I think that it was only natural that municipal governments should attempt to render the service to its people that was allocated to municipal governments by virtue of the Legislative Acts under which they operate. One of their first considerations, as mentioned previously, Mr. Speaker, was that of education, closely followed by health, public works, and in the urban centres the public work consisted very largely in the early days of streets and sidewalks, moving from there to sewer and water. And this change in the pattern of settlement is indicated by the number of changes that have been

made in the boundaries of our urban centres in this province. For example between 1945 and 1955, the period of the greatest expansion in the history of this province, there have been 90 alterations in the boundaries of the villages, 36 alternations in the boundaries of the towns, and eight changes have taken place in the boundaries of the cities.

I believe the hon. members opposite sometimes overlook that here in our province we have 145,000 miles of rural surveyed road allowances; 145,000 miles to service 100,000 farm units, or approximately 1½ miles of road allowance per farm unit. This is approximately one-third of the total mileage in all of Canada. It is a greater mileage than that of Manitoba and Alberta combined, and the additional responsibilities placed upon municipal governments, both rural and urban, since the formation of the province, is strongly indicated, particularly in the rural areas, by the increase in the number of motor vehicles that are registered in this province. For example, in 1905 there were 22 motor vehicles and no trucks in what is now the province of Saskatchewan. In 1955 there were 275,000 motor vehicles registered in this province. Going back again to 1905, the total expenditure on all types of kinds of roads in this province, Mr. Speaker, was \$54,000, and in 1955 the estimated expenditure was \$28 million, by rural municipalities and the Department of Highways. It is also of some interest to note that today \$54,000 is spent on one mile on certain sections of the Trans-Canada Highway; and trucking associations are still complaining that we haven't got the kind of a road to carry the kind of freight trucks that they would like to operate on the roads of this province.

The distribution of the tax dollar as between Federal, Provincial and Municipal has also undergone a tremendous change in recent years. For example, in 1926, 46 cents out of every tax dollars went to the Dominion Treasury, 18.7 cents to the Provincial Treasurers of the Dominion and 35.3 cents to the municipalities of the Dominion of Canada. As we move on from 1926 to 1952 we find that 72.2 cents out of every tax dollar went into the Dominion Treasurer, 15.7 cents into the Provincial Treasuries of Canada, and 12.1 cents into the local governments. So we find that the Dominion government expenditures have increased in this comparatively short time from \$313 million to \$4.270 million, or about 13 times. This naturally would bring about, and did bring about, Federal-Provincial conferences for the purpose of considering advisability and ways and means of the reallocation of the citizens' of Saskatchewan tax dollar.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, recognizing the important place of local government in our society took the lead in advocating that there should be a place for local government representation around the conference table at the Dominion-Provincial gathering. And at the October conference it was very gratifying to note that nine of the 10 provinces had municipal advisors with them at that conference.

I remember three years ago at the International Municipal-Mayor gathering in Montreal that the Mayor of Edmonton who was chairing that panel got up and read a letter from the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan supporting the national body of mayors and municipalities in their request to have municipal representation at Dominion-Provincial conferences.

Now a great deal has been said about the lack of financial assistance given to the municipalities of this province, by the Government

February 23, 1956

of this province, and undoubtedly there are those opposite, Mr. Speaker, those to your left, who are not fully aware of the indirect assistance given to municipalities during the past 12 years. If they are familiar with all of the indirect assistance rendered to municipalities, then I regret the type of debate that they are carrying on at the present time.

I think the hon. member from Last Mountain (Mr. R. Brown), in moving the Address, and the hon. member from Biggar (Hon. Mr. Lloyd), the Minister of Education, and others have dealt very effectively with the average mill rate for municipal and educational purposes. I think they have dealt very effectively with the tax dollar cost per quarter-section. I think they have dealt effectively with the per capita tax, and the cost of education per pupil, attending schools. I want to say here that I am firmly of the opinion that our municipal and school officials are doing a very good job.

Some Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — All I want to say in connection with that is this, that I think members opposite, Mr. Speaker, are fully in accord that our economy in this province and that the economy to a similar degree in Manitoba and Alberta is dependent upon the return per occupied acre of farm land on the prairies of Western Canada. I think those opposite are in full accord with that statement. If they are, now might I just say this, that the taxes on the land that I have spoken about, that is the area of taxable land in the province of Alberta are, in 1953, 67 cents per acre; in the province of Manitoba, 81 cents per acre; and in the province of Saskatchewan 45 cents per acre. Now those are the direct taxes, and that is what the members opposite seem to be most concerned about, Mr. Speaker.

In addition to the direct grants given to the rural municipalities for public works, which has increased by 400 per cent in the past 10 years, there is also indirect assistance given to the municipalities. It has been mentioned in this House earlier in this debate the cancellation of the seed grain debt, that took a very substantial debt off the shoulders of the municipalities.

And then take a look at the increase in social aid assistance in the past 10 years, and we find it up \$4 million. Four million dollars, at least, of additional assistance in the social aid field in the past 10 years. There has been an increase in the San levy, an increase from around \$280,000 in 1945 to \$575,000 in 1954.

Then we come to the cancellation of the Public Revenue Tax, and just before we mention the cancellation of the Public Revenue Tax, it is rather interesting to pick up the debates and proceedings of February 20th, 1952. Mr. Danielson (the hon. member for arm River), says here:

“I have had Reeves and Councillors come to me and say ‘what are they worried about, all they have to do is to let us keep the Public Revenue Tax, and we will look after our own roads. We are not asking for any road grants, if they will let us have that mill and a half’,

(and may I correct to say that it was 2 mills;)

‘on the assessment which we now have to pay to the Saskatchewan government’.”

Then a little further on in the same debate and the same day, the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) said:

“Today all we ask, Mr. Speaker, is this – let us attend to our business, let us levy our own taxes, and you can take your road grants and forget about them.”

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — But we never get any.

Some Hon. Member: — We voted against it.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Now, Mr. Speaker, what has the cancellation of the Public Revenue Tax meant in the last three years to the municipalities in the province of Saskatchewan? A total of \$5,795,559, for which the rural municipalities benefited to the extent of \$3,944,909.

Then in addition to the Public Revenue Tax, there was a saving to the rural municipalities, as well as the urbans, as a result of Saskatchewan’s hospitalization service plan. Taking as a representative year 1955, a survey shows that municipalities paid hospitalization tax for 5,795 indigent persons. Many of these indigents were hospitalized, but the hospital plan paid \$146,536 for the hospitalization of the indigents that the municipalities paid the tax for. That is in my opinion, a very substantial saving to rural municipalities, to urban municipalities, to have the benefit of the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Plan.

Then last year, in the light of the emergency that existed at that time, there was a special fund to assist the municipalities in the public work, and it is not generally accepted or considered that the Community Planning Branch, which is of untold assistance, particularly to the urban municipalities, and is becoming more important to the rural municipalities of this province, is carried on at the expense of the province. The Assessment Branch, which costs \$175,000 annually, is an expense borne by the province of Saskatchewan for a service rendered to the municipalities of the province of Saskatchewan.

ten, Mr. Speaker, it is also of some interest to note that when the Inter-Provincial crude oil pipeline spanned this province, those who were responsible for the line recognized that there was going to be a municipal tax; they came to the Government and suggested that they pay to the Government the tax. I Might also say that the C.P.R. branch lines, and the works on the branch lines that are associated with the operation of the main line, came to the Government and suggested that we pay you the tax, an we said no. We said:

“These pipelines, these oil-lines, the railway lines run through municipalities; we will fix the assessment according to the formula, and you pay to the municipalities the tax that they are entitled to receive on the basis of the fixed assessment.”

It is rather interesting to note that the equalized assessment in 1955 for railways, excluding the main line of the C.P.R. and for the

Inter-Provincial Pipeline and oil wells, amounted to \$17,743,000, and at the average mill rate in the province, that meant the municipalities were receiving in taxes some \$1 million per annum. These are some of the indirect benefits associated with the services rendered by this Government to the municipalities of the province of Saskatchewan.

Now I note my time is running very, very short, Mr. Speaker, but I would just like to conclude by stating this, the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr), as I stated before, said he could not see his way clear to support the Throne Speech, because we had not solved the municipal problems.

Might I just point out that no province in the Dominion of Canada has solved the problems of municipal government. It is one of the foremost and basic problems confronting provincial governments from one end of Canada to the other, and in the very rich province of Alberta, the Premier of that province mentioned at the Dominion-Provincial conference that they had set aside a revolving fund of \$100 million to loan to municipalities to assist them in their self-liquidating public works projects, and he stated that this sum, in the opinion of the municipalities, when it was discussed, was sufficient to do them until 1960; but at the end of 1955, over \$90 million of this sum had been loaned for that purpose, and the net result today in the province of Alberta is that the municipal debt is \$200 million, and the provincial debt is approximately \$88 million, with probably sufficient surplus accumulated to discharge that obligation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again in conclusion, I am sometimes inclined to agree with Oliver Wendell Homes, Jr. who said that he likes to pay taxes, since they are the price of civilization. I want to say that, in common with the members on this side of the House, I am a firm believer in democracy, by which I mean organized society living under the rule of law, and I want to state further that in my opinion it is impossible to preserve democracy in a modern state unless local and municipal institutions are preserved and the function of local government are much more fundamental to democracy than just requisition senior governments for assistance, and I want to say that this Government is committed to the calling of a Provincial-Municipal Conference.

Mr. T.R. MacNutt (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, at this time I do want, very hurriedly, to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. With the material they had to work on, they did a very marvellous job.

There is one thing I admire, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the hon. gentlemen on your right can talk more and say less than any bunch of people that I ever saw in my life before.

Premier Douglas: — Agreed.

Mr. MacNutt: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I haven't got very much time today because I have promised to give one of my colleagues part of my air time. The trouble with us on this side is that we have so little air time we have to cut our speeches pretty short. However, I do want to say a few words about some of the remarks made by some of the hon. members on your right, Sir, and I regret very much that I must take to task my old colleague of former times, just to correct some of the misleading statements that he had made in his speech.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of his remarks. One of the most glaring mistakes that I could see in that speech was the comparison of the provincial debt in 1944 and 1954. I have here a copy of the 'Leader-Post', February 14th, and I quote:

"Fiscal policies of the Government haven't been coming in for enough publicity", he said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I quite agree.

"The C.C.F. took over a bankrupt province when they came into power, the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. R. Brown) said".

Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with that.

"The Provincial debt at the time was over \$177 million."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know just where he got that \$177 million. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics the provincial debt at April 30, 1944, before this present Government took office was \$214,253,000. I don't know what he did with the other \$47 million, he must have overlooked it somewhere or other.

Now how did we get in that shape? At that time, Mr. Speaker, early in the 'thirties' our Saskatchewan Wheat Pool was broke, and I don't think that anybody in the province of Saskatchewan wanted the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to be broke, and the government of the day, which happened to be a Tory government, the Anderson government, extended to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool something like \$14 million, \$13,750,000. I do not think we can take exception to that, but it did increase our provincial debt by that amount, because they had to borrow that money; and then due to drought, grasshoppers, world depression, over which we had no control, and possibly at that time there were a few C.C.F.'ers coming along and they didn't help matters too much, the provincial government had to borrow huge sums of money to see that the people of this province were fed and clothed, and were provided with seed and feed and fodder. Now I do not think we can find too much fault with that. That money was borrowed, almost all, if not all, from the Federal Government at Ottawa, and the only fault that anyone could find was that probably the authorities didn't give the people of this province enough; probably they could have been a little more generous with the people, which would have made the provincial debt higher than ever. So I cannot see for the life of me, why the hon. members opposite, Sir, will come out and talk about the provincial debt going up and up and up in those times; there wasn't anything else that could be done about it.

Now let us see what happened after that. By December 31st, 1948, that was when the C.C.F. government had been in office about four years, the net debt was reduced by \$69½ million. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see how that debt was reduced. Our friends across the way, Sir, take all the credit for reducing the debt at that time. I have in my hand here, Sessional Paper #73, Session 1952, and it shows their figures, and this is what came into the Provincial Treasury from other than government agencies, other than the C.C.F. Government, and this money was, or should have been used, to pay off the

provincial debt. Paid off by the Patterson government \$5,213,000, that was the government that had gone bankrupt, they paid \$5 million of the debt at that time. Loans cancelled by the Dominion government \$44,368,000; that terrible Liberal government that we have down in Ottawa said to the province of Saskatchewan "You owe us this money, but we will forget it."

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. MacNutt: — Saskatchewan's Wheat Pool paid in \$4,627,000, and I believe, I am not too sure, but I believe that that finished off the indebtedness of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to the government at that time.

Government Telephones \$2,454,000. Saskatchewan Co-operative Creamery \$390,000; the Saskatchewan Co-operative Creamery had been helped before that. Farm loans repaid by farmers \$10,312,000; 1938 seed grain repaid by farmers \$5,561,000; relief account receipts, other than 1938 seed grain \$2,591,000; contingent liabilities repaid by municipalities \$1,259,000. Now that makes a total of \$76,775,000, Mr. Speaker, that was paid in by agencies other than government, or other than the C.C.F. Government.

Now we can be fair about this, there was a little better than \$5 million paid off by the Patterson government, so let's take that off, because after all that did come out of the revenues of the province, and we will say in round figures, call it \$72 million that was paid into this Provincial Treasury by agencies other than the C.C.F. Government. Now what do we find? They paid off \$69½ million of our debt, which tells me that instead of reducing the debt at that time, this Government increased the debt from 1944 to 1948 by \$2½ million.

Now the hon. member for Last Mountain tells us about the present debt, and he says:

"Under C.C.F. administration the net dead weight debt",

(and he says 'net dead weight debt' I want to draw your attention to that.)

". . . had been reduced to just over \$79 million in 1954, with a further reduction during 1955."

Now then, let us take a look at the figures from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. The net debt as at December 31st, 1955, amounted to \$200,089,000. This is an increase since 1948 of about \$55½ million, but this Government had \$72 million paid in by agencies other than taxes, and they paid off \$69½ million.

The Provincial Treasurer, of course, will say that we do not know anything about accounting over here, and that \$79 million is dead weight debt, and the balance is self-liquidating. No, I believe we have got a new phrase — 'loans and advances to revenue producing enterprises.'

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Another handle. He's changed the title again!

Mr. MacNutt: — Mr. Speaker, I don't care what the money is used for, a debt is a debt, and I don't mind if the Provincial Treasurer does

divide it up, and calls it one thing and the other something else, it is easier for accounting that is perfectly all right, but why under the sun, Mr. Speaker, why don't we go out and tell the people about this, instead of trying to mislead them, by stating that our provincial debt is \$79 million. It is no such thing.

I am not against mortgaging for the future, I am not trying to take this Government to task for borrowing money if it seems to be in the interests of the province and good business, but I do not like to see anybody going out and trying to mislead people. Let us tell the people that we have a \$79 million debt that has got to come out of the revenues of this province and we have got to tax for it, and according to this we have got another \$121 million that we have borrowed for revenue-producing enterprises. I just wonder – I hope, that they will be revenue-producing enterprises. However, Mr. Speaker, in the past we have borrowed a certain amount of money for these revenue-producing enterprises, and several of them have gone broke, and the losses had to come out of the Treasury of the Province.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — We got some shoes.

Mr. Cameron: — And blankets.

Mr. MacNutt: — Now I sincerely hope that in the future we don't have any of our enterprises go broke, but strange things have happened, and whether it is a self-liquidating debt or not, we as a province have to be responsible for the payment of that money, whether it is supposed to be self-liquidating or not.

After the hon. member for Last Mountain told us about the public debt, he went on to tell us what the Government had done for municipalities and we have just heard a little more about what the Government has done for the municipalities. Mr. Speaker, I live in the rural portion of this province, and you go out and try and tell the rural municipalities, you go out and try and tell the farmers that, and I think you won't have too much success.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — You know better.

Mr. MacNutt: — I do want to draw your attention and I am not going to say too much about it, but I do want to draw your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Last Mountain gave the average municipal tax of the province at 22 cents per acre. I thought at the time that he had made a mistake, but he didn't correct it, so I suppose that he must have meant it.

Mr. Brown (Last Mountain): — Don't worry, I will, at the first opportunity.

Mr. MacNutt: — I don't know where he got that figure. Now if that is so, at 22 cents per acre, it will work out to about \$35 per quarter-section. Well now that will be a lovely state of affairs if it were true, but it isn't. The Department of Municipal Affairs, in the 1953-54 report, gives that figure at 49.88 cents per acre. As my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) pointed out that that would amount to about \$80 per quarter-section, which is nearer the mark.

Mr. Brown (Last Mountain): — How much is it in Manitoba?

February 23, 1956

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — You don't know.

Mr. Brown (Last Mountain): — Don't I?

Some Hon. Member: — You don't know anything.

Mr. MacNutt: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to take a look for just a few moments, I haven't got too much time, at what has been done for us in northeastern Saskatchewan, especially in the constituency of Nipawin. Ever since I have become a member of this Legislature I have asked that consideration be given my part of the country in the way of drainage, larger grants for municipalities, extension to highways, and the opening up of that country between Carrot River and The Pas. Now there has been some drainage work done up there, I am going to give the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) some credit here. I shouldn't maybe, but I am going to. I am going to pat him on the back with one hand and slap him on top of the head with the other.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — And hit me on the backside with the other.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Don't hit him too hard on the head.

Mr. MacNutt: — We do appreciate the amount of work that has been done this year, but it is years too late. Too little and too late! Now it has been suggested by some people in my part of the country that a lot of those ditches aren't in the right spot.

Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — It was dry last year.

Mr. MacNutt: — Yes, in some places they do dry up and these ditches will not do as effective a job as intended. I don't know anything about that, but we will know as soon as we get the spring run-off, which won't be very long now, I hope. We didn't have any ditches last year. I want to say to the Minister of Agriculture that he has just started and we are not going to be satisfied until he goes a long way farther, so I hope to see the Minister up in that country in the coming summer, and I am sure that he will be very welcome.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I'll be up there.

Mr. MacNutt: — Our needs are serious and we have to have more drainage; we have to have drainage and lots of it, and if this work had been done when it should have been done I do not believe that we would be in the sorry mess that we are in at the present time.

Now as far as grants to the rural municipalities are concerned, I have three rural municipalities in my constituency. That doesn't sound like very many, but they are large municipalities, they take in a lot of country. In 1952, we got a special grant up there to build a road from Nipawin east to the Co-op Farms. Well, that was election year, which helped out a lot, and now we might get a little more this year. Since then all we have had is the equalization as far as I know.

I want to say a word or two very quickly about bridges. The bridge situation in that country is deplorable. Last spring the bridge at Love went out. I got in touch with the Department about that, and I was told that they wouldn't be able to put it in right away, and probably wouldn't have it in even at harvest time. What did that mean? That meant that the people north of the river had to go away around out to No. 35 highway, the extension of No. 35 highway, you know the one that goes out into the blue there, and come down No. 35 highway and around that way, and they had to go through bush roads. If you had ever travelled them, Mr. Speaker, you wouldn't want to go through it again. There is no reason why they couldn't have made an effort to put that bridge in, and give those people a way to their market places.

The bridge leading into the Co-op Farm (and they haven't got too many ways to get in or out of there) became impassable last spring. I wired the Minister of Highways about it, and I am going to give him full marks for answering me promptly. I had a letter back by return mail saying:

“If the crews weren't in there, they would be in there shortly.”

Well, they did come in. They took a look around and made a few minor repairs, and then they took off, and today, Mr. Speaker, the people aren't using that bridge; they are going down across the ice. Whatever is going to happen when the break-up comes – those people are going to be isolated again, and I would say that it is just sheer inefficiency.

What about the bridge between Arborfield and Carrot River? That happens to be in the constituency of Kelsey. I don't know what my hon. friend over there has been doing about it, but apparently nothing too much.

Hon. Mr. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — The hon. member knows better.

Mr. MacNutt: — That bridge has been in a terrible mess for quite some time now. All last summer when you turned on CKBI at one o'clock p.m. to listen to the road report, it read something like this:

“Secondary highway – Carrot River to Crooked River – fair, rough in spots. Watch for unsafe bridge between Arborfield and Carrot River.”

Mr. Speaker, that is the main road that we have up in that country. We haven't any blacktop, we haven't any highways up there, all we have got is a secondary highway with an unsafe bridge.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You should live in Carrot River, and then you wouldn't have to travel.

Mr. MacNutt: — I am sure that the hon. Minister would like to get me out of his constituency, but I think I am going to stay there.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I see that my time is running out, and I have a lot more stuff here yet, but then I expect to speak again, and I will give it to you at that time, but actually we are just getting a little fed up when we

get bridges sent up to us, we get second-hand bridges, we haven't got a new bridge up in that district, at least none that I know of. When we need a bridge, they take a bridge out some place else and they send it up to us, steel bridges that you can't get a combine over without taking it to pieces. What we are looked on as, Mr. Speaker, is just a bunch of poor relations, and we are just getting a little fed up with it up there. We want a little more action on highways and roads and bridges, and I can assure you that the people there spoke in 1952, and they said they didn't like the actions of this Government at that time and they elected a Liberal member in the constituency of Nipawin that had been C.C.F. for some time before that, and I can assure you that they are going to do more of that in the north country in the next election.

The north half of the province, Mr. Speaker, is a rich part of the province. The south half has been carrying the economy of the province ever since the province has been formed, and they have done a good job of it too. It is time that more attention is paid to the north, the natural resources taken advantage of, to relieve the pressure in the south and make this province one of the greatest in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I see my time is up, and I will close now by telling you, and I think probably you will have learned it by this time, that I do not intend to support the motion.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, you will recall that, not many months ago, a bombshell was dropped in the House of Commons when the C.C.F. member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre deflected from the C.C.F. Party.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak (Minister of Telephones): — Here we go again!

Mr. Cameron: — This young man, elected to the Commons at an early age, and returning again with an overwhelming majority, in 1953, rose in his place and stated with dignity and with feeling that he could no longer support the C.C.F. Party. He stated that the actions of the C.C.F. in the House of Commons, no matter how well-intentioned, could not help but give comfort to Soviet Russia. Turning to the C.C.F. in Saskatchewan he stated:

“The left wing element has gained an unwarranted and dangerous recognition with the councils of the party.”

The action of this member in leaving the C.C.F. Party because he could not longer, in conscience, support them, electrified this province.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Who wrote that?

Mr. Cameron: — Many who feared the C.C.F. as a leftist party in 1948 cut their majority from a landslide victory, in 1944, to within an inch of defeat in 1948. What appeared to be a change of heart of the Government lulled Saskatchewan into a sense of security. It was not until one of their own members, with first-hand knowledge of the aims and aspirations of the C.C.F. . . .

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — What are you reading from, Cameron?

Mr. Cameron: — . . . bolted the party to place the people on guard in this

province once again.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Who wrote your speech?

Mr. Cameron: — Actions of the C.C.F. Party began to receive close scrutiny . . .

Mr. Kramer: — You'd better talk to him, 'Hammy'.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — Reports appeared in the press of a man hanging around the collegiates of Regina when he should have been working, handing out literature and attempting to spread communist teachings. When asked by a reporter who he was and what he did, in answer he stated he was Educational Director for Saskatchewan, that his wife was the Chairman of a Youth Organization sponsored by the Communist Party; that they were organizing a group between the ages of 14 and 30, and that these young people could join under one condition, and this was the condition; that they pledged to work for the establishment of an absolute socialist state, as established in Russia.

Last year in the Legislature I asked if this man worked for the Government and the answer was that he did. Here was a civil servant in the employ of this Government, during working hours out peddling communist literature to the high school youth of the city of Regina. I said nothing about this because I felt it was only an isolated case, and I hesitated to bring to public attention something that might be construed as casting a reflection on the civil service.

Mr. Kramer: — Oh, not you!

Mr. Cameron: — However, in December, I saw in the daily paper where the Deputy Minister of Labour and Assistant Deputy Minister of Health actively participated in a communist-dominated meeting on behalf of a convicted communist spy, and I felt it was time to speak out. The press report said:

“Mrs. Helen Sobell, wife of a communist sentenced in the United States to 30 years for espionage, was appealing for funds for a new trial for her husband.”

They went on to say that one Deputy Minister was chairman of the meeting and the other was present on the platform. Mr. Speaker, that press report appeared in the daily press; there has been nothing to indicate at the present time that anyone took exception to that press release.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — How about yourself?

Mr. Cameron: — Knowing there was a civil servant peddling communist literature to high school students, and now finding two Deputy Ministers arranging for and conducting this particular meeting, and conscious of the former C.C.F. member for Moose Jaw's statement that he felt that left-wing elements had gained an unwarranted and dangerous recognition with the councils of the C.C.F. . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You're a nice reader.

Mr. Cameron: — I felt compelled to demand action.

February 23, 1956

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — And Staines is a nice writer.

Mr. Cameron: — I did so, fully conscious that every left-wing in the country would condemn me as instituting a ‘witch-hunt’. Further developments since then, Mr. Speaker, verified in the press reports, have removed any doubt in my mind that I chose the proper course. I could bring into this House, Mr. Speaker, bundle after bundle of letters, letters from every constituency in the province of Saskatchewan, letters that I received from Alberta and British Columbia, Manitoba . . .

Some Govt. Member: — He should table that.

Mr. Cameron: — . . . as a result of this. While the wording was different, the tone was the same. Each offered me moral support and each sent clippings and magazines which they hoped would assist me.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You need plenty of moral support.

Mr. Cameron: — I read in the papers, the other evening, that Russia had announced she had a budget of \$100 million for propaganda in the western world. It is evident to me, with hundreds of millions of dollars available, Mrs. Sobell did not have to come to Saskatchewan to raise funds for a new trial. Fully aware then of the implications of his actions, in a press report, the Deputy Minister quickly attempted to allay the fears of the people by assuring the public that neither the C.C.F. nor the Government had anything whatever to do with organizing this meeting on behalf . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Is the hon. member quoting, or is he reading his speech?

Some Govt. Member: — He’s reading it.

Mr. Cameron: — I suggest that when the Deputy Minister issued that statement he did so knowing it was not true. He knew he was issuing a false statement, because he was a member of the committee that arranged for and sponsored this meeting, and thus, being a member of the committee he knew who the other members were. There appeared in the ‘Leader-Post’ — I am quoting from press reports in the ‘Leader-Post’. These reports likewise — December 22nd, a news release captioned ‘Sponsors Describe Purpose’; and that news release was put in the press by the sponsors of this meeting, themselves. And this release went on to list the names of the members of that sponsoring committee, and on the committee with the Deputy Ministers was Mr. Hansen, editor of the C.C.F. Commonwealth, and, to my amazement, the Hon. Tom Johnston. You, Mr. Speaker, — a member of the Cabinet and Speaker of this Legislature, actively arranged and participated in a meeting on behalf of this man convicted of espionage in the United States. As Anthony explains it, Mr. Speaker, that was the ‘unkindest cut’ of all.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I give you a little correction, and that is . . .

Some Opposition Member: Order!

Mr. Cameron: — Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: — I want to make a correction. I am not a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. Cameron: — I will accept that correction.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — You had better come down to the floor and speak.

Mr. Cameron: — I will accept that correction, Mr. Speaker, but you do hold a position of dignity in this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We'll bring that issue right on the floor if you . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . narrow minded . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Christianity, Mr. Speaker, was born in the yoke-bound colonies of the Roman Empire; . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, I'll say – Christianity! Perverted!

Mr. Cameron: — . . . and for centuries her subjects struggled towards a life of freedom . . .

Mr. Gibson (Morse): — Is that what it says there?

Mr. Cameron: — Our whole democracy is based upon the Christian concept of the dignity of man.

Mr. Kramer: — Who is the . . . McCarthyism?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — It took thousands of years of evolution to produce this new concept. Nevertheless, there is in the world today an evil force spawned in the Kremlin, compounded of hate and fear and greed and ruthless treachery, whose sole aim is to return man . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Who are you quoting now?

Mr. Cameron: — . . . again to the state of bondage from which he struggled so valiantly to emerge. In Russia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, China, and every country behind the 'Iron Curtain' slaves of communism are beating out the weapons for world conflict.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

Mr. Cameron: — When the evil viruses infiltrate into the minds of men . . .

Premier Douglas: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member sit down for a moment?

Premier Douglas: — The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald), the other day raised the question of reading of speeches. I have hesitated

February 23, 1956

to interrupt my hon. friend while he was in the main part of his speech, but the Leader of the . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Some Opposition Member: — Sit down, that's a speech.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — Sit down and let him make his speech.

Premier Douglas: — The Leader of the Opposition has already protested against written speeches, and now his own deskmate is doing more to violate that rule than any member who has yet spoken in this debate.

Mr. Danielson: — Every man on that side has . . .

Mr. Cameron: — May I go on, Mr. Speaker. This generous, humane Government so restricted us that I had ten minuets on the air and the Premier has been successful in taking up five of those. Nevertheless, I will try to proceed.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — And you have to take it.

Mr. Cameron: — The struggle in the world, today, is the struggle to possess the minds of men; and this struggle in the world, today, is a struggle unto death. There can be no choice as to which side we travel on.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Rabble rouser!

Mr. Cameron: — The C.C.F. have travelled far toward the ultimate end of socialism in the past six years.

Mr. Loptson: — We know where they belong.

Mr. Cameron: — I want to go back for a moment to 1950, and read reports from that year.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — I want to read what Mr. Coldwell had to say, and the Secretary of the C.C.F. National Party. At that time we were being flooded with literature, supposedly in the name of peace, by an organization known as 'The Canadian Congress of Peace'. Mr. Coldwell was asked what his interpretation was, as to how he assessed this organization, and I want to read his answer, from Vancouver, July 20, 1950. He said in an interview "that it was a ruse to assist the Soviet Union in disarming the peoples of democratic countries in order that Russia may continue its aggressive tactics." That was Mr. Coldwell's assessment of the Peace Congress, in 1950, the organization which the National C.C.F. Secretary termed, himself, a communist-front organization with which the C.C.F. would have nothing to do. Those were the statements in 1950.

Mr. Loptson: — They are quite different in 1954.

Mr. Cameron: — The various church denominations put themselves on record as unalterably opposed to this organization. The Canadian Legion vigorously opposed it. That is just six years ago! Coldwell said, speaking in Vancouver, July 26, 1950, stating further: “When organizations like The Canadian Peace Congress directs the major portion of their attack on the real forces of aggression as they are found in Communist-dominated countries, then they will deserve some measure of respect from the Canadian people.”

That was the stand, in 1950, and that stand was made eminently clear. When the Communist press in Toronto published the fact that the Saskatchewan Minister of Health had written to the Congress, when they met in Toronto, as a corresponding delegate, wishing them well, this astounded Mr. Coldwell and the National Secretary of the C.C.F. and that is when they made these pronouncements.

The C.C.F. National Secretary, in 1950, in reply, said when he was asked to join: “The C.C.F. would have nothing to do with this communist-front organization.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am taking statements given by the C.C.F. leaders themselves. Those aren't my statements. Those were the statements expressed in 1950.

Some Govt. Member: — The whole speech is not your statement; it is Hubert Staines'.

Mr. Cameron: — Let us look at the picture now to see why this member of Parliament should find it necessary to deflect from the party. Even as recently as 1955, at a meeting held in Regina this same Peace Congress expressed these views: “NATO generals were termed ‘war maniacs’; Sir Winston Churchill was termed ‘that wicked old devil’; and John Foster Dulles, ‘that eternally damned reprobate.’”

Those were the sentiments expressed in the city of Regina, chaired by the Chairman, whom we know and know she is employed here. In fact, according to the Peace magazine, they list (and these are according to their magazines, they are not my statements) that 14 Saskatchewan M.L.A.'s, including several Cabinet Ministers, supported them in their Peace League.

Premier Douglas: — Supported what?

Mr. Cameron: — In their Peace League – of their statement of May, 1955.

Some Govt. Member: — Any objection to peace?

Mr. Cameron: — These things, in themselves, when assessed over the whole picture led this man to deflect. Is it any wonder that he cried out that left-wing elements had gained an unwarranted and dangerous recognition within the councils of the C.C.F.? Sometimes many people, according to letters I have received, assessing this situation, are beginning to feel that we are fast getting ourselves into a position where the tail is wagging the dog. And then they talk of civil liberty. The Premier stated, “Mr. Cameron has served notice that if you elect a Liberal government every civil servant who attends a meeting of which the Liberals disapprove will be fired.”

February 23, 1956

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — That's right.

Mr. Cameron: — Let me say this to our 10,000 civil servants and employees of the Government, that we of the Liberal Party are conscious of the fact that civil servants play an important and a vital role in a democracy.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — If they do what they are told, eh?

Mr. Cameron: — In the history of civil servants in Saskatchewan, it contains the history of a host of people, particularly Deputy Ministers, who spent their lifetime in the service of our province, who served under different types of government, or different political stripe . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — They were all fired, weren't they?

Mr. Cameron: — . . . but who conducted themselves at all times with prudence and dignity and loyalty and commanded the respect and confidence, not only of the Ministers they served, but of all the members of the House, and of the people at large. He was always conscious, at all times, that when he lost the confidence and the trust of the people he lost his usefulness; and Saskatchewan owes a debt of gratitude to these men, who, throughout our 50 years of history have built up this great tradition. We have, today, many men and women of this type, carrying on the great tradition of faithful and devoted service. And we say to these people who are carrying on in the tradition of the civil service and have done so down through 50 years, you need have no fear.

Premier Douglas: — And no job.

Mr. Cameron: — We give you our pledge; we will safeguard the rights and privileges of these employees, but we will remove from amongst your midst those who have infiltrated and would bring discredit and disrespect to our great traditions.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You would have a purge!

Mr. Cameron: — The C.C.F. are quick to trot out the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights; they call it the great 'charter' of their employees. The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights did not confer upon one person any freedom which he did not enjoy before.

Premier Douglas: — Oh! Oh!

Mr. Cameron: — Any Bill of Rights serves a purpose in that it catalogues the rights and privileges, but it does not, in itself, guarantee those privileges; and neither does your Saskatchewan Bill of Rights, which I will point out to you in a moment.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It sure does.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — Here is an account of a document guaranteeing freedom under a Bill of Rights in this case, too, and according to this Bill of Rights it guarantees "all court cases were in the public; and all accused

were guaranteed the right of a counsel; judges were independent, subject only to the law; citizens are guaranteed freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, Mr. Speaker, freedom of demonstration and secret elections.” These guarantees, Mr. Speaker, form part and parcel of the constitution of a socialist Soviet Republic.

Mr. Swallow (Yorkton): — You don’t like that!

Mr. Cameron: — And would any of us want to live in that country, under that Bill of Rights? The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights has not brought security to its employees, which I am now going to deal with, and if the member from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) is here, and the member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Buchanan), they will know something about what I am going to mention. I can mention a civil servant who has been on the permanent staff of the civil service. He came home off the road and opened his mail at the supper table and he saw a letter from his Department, and he opened it thinking there might be something of importance in it which he should possibly deal with first. It was important – out fell up his lap a slip that said: “Effective immediately your services will be no longer required.”

Mr. Danielson: — Did they give any reason?

Mr. Cameron: — That gave him security – and this man said to me: “I joined the civil service and I worked myself into a permanent position because the slogan was ‘Join the Civil Service and Have Security’.”

Did the superintendent of the home in Melfort find security under your Bill of Rights? He was dismissed by a telephone call from the Minister of Social Welfare, verified by registered letter the same day; because, as the Minister said “for insubordination.” He appealed, under the Bill of Rights, for a fair and impartial trial . . .

Some Govt. Member: — You’re digging yourself a big hole in the ground.

Mr. Cameron: — This man here . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You don’t know who you are defending.

Mr. Cameron: — . . . and the Mayor of the Town, and the Canadian Legion was defending him, Mr. Minister of Agriculture. The Ministerial Association was defending him, Mr. Minister of Agriculture. I don’t know who I am defending – I never met the man or heard of him before.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You ought to know.

Mr. Cameron: — But he was a civil servant. These gentlemen lived there; they sent in appeals; the Board of Trade, the Canadian Legion, the Ladies Auxiliary, the Ministerial Association, asking for a fair and impartial investigation into conditions of the Home.

Premier Douglas: — Was it refused?

Mr. Cameron: — According to press reports, Mr. Douglas said: “This man has a course of redress; he can appeal under The Saskatchewan Civil Service Act or The Public Service Act, for review.”

February 23, 1956

Premier Douglas: — Did he appeal?

Mr. Cameron: — Just a moment; just bide your time. They said we want an impartial investigation to assess the blame for these conditions, but I do not want to go over those conditions; they were all washed in the daily paper. It was a disgraceful situation . . .

Some Govt. Member: — You are trying to dirty them all again.

Mr. Cameron: — . . . due to ‘lack of staff’, according to the press report emanating from Melfort. I wasn’t there.

Premier Douglas: — The reports were not true; I went there personally.

Mr. Cameron: — Perhaps not, but here is what I want to point out. Sure, the superintendent can appeal from dismissal under The Public Service Act, section 40 of this great Act gives him these rights:

“Upon appeal both employee and permanent head concerned shall have the right to be heard. The findings of this Commission which will be set up to hear it shall be considered by the Department head (that is the Minister himself) who shall dispose of the appeal and his decision shall be final.”

And to bring a redress against a Minister whom he thinks has done him wrong, and ask the Minister to sit in judgment of himself, and to assess whether or not he, the Minister, had done wrong.

Mr. Loptson: — That is C.C.F. justice.

Mr. Cameron: — That is The Public Service Act.

Premier Douglas: — It has been there for twenty years.

Mr. Cameron: — And that is how . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — You’d better change it, then.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You put it in.

Mr. Cameron: — You talk about our Bill of Rights in Saskatchewan. Practically every year amendments are brought into this Bill of Rights, there have been lots of amendments since I have been here, and every one of them have been of a restrictive nature; every one of them have been to remove some of those rights that we enjoyed before.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — For protection against your kind!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, we have a Bill listed here to come up for debate again; I think it is called “The Fair Employment Act”; they have taken it out of The Bill of Rights and established it in an Act, itself. It removed from the Bill of Rights the section dealing with discrimination regarding employment or membership in unions, and puts it in an Act of its own.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Any objection?

Mr. Cameron: — Sections 10 and 11 of the Act provide “that failure to reach a settlement on the complaint of any person who claims a violation of non-discrimination provision of the Act, the Minister of the Crown may appoint a commission of one or more persons and inquire into the complaint.” The Minister, then, may issue an order carrying out the commission’s findings. “Publications of the commission’s report must have the permission of the Minister before being published. Neither the findings of the commission, nor the findings of the Minister, can be appealed in the courts of this province.”

The right granted the individual to appeal to the courts for redress has been denied him under this Act. This Act sets the Minister up, meting out justice, and he, himself, beyond the powers of the court.

Take your Vehicles Act; you have the same restrictive legislation which has crept into that year after year. These magistrates, these judges have been robbed of their right to use compassion and discretion in assessing the degree of violation. And a Chairman of the Board has been set u with absolute power and his decision, too, is likewise not subject to the court.

What about the Bill that was passed with regard to purple gas? Just last year a Bill was passed that if you are found with purple gas in your car the penalty is such and such. A magistrate hears the case; he asks whether the man is guilty or not guilty – that is all he can do. The man may have been taking a sick child 50 miles to hospital over bad roads, and he may be picked up the next day on the street with purple gas in his truck. What can the judge do? Nothing. He can have all the compassion in the world, but the Act says “this is the penalty.” You have taken the discretionary power of the judge away from him, and the penalties are set, regardless of the conditions, regardless of the facts surrounding the case itself.

Some Govt. Member: You should join the Shakespearean Players.

Mr. Cameron: — Magistrates and judges have been relegated into the position of order takers, merely to assess guilt.

What was the effect of legislation, last year – we debated it here in the House. What about the regulation regarding people passing near or through or by a gaol? That legislation would give any guard the right, as a police officer, to bring this man before court, if he thought he had done anything that would be contrary to the discipline of the gaol itself. But the Act says:

“If, in the opinion of the guard, the man is guilty, the judge must find him guilty.”

Mr. Danielson: — C.C.F. justice!

Mr. Cameron: — Then you talk about the Bill of Rights and your justice of the people before the courts of law of this province. The judge in this case was relegated simply to a clerk recording; a judgment that was handed down by a guard, if that Bill had passed in this House.

Mr. Loptson: — Better scrap it.

Mr. Cameron: — Then these people talk about this Saskatchewan Bill of Rights;

February 23, 1956

the great humanitarian doctrine. Each year, bit by bit these rights and privileges of the individuals are being taken out of the Act, and this Government has ceaselessly been chipping away at the very foundation upon which our great judicial system was formed. Each year these foundations are weakened, with the ultimate end that our judicial system, if we continue in such a manner will collapse and crumble. Yes, that causes a smile. I wonder if you would smile if you went near the jail and someone thought you didn't have a proper haircut, and in his opinion you were guilty.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We're just laughing at your comedy of errors!

Some Govt. Member: — You need a haircut!

Mr. Cameron: — It won't be long, if we keep removing these freedoms, taking the powers from the Court; it won't be long before you can relegate the judges to a showcase in this Museum over there as a relic of the past, because you will no longer need them. There's nothing more for them to do.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — That's what some of them are.

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan needs a Bill of Rights, but it needs a Bill of Rights to guarantee the freedom of the people against the encroachment of their rights by this Government. That is the type of Bill of Rights the people of this province are beginning to ask for. When you talk to them out in the country they say, "Is there not some way that we can find some provision to protect this Government from encroaching upon the freedom that we want to have and enjoy?" Ask them out in the country, and they'll tell you that.

You travel down the road and someone comes along, as a man told me just the other day (and he talked about his freedom); he told me this: He was going down the highway (the Trans-Canada) with his truck, travelling at 50 miles per hour and he saw he was being followed. He figured it was a road patrol; he wasn't concerned because he was within the speed limits, but when he was stopped he said, "What's the matter — I was travelling 50 miles an hour; in fact to be exact, I think I was travelling 51 miles an hour. Can't a half-ton truck go 50 miles an hour?" The reply was, "You can if your truck is empty, but you have a half-barrel of fuel oil here and two cases of eggs; therefore you are classified as a truck."

Mr. Lopton: — That's the C.C.F. Bill of Rights for you.

Mr. Cameron: — Those are the things that the people are asking about. Every time they move off onto the highway; every time they have any doubt there is nothing but fear for the consequences of their actions, because they don't know what their rights and privileges are under this great Bill of Rights. And anyone that would say that the Liberal Party would rob these people of their rights and privileges know there were governments of the Liberal Party that instituted and embodied in statutes every freedom the people enjoy — every one! Not one has been added!

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — They wouldn't let you into that kind of a party.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Cameron: — There is another matter that I want to put on record in this House. I want to deal for a moment with the statement of the

member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Wahl), uttered in the House a short while ago in which he said that the 'Leader-Post' had suppressed the news of a death from diphtheria among an Indian colony, because they didn't want to embarrass the Federal Department of Indian Affairs. He said this was "an atrocious thing, because if they had brought pressure to bear upon Ottawa, the lives of these boys and girls would have been saved; therefore you have this death upon you." That statement went out in the press and across the radio throughout the land, and I want to read the response to that statement by the member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley:

"Reports of an outbreak of diphtheria among Indians of the Piapot and Sentaluta reserves were suppressed . . ."

And the paper goes on to say there was no suppression of the outbreak; they were reported January 3rd, January 10th, of this year. The main outbreak occurred in December. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Wahl), in the Legislature Thursday charged the 'Leader-Post' with suppressing the news for the reasons "it might be embarrassing to the Indian Affairs Department of the Federal Government." The first authentic word of the outbreak came from Dr. M.H. Dehnel, Regional Health Officer for the Regina Rural Region:

"No announcement either of the June case nor the December outbreak was forthcoming either from the Provincial Department of Public Health, nor the Government Bureau of Publications."

Mr. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — It happened on the Indian reserves.

Mr. Cameron: — The Provincial Government Bureau of Publications said it issued no release about the epidemic because it knew nothing of them.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Of course not.

Mr. Cameron: — The Health Education Branch, likewise, did not publicize the epidemic because its information was sketchy.

And then Dr. Walton, the City of Regina Health Official, commenting on this attack by the member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, that the newspaper suppressed the news of an outbreak of diphtheria among the Piapot and Sentaluta Indians, said, he received weekly reports on communicable diseases from the Provincial Health Department and from the Hospitals. From Ottawa a weekly report comes on communicable diseases all over Canada, and parts of the United States, and in this way the City Health Department has an up-to-date accurate knowledge of the incidents of these diseases in a pretty wide picture. Dr. Walton said, he was notified of the Piapot and Sentaluta cases last year through the usual weekly report channels."

I want to read a letter that appeared this morning in the 'Leader-Post' . . .

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Oh, you're getting pretty low now.

Mr. Cameron: — . . . which expressed — Thank you. If this gentleman . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Couldn't get any lower than you.

Mr. Cameron: — . . . he would be very glad to hear that remark. This letter was written by a man who knew something of Indian Affairs, by a missionary who has devoted his life, because of his love for the Indians, and I want to read into records to bring this man's voice into this Chamber, and lay on the records what he thought of the remark of the member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. The report reads:

“Indian Affairs, Mr. Editor, may I deal out a comment upon some of the statements attributed to Mr. Harry Wahl, C.C.F. Qu'Appelle-Wolseley in your issue dated February 17th. I would refer especially to his alleged remark of the callous attitude of the Indian Affairs Department, in not seeing that these children were inoculated, was a disgrace

“While I had no knowledge, whatsoever, of the outbreak of diphtheria in the Piapot Reserve, I deplore such a sweeping statement as that quoted above.”

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — He admits he didn't know anything about it.

Mr. Cameron: — “If Mr. Wahl really believes the Indian Affairs Branch to be a cold, callous organization, one can only deplore the fact that a person so ill informed should hold such a responsible, public position. Such abysmal ignorance of one's subject could only apply in the field of politics. However, one must be charitable and assume Mr. Wahl to be sincere, free from every wish to embarrass a government department by inaccurate statements, and I would therefore like to present a true picture of Indian Health Services as I have seen it in operation on a day to day basis both as a missionary on Indian reserves, and also as principal of a large Indian Residential School with over 150 Indian pupils.

“I see large hospitals, equipped with the most up-to-date facilities, well staffed with doctors and nurses and domestic staff. In many cases the staff serve in rather remote districts; sometimes actually on the reserves; for it is the department's policy to take its hospitals as near to the Indians as is convenient. And I see these large hospitals reserved exclusively for Indians who all receive the best of attention at no cost whatsoever to themselves. I see free transportation to and from these hospitals, sometimes by air ambulance, but often provided by the reserve public health nurse of the Indian Affairs Department. On or adjacent to the reserves I see the office of the Indian health nurse and again I see it well equipped with all types of medication, not excluding all the latest antibiotics – all free to the Indians. Further, I see the same nurse ploughing through the snow or mud to visit the Indian in his home

on the reserve, often travelling at night unescorted, and often under weather conditions that have stopped all traffic on the public highways. Again this service costs the Indians nothing at all; it is provided by ‘a callous Indian Affairs Department’.

“Here in this school, I see regular medical examinations by an Indian Affairs branch doctor and regular dental care by an Indian Affairs branch dentists, plus regular attention by an Indian Affairs branch nurse. I see recommendations for hospital treatment where necessary, all free, of course. I see a school dispensary, well stocked by the Indian Affairs branch with everything we need from antibiotics down to vitamin capsules. However, I see also another side of the picture; a side that gives me much concern. I have on my desk at this moment recommendations from the Indian Affairs branch doctor for 21 children to receive hospital treatment, some fairly urgent. I have also a letter from the nurse, pressing me to get the children into hospital as soon as possible. To quote only two examples, I have a child with a serious mastoid condition which I am told may become grave at any moment. Another with an eye condition which may permanently impair the sight of one eye if it is not attended to. But I shall not send the children to hospital, for unfortunately, I have in some cases a flat refusal from the parents, while 12 other parents did not even answer my request for a signature on the form applying for medical attention. Should one of these children die, will Mr. Wahl again blame ‘the callous Indian Affairs Department?’

“I know of many cases where vaccination and immunization is refused. I have seen refusals to be X-rayed for T.B., and I have seen those suffering from T.B. hidden by their friends in some remote part of the reserve, rather than go to hospital. I have myself been criticized and abused by Indian parents for sending a child off for an emergency operation without their approval, and this at a time when the parents were away up north on a trapline and could not be located.

“No, Mr. Editor, I cannot agree that the Indian Affairs branch is ‘callous’. I deplore Mr. Wahl’s statement that ‘Indians are known by a number – and when one dies, the department just strikes out the number’.

Mr. Wahl: — It’s true.

Mr. Cameron: — “Possibly there is much to criticize, possibly some person was at fault in the Piapot incident;

February 23, 1956

but to draw from this such sweeping generalizations as Mr. Wahl does cannot be allowed to pass unnoticed. I challenge Mr. Wahl to produce official figures, showing the cost of medical and health services for our Indians, plus details of the numbers of treatments given; all of course at no cost to the Indian. Let the same publicity be given to this information as was given to Mr. Wahl's irresponsible statement and let the public judge for itself.

“Perhaps it may be as well to state that I am not employed in any way by the Indian Affairs branch, but I do like to see ‘fair play’.”

(Signed) Rev. Albert Southard, Principal,
Gordon's School, Punnichy, Sask.

That is the answer to the member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley; that is his answer, to something which he stated in this House when he stated what he knew to be a tissue of lies; and he stated it for cheap, political purposes, that's why.

Some Govt. Members: — That's not true.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member must withdraw that statement.

Mr. Cameron: — I will withdraw that statement.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You'd better withdraw the whole subject!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — The people will judge it in the manner in which it was given.

Mr. Wahl: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I think all my statements were proved; I have proof of them. I did not make any irresponsible statement.

Premier Douglas: — There isn't a single denial in that letter.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — In that letter he said he didn't know anything about it.

Mr. Cameron: — In this letter he assessed the situation; he found it, and I say this after the plea of this man, after the charges were refuted by the Department of Indian Affairs and by the press; if you had a spark of decency in you, you would apologize to the House and to the public, and make these statements known.

Mr. Wahl: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. That man didn't say any of that was untrue.

Mr. Cameron: — That's not a point of privilege.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — He said he didn't know anything about it.

Mr. Wahl: — That's right, he said he didn't know anything about it. I have the proof of my statements.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — He's judging you by himself.

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh, we never do that!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — How about apologizing for the speech you have given today? You are the one who should apologize.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Cameron: — I just want to read about the political performance and the great march to Ottawa of the C.C.F. I want to read from 'Saturday Night' December 10, 1955, and their assessment of the C.C.F., its leaders and its aims and where it is going in Canadian politics.

Premier Douglas: — It's not their assessment; it's the assessment of the writer of that particular article.

Some Government Member: — Who wrote it?

Mr. Cameron: — It says, 'during the past few years . . .'

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is going to quote, he must obey the rules of the House.

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, the article was written by John A. Irving. Do you know him?

Premier Douglas: — I know him. Explain it that way then, don't say the editor of the paper.

Mr. Cameron: — I didn't say the editor. I said I am reading from this particular magazine.

Premier Douglas: — You said it was their opinion. It is not their opinion, it is Mr. Irving's opinion.

Mr. Cameron: — This is the opinion they express:

“During the past four years it has become increasingly clear to informed Canadians that the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation is a prime example of the failure of a social and political movement.

“Recent provincial elections across Canada, coupled with the failure of the movement to make significant gains in the federal elections of 1949 and 1953 indicate that today the C.C.F. is barely breathing. Even its most ardent supporters must have been dismayed by its spectacular failures in provincial elections last June. Under new leadership in Ontario it won only three seats. In Alberta, the C.C.F. failed even more hopelessly;

there it yielded to a resurgent Liberal party the spear-heading of the attack on the Social Credit government.

“Why has the C.C.F. failed so miserably? Three factors are necessary for political success of the new social movement: leadership, ideology and strategy. In all three respects the C.C.F. has been singularly lacking in the qualities essential for success.”

Some Hon. Member: — Oh, you could write a better article than that!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, is my hon. friend finishing the sentence? I read the article very carefully. Have you left out the phrase, “except in Saskatchewan?”

Mr. Cameron: — Pardon? No, that’s not in this paragraph I just read.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, yes it is. Go ahead and finish it.

Mr. Cameron: — I’m coming to that. He is talking about your great national C.C.F. movement. This great “national democratic socialist movement”, as someone over there said the other day.

“Twenty-three years after its conception in Calgary, it seems more unlikely than ever that it will succeed in solving those problems.

Then he goes on, but I’m not going to read the whole thing:

“With the exception of Saskatchewan . . .”

Except one province out of 11. You see, Mr. Premier, it’s a way over here, and I was reading away over there; you got a little too hot a little too soon.

“With the exception of Saskatchewan, the leaders of the C.C.F. provincial parties in Canada share the merits and the defects of the national leaders of the movement. In neither the federal nor the provincial fields has the C.C.F. solved the problems of leadership.”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You’re not too happy about that, yourself.

Mr. Cameron: — “It is a fact that the movement has recently changed its name. Even in the economically depressed Maritimes, the ideology of the C.C.F. carries little appeal except in a few mining areas.”

Then it concludes:

“Incapable of developing a mass movement, harassed by schisms within their ranks, and frustrated

by smashing electoral defeats, the leaders of the C.C.F. have recently injured their cause almost to the point of no recovery. They are now blaming the apathy of the working man and the general trend against peoples' movements throughout the world for the failure of the C.C.F. to advance materially.

“The healthy critical attitude of the Canadian voter, the Ontario C.C.F. leader is reported to have said recently, has degenerated into a destructive, defeatist cynicism.

“Why does the alleged apathy of the Canadian electorate offer the C.C.F. a cup of bitterness rather than a challenge?

“Leaders of the C.C.F. would be well advised to admit frankly and fully that the fault is in themselves rather than in the Canadian people. They would then realize also that the C.C.F. is a spent force.”

Mr. Wahl: — Why don't you just pack up and go home then?

Mr. Cameron: — There is just one other little thing I want to put on the record and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) in speaking of the removal of the Public Revenue Tax, did not complete the picture. I want to go back to the Journals of February 20, 1952:

“On a motion for the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax put by the Speaker, the debate continued on the proposed amendment, and the question being put, the Yeas were: Benson, Tucker, Loehr, Dundas, Loptson, McCormack, Danielson, Trippe, Egnatoff, Banks, Horsman, Deshaye, McDonald, McCarthy and Maher.

“Those who voted against it led off with the Minister himself, Mr. McIntosh, Fines, Corman, Lloyd, Brown, Gibson, Marion, Swallow, Thair, Darling, Nollet, Howe, Douglas (Rosetown), Williams, Gibbs, Heming, Dewhurst, Stone, Erb, Kuziak, Denike, Walker (Hanley), Buchanan, Larsen, Walker (Gravelbourg).”

Every one of them stood up and voted against the removal of the Public Revenue Tax.

And then before the election they had a change of heart and thought they had better do what the Liberals had urged them to do . . .

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

Mr. Cameron: — That, Mr. Speaker, concludes what I wanted to say, and I have no intention of supporting the motion.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — My hon. friend spoke about an amendment that a vote had been taken on but he did not give us the motion that was being voted on at all. I think it would be fair to put that on the records, too. I wonder if he would like to do it.

Mr. McDonald: — You can't squirm out of it now; you voted against it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I would like to have the whole story read.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Has the hon. member finished his speech?

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, I said so, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I drew a blank.

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR TREATY INDIANS

Moved by Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland), seconded by Mr. Feusi (Pelly):

That this Assembly:

- (1) recommend that the Government consider the advisability of preparing and submitting legislation
 - (a) extending the provincial franchise to Treaty Indians unconditionally, and
 - (b) removing from existing provincial laws any restrictive legislation which denies to Treaty Indians certain of the rights, privileges and responsibilities enjoyed by citizens of Saskatchewan generally; and
- (2) request the Government to make representations to the Government of Canada with a view to the establishment of a Federal-Provincial Board or Commission to plan policies and programmes to ensure that the actual needs of Treaty Indians in the field of health, welfare, education and local self-government may be provided for, at the earliest possible date, on a basis of equality with the services in those fields now provided for Saskatchewan citizens generally, and without abrogation or loss of their hereditary or treaty rights.

Mr. J.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, in submitting this Resolution to this House, I recognize quite well that any legislation that we may pass will not solve the problem of 150,000 native Canadians in this country. The problem is serious, complicated, and will require considerable time and the best of judgment for its ultimate solution.

I think on one thing we can all agree, and that is that the

Indian people, since the encroachment of the Europeans have lost their country, their culture, and their traditions. They have been, since the first days of Cartier, an under-privileged people, and today after many decades of treaties with the Federal Government of Canada, they are still an under-privileged people, ill housed, ill clothed, beridden by hunger and disease, and having few opportunities to make a living. Certainly they have not the same opportunities as other people have, who came to this country from Europe and Asia and other parts of the world.

I do not think that this failure means that the aborigines, that is, the native people of Canada, have not the potential to make as good citizens as other people make. I think if they have not made a contribution such as we would like to see them make to this country, and have not improved their standards to the standards that we believe in, then to a great extent we who are the masters of this country, and who govern, are to blame.

I would like to point out at this time, Mr. Speaker, that when you go back to the early days of conquest of the Americas, we must recognize the fact that these people were not a savage people. They may have been primitive according to our understanding; they may have had a different culture, but the fact is that they had made tremendous progress.

We find today on the American continent the remains of the great buildings that they had, we find today in our ordinary life that many of the foods that we consume, and I could name many of them – corn, squash, even the tobacco that we take for enjoyment, potatoes; dozens of foods like that were originated by the Indian agriculturists. They did have a culture. True, that culture was different from ours, entirely different in fact. So for that reason we have treated them over the years as a savage and as a primitive people. One of the reasons why, I believe, we have treated them with prejudice is the fact that we did not like their ways of life and their culture. And the relationship between us (that is the white people as we call them) and the natives of Canada has never been too good in view of these inherent differences. Even today, wherever you may go across Canada (it is not so bad in the east, but worse in the west), you will find there is prejudice against the native Indians, for they are considered as inferior animals compared to ourselves.

I have an article here that I would like to quote at this time, which will give us some indication as to how we approach this whole subject. It is from the Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, Volume 20, 1954. One of the paragraphs says this:

“One major cause for prejudice was the Reserve, or the apartheid system which separated the Indians from the whites and conferred on them a special status. It exempted them, for example, from the income and other taxes that their white neighbours paid. It released them from any lawsuits for debt. It prohibited them from selling or renting any part of their Reserves, except through the Government, and debarred them from the white man’s privilege of purchasing alcoholic liquors.”

February 23, 1956

And it goes on in that way, pointing out the reasons for the prejudices. The white man feels that the native Canadian is in a privileged position, and he is prejudiced against that position. He feels, today, as has been mentioned on a number of occasions, and as has been indicated in a letter that was quoted by the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) that they get all these things for nothing; they get hospital services for nothing; they get medical care for nothing; and that is the attitude of many Canadians, and has resulted in so much prejudice.

I would like to quote again from the same article, and it is written, by the way, Mr. Speaker, by Diamond Jennise of Ottawa, and he talks about the present situation and what the obligations of the Canadian Government was in order to safeguard these people. We know that, in the early days of settlement when Canada decided that the west should expand, that it should develop into an agricultural area, the Indians were relegated to hunting grounds and the reservations. The Government recognized at that time, I believe, that the natives should have certain guarantees; and the question is what were the obligations of the Canadian Parliament and people of that time. "Briefly," the writer says, "to protect the Indians from exploitation."

That is one of the things: "To protect the Indians from exploitation." That is one of the safeguards that we tried to give them. Secondly, to safeguard their health and to educate them, and finally to train them for eventual citizenship.

Now the question I would like to pose to the members of this Assembly is this: when you consider the objects of those treaties, to safeguard the health of the Indians, to educate them, to train them for eventual citizenship, no one thought of how long it was going to take to do that – would it take 100 years, or 200 years, or would it take a millennium?

Now we have gone on for at least 100 years, and what is the situation today? We have, in my opinion, made absolutely no progress notwithstanding what some honourable Ministers of the Church may say as to how well we treat these people. There are situations in Canada today where the people have not a hospital, haven't a doctor's care, have no suitable way of making an income, and on top of all that, they are considered as No. 2 Canadians – different Canadians than we are.

Those of us who have travelled through the north and have met with these people, find there is a certain reaction that is encountered. It is a hatred of everything that we have done, and I think that if we analyzed the whole situation insofar as these people are concerned, we would find that that reaction is a result of our paternalistic or benevolent attitude towards them.

I know how I would feel, Mr. Speaker, if somebody said: "You aren't capable of looking after yourself, I will help you; but you stay over there on the reservation!" I feel that I, having some certain dignity, a certain pride, a certain philosophy of life, would resent the person who tried to be benevolent and paternalistic to me. Had that basic fact been recognized a long time ago, I think we would have dispensed with the

reservation system, and we would also have accepted these people into our society in the same way as we have accepted people from other parts of the world.

One of the worst things a native can say to another, and I have heard it on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, is this: if this native misbehaves in any way, he is told, "You are behaving just like a white man." If the native does something wrong, the worst thing that he could hear from his fellowmen, of the same culture and the same ethnic origin, is that "You are behaving like a white man." There is nothing worse that can be said, and it is a shame to us in a civilization such as we have in Canada today, and what we call a democracy, that we have 150,000 people that react in that manner towards us. Somewhere we must be wrong.

I am not going to suggest to this Assembly through this Resolution that this problem can be solved by assimilation. I do not think it can be solved by assimilation. I think the problem, as I have said, is a complicated one. It deals with a culture of a people; it deals with the feelings of a people, the self respect, the dignities that they have, and it is more a problem, I think, of integration into Canadian society. That is why in the Resolution I have mentioned first of all that we should give them the same freedoms that we have set down in our legislation for ourselves; and by integration I mean that we would treat them as a minority, just as other minorities are being treated in Canada today. We must get away from this idea of assimilation. You may be able to assimilate a small group of five, ten or one hundred people, but you cannot assimilate hundreds of thousands of people; and in this case we have 150,000, I am told, of Canadian citizens of native origin.

When I say these things, I am not the only one who thinks in this manner. I have referred in the past few days in my little bit of research to a number of articles by different people, and I find that without exception every one of these seems to feel the same way as I do, that the time has come in this great country of ours that we should open the doors for these people to come in. If they do not care to come, that will be their business, but the doors should be open. How long, I ask; how long as we to consider people who have the same potentialities, the same abilities, if they only had a chance, such as we have; how long are we going to consider them as little children, and as wards?

Certainly we cannot lead them to water and say, "you must drink"; but yet, Mr. Speaker, we can say, "there is the water, it's good for you. If you want to take advantage of what we offer to you, then the door is open." That is the purpose of this Resolution, and I think this Government can do considerable in speeding up and accelerating the process of integration of these people into the society of Canada.

Before I proceed any further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I have certain purposes in mind, and I have listed them here. One of the purposes I had in mind, when I brought in this Resolution was this, that after all, we as a Government – true, not the Federal Government, but the Provincial Government, Legislature – should take some action to bring about a condition that will raise the Indians to the level of

February 23, 1956

citizens within one generation, and by one generation, I understand 25 years more or less. That is one thing I considered, and the reason behind my thought was this – I know of other minority groups that migrated to Canada – yes, Ukrainian people, German people, Polish people and others – and I am one of those who came to Canada, and I think that it takes about that long to become integrated into a contemporary society.

Maybe with the native Indians it may take longer in view of the way we have treated them in the past. There may be a very sore spot in their hearts and in their memories, which will take longer. But, supposing it takes two generations; I still say we should take action to bring about a condition which will raise them to the level of citizens within a period of time.

Secondly, I thought that we should take action to preserve all the good in Indian culture and in Indian skills, which today I know are dormant to a very great extent.

I could talk about the subject of native culture and native skills, because I have been around a little, and I know that the people have abilities, certain things that they can contribute to the society which we are building in Canada today – to a new civilization, and I would like to see that these are safeguarded just as we have safeguarded those values of the various ethnic origins that came to this country.

I would like to say also I have this purpose, to try to encourage the Indian minority in Canada to accept of their own free will educational and other opportunities for ultimate re-establishment as a minority group in Canada, without any loss of hereditary or treaty rights, in order that they may live according to the comparable standards of living that we have as citizens of Canada today.

Mr. Speaker, when I hear anyone get up and say we are giving “this” free to the Indians, we are giving “that” free to the Indians, I can never forget that one of the greatest injuries ever done to any race – if there is such a thing as a race; (there is only one kind of race – Homo sapiens) but, to any ethnic origin anywhere, the greatest injury that I know of was done here in America, than in any other part of the world. They lost everything that they had been proud of; not only their country, but they have lost their souls, their culture and their way of life, and yet we say we have given them these things free!

Therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, that I want to include in this Resolution that we, if we are going to be just and fair to these people, must safeguard their rights under the contract which they signed with the Dominion Government. Surely the little that we are giving them in return for this country of wealth and opportunity is very little indeed, and let us not say we are giving them something for nothing.

I say that we should keep the doors open to these people, because they are underprivileged and it is going to take a little time before they realize what is in their best interests; but believing as I do, and as I know (because I have discussed this with them), that they desire to get up in the world, that they desire to meet with us, provided we will

meet with them, on common ground. I could mention situations here from which you can draw your own conclusions. Take, for example, a bank manager, or maybe some broker, who will come out into the north country to places like La Ronge or to Candle Lake, and when he gets out there, he comes up to the Indian and shakes his hand and tells him how glad he is to see him, and could he take them around so that they could get some good fishing, or it could be, of course, hunting ducks. And so for a whole week, Mr. Speaker, they are the best of friends. They associate as brother men, and when they go away, whether they pay or not, doesn't matter. The Indian is not too interested in taking money from friends, but he will accept it, and when they go away they shake hands again and they are the best of friends. But, Mr. Speaker, when that Indian comes into the city of Regina, or into the city of Saskatoon, or even into the little city of Prince Albert, and he walks into a hotel and wants a room, the hotel keeper will look at him and say, "Sorry, we are filled up." If that same man goes up to see his broker friend, or the manager of some corporation, the secretary looks at him and sees he is an Indian, and says, "I am sorry, the boss is away, or he is busy."

There is where the fault lies, Mr. Speaker. It is time that we accepted human beings such as ourselves as equals and not on the basis of how well they are off economically or according to the knowledge that they may have.

One way we can achieve some of the things that I have in mind is to give these people local self-government. Notwithstanding how my friends opposite may uphold the Department of Indian Affairs, it has failed. If they want some of the facts, at a proper opportunity I will be glad to tell them what goes on in some of these reservations; and when you talk about dictatorship, Mr. Speaker, there is where you will find it, dictatorship in a concentration camp.

There is only one answer this whole problem, and that is that we must give these people local self-government. We do not have to include them into the province of Saskatchewan and give them local self-government as we have in the municipalities, but we can grant local self-government and still have them protected under the treaties, and I think we can go farther than that. Maybe it's a vision. I am looking at the Premier here, and I hope that he will look into this; maybe we can take these 18,000 people of native origin in Saskatchewan today on their various reservations and say to them, "in your local communities where you have local self-government, we will permit you to elect a member into the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, so that he can talk in this House and speak for you, instead of the member for Cumberland.

Mr. Speaker, after 200 years all that we see around us is failure. It is true, we have made some worthwhile progress in the direction of amalgamation. I will admit that the Department of Indian Affairs as an agency of the Federal Government has had to make progress. I think that it is mentioned in one of these articles here that "after the Indians were just about gone through death and disease, something had to be done. In British Columbia, when the Government woke up in their Indian Agency, some good steps were taken. As a matter of fact, they even agreed that if the province wanted to grant them the right to a franchise and to vote, it

could be done. At the same time there has not been enough progress, and if we are going to integrate, at the rate we are doing now, I cannot see the day ahead of men when the problem will be solved, because if we take the figure of 150,000 native Canadians today, and if the figures from Ottawa are correct where they say that 1,000 every year are integrated into our society – as a matter of fact, I don't think they are integrated., I think they are assimilated; they get so fed up with the life on the reservation that they go out into society and become dependents on society. But if they get out of there, at the rate of 1,000 a year, not counting the natural increase, it will take 150 years from now before we could get them all off the reservations and assimilated. If one adds the natural increase every year, then the problem will never be solved; and so I say it is a problem for integration and recognizing these people as a minority, with all the rights of a majority. This is the state of affairs today.

I would like to mention at this time when speaking on this subject, that a solution has been found where a similar condition existed and it happened in the country of New Zealand, which is one of the Commonwealth countries of our group. They had, until about 60 years ago, a problem with their Maori people. The Maori people were in very many ways similar in their thinking and in their culture to the native people of the Americas, of Canada and the United States.

However, it appears that whatever government they had 60 years ago in New Zealand after they saw what was happening to these underprivileged people, who were primitive and displaced, they took the action other than segregation into the reserves. They tried to bring them into the society of New Zealand. True, they had considerable difficulties. For a long period of time they found the same thing as we would find here, under freedom. These people drank to excess; they just couldn't find themselves for a little while. Then, I understand, there was a group of young Maori people who saw the light, and got themselves organized into a youth movement, and in 50 years time (to make my story short) what do we find? We find the Maori people today active in agriculture; we find them in the professions; we find them in business, and we find them (I think 27 or 28 of them) in the Legislature of New Zealand, and that is the way that the problem can be solved here.

There is one more thing that I would like to mention before I close, Mr. Speaker, and it is this, and I mentioned it in my Resolution. Somebody has to assume the responsibility for the administration of social welfare, public health, education and other services. I think that all members in this House will agree with me that our public school system is the only system; if they do not I would like to go ahead and tell them something about the system that has existed on the reservations so far; but I think I spoke on a previous occasion mentioning in particular an area up north, and I am referring to these Mission Schools we had for training children from 200 miles away. I do not think it is satisfactory. Somebody has to administer services, and I submit to this Legislature that, on a non-partisan basis, (I think we are all interested in this problem as Canadians), the best way to administer would be through the Provincial Government. I do not see any better way. Of course, that would relegate

the Indian agencies bodily into the past, but maybe that would be better for Canada.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, there is a contract between the Indians, as we call them, and the Dominion Government under their Treaties, and if anybody is going to pay the 'shot' for the education and the social welfare, and for public health and all the other services that these people require, it will have to be the Government of Canada, which is responsible. Now we can hardly expect the Government of Canada to say to us, "here is the money, you spend it any way you like." I don't really know the answer, but I think the answer would be this: that we, as a Provincial Government, in co-operation with the Federal Government, appoint a Board or Commission or whatever you want to call it. One Government supplies the money, the other is going to administer the services, and together they can outline the policies and the kind of things that should be done. There should be all the necessary money available, and at the same time we should be able to provide the best possible services. Surely we are not the kind of people who, in order to make Canada a better country, would not go along with some such idea. It is quite possible that there may be a better way of doing it, but we have got to start somewhere, and so I have suggested such a Board in my Resolution.

And so, Mr. Speaker, since it is getting pretty close to supper time, I would like to move, seconded by the hon. member from Pelly (Mr. Feusi), the Resolution, standing in my name.

Mr. A. Feusi (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate the business of the House, I think I shall speak very briefly on the resolution. The member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) has given the matter very good coverage, and I should like to commend him on his sincerity of delivery. He has taken the needs and interests of a people who are not represented in this House and brought them forward, and my little share in this I shall be happy to perform.

The resolution asked for extension of all rights of citizenship to the Indians. It means throwing open the door to these people so that they can take their place beside us as democratic and free peoples, in time. There must be a greater control of the Indian's destiny by himself; there must be at the present time a greater share in reserve responsibilities undertaken by the Indians. It is rather a strange thing that a matter of 20 years ago, I believe our Canadian Indians were much in advance of the American Indians. Today that picture is reversed. Today we find the American Indians taking part in most every activity of American social, political and sports life.

Among the problems that our Indians are faced with, Mr. Speaker, and probably the prime one is in the employment field. The Indian is a hewer of wood and a drawer of water; he is the lowest on the scale. He is the last to find employment, and is the last to be taken on employment. Today our Indians have a measure of education. Probably basic education is known to all the younger Indians, but a great drawback is the fact that they know very few trades and very few professions. Some rectification is taking place. I find that in this House a matter of a year or so ago, I could mention that I knew of no Indian from my constituency who had gone beyond Grade VIII. This year it is different; probably half a dozen, or eight or ten I believe that

February 23, 1956

I know of are taking schooling away from the reserve, and in the upper grades. There is going to be a need of acceleration of this higher education for Indians in order to get them out into professions. It is needed in order to restore to the Indian his pride, a pride that he had before the white man infringed upon his way of life.

There is problem, too, Mr. Speaker, that we must solve, and that is to marry the philosophy of the Indian and the white. There is a great difference in the Indian's way of thinking and the white man's way of thinking, just in the amassing of property. The Indian has no great concern for future saving and planning. We find that the Indian does not accumulate nor hoard nearly as much as the white man does. I feel that on many of our reserves there could be an education given the Indians into looking after their own needs, in the form of Indian stores, in the form of co-operatives and credit unions. I believe the Department of Co-operatives is presently stimulating such action in the credit union field among the Metis.

There must be an improving attitude taken on behalf of our agencies that are in control of the reserves today to encourage the Indians to home and farm improvements. On our reserves in Pelly constituency, we have, I believe, in excess of 100 acres broken per quarter-section. Our reserves are agricultural reserves. But we do not find as great an interest in their livelihood by the Indians on the reserve, and a greater interest should be taken in agriculture. To some extent, Mr. Speaker, our Indians are standing on the sidelines.

I would just like to mention one item on conservation. Our Indians are naturally conservation-minded, but in the clearing of the land that has taken place in the past few years, much land clearing, or much destruction of nature took place, and needlessly today we find our Indian reserves without protection, without shelter on some quarters. Had the Indians had a right to some say in that, I believe they would have arranged matters differently. Again, insofar as our Indian women are concerned, there is a great lack in homemaking, and as I mentioned here a few years ago, from the time they leave public school at the age of 15, until such time as they know better, there is great wrong done to the Indian people, particularly the Indian girls. By the time they reach the age of 20 or 21, when they are to take their place in managing a home, considerable deterioration has taken place, and the knowledge they have gained through their schooling has been lost.

Pelly constituency is probably an example of what is going on elsewhere in Saskatchewan. The increase in Indian population is growing at a fast pace. Today we find insufficient land available for the Indian families, and if we are going to continue to supply, as the Federal Department of Indian Affairs has, a quarter-section for each Indian family, we have that problem. We have reached the stage where the land isn't available any more. That is a problem we are faced with in the very near future. I know our Department of Natural Resources is going to make available some trapping land which the Indians had many years ago, and for some reason or other it reverted to the Crown. I believe the Indians are making use of the land at the present time for trapping.

But there is available for them means of expansion; there is land available for them for pasture, but there has been no interest taken in livestock stimulation, or the growth of ranching on the reserve. I know that some 15 or 20 years ago, before the land was broken up, the Indians did do

considerable ranching. Some of the Indians did a very good job at it.

So, Mr. Speaker, the big problem before us is the restoration to the Indian of his pride and his incentive to look after himself, and better himself. I would just like to bring to the attention of the House a problem that the Indians are faced with on the reserves. My deskmate has written out his:

“In order to justify their existence, the Indian agents keep telling their seniors in the Department of Indian Affairs, that the Indian could not live without the present state of society that he has nor without the control that is kept on the reserve.”

I would just like to mention in passing that there are problems that the Indians should be studying today; in fact that there are forms of taxation available that can be placed by the leases on to the Indian reserves. There is the matter of studying the game laws; all these factors our Indians should be studying today, and they do not have the free right to do so.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to mention here that we will have to take the Indians into consideration in any changes made. Some of the changes made in the Federal treaties were not made with the full sanction of our Indians. I would like to see the Government of the province of Saskatchewan meet with the Indians in council this coming summer, and discuss some of the matters with them. I would like to see a step taken to give the Indians direct representation in this House, as was suggested by the mover of this resolution. The Indians of B.C. today have a member directly representing the Indian people of British Columbia, and I think it has been all to the good, Mr. Speaker.

I take great pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Mr. H.C. Dunfield (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

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