

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
FIRST SESSION — FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE
7th Day**

Friday, February 17, 1961.

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

QUESTION RE SECURITY COMMISSION APPOINTMENT

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Attorney General. Could he tell the House whether a successor has been appointed to the Security Commission, Mr. Cameron, who I understand resigned today.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

50th ANNIVERSARY OF THE SASK. ANTI-TUBERCULOSIS LEAGUE

Hon. Mr. Erb (Minister of Health): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the hon. Members of this House the 50th Anniversary of the founding of the Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League. You may recall that on February 17, 1911, a group of 18 men were brought together for this purpose at the King's Hotel in Regina at the invitation of Dr. F.M. Seymour, then Health Commissioner of this province and later its first Deputy Minister of Public Health.

At that time tuberculosis was a leading cause of death and invalidism among our people here and throughout the civilized world. The organization which these men set up a half century ago has been an outstanding example of how people, combining their resources, and working together, can cope with a cruel and devastating disease. I am told that the number of patients who have been admitted to these three sanatoria in the province since they were opened now totals about 19,000 and there are at least 10,000 living, former patients of the Sanatoria. These surviving patients are a living testimony to the once-doubted fact that tuberculosis can be prevented and can be eradicated.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of this House would wish to join me in offering congratulations and good wishes to the present Board of Directors who are now holding their

February 17, 1961

quarterly meeting in the City of Regina.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — Before the Orders of the Day, by leave of the Assembly, I would like to draw the attention of the Members to a very fine group of young people in the upper rows of the Speaker's gallery. These are students from Grades XI and XII from Hazlet high school, under the charge of their teacher, Mr. Monty Anderson. I am sure the Members would wish to join in wishing them a very pleasant time here this afternoon.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Kramer, seconded by Mrs. Strum:

And the proposed amendment thereto, moved by Mr. Thatcher, and seconded by Mr. McDonald:

Mr. David Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with all previous speakers who have participated thus far in congratulating you on your election as Speaker of this Assembly. I realize your high office and duty, and I personally wish you well.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the packages of potato chips that appeared on our desks yesterday afternoon have already been referred to by the Minister in Charge of the Industrial Development Office. When I noticed the package on entering the Chamber, I wondered who was responsible for helping me give publicity to the Constituency which I represent. I had made an offer to the management of this Company to make this gesture on their behalf. However, I am more than pleased to have this help from the Minister and I sincerely hope that he will give further consideration to publicizing the Rosthern Constituency and also further consideration to the industrial development of that area of the province. It is obvious that the shareholders of this Company have friends on the opposite side of this House.

In addition to this, the Rosthern Vegetable Growers' Co-operative Association established a \$100,000 storage plant. I believe these two industries are the two major industries developed in Saskatchewan during the last year, and I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has failed to recognize them in the Throne Speech.

Reference has been made on several occasions in this debate of the cost of the new Saskatchewan Power Corporation

building in Regina. As early as September, 1959 'The Leader-Post' reported that this building would cost in the neighbourhood of \$4 million. This was later repeated, and as late as June 16th the amount remained at \$4 million, but one day later 'The Leader-Post' reported that this building would cost in the neighbourhood of \$5 million to \$6 million. Apparently Mr. Cass-Beggs had convinced the Cabinet that they needed a better building. The reason for this increase was stated that there would be more detailed plans as the floor space, instead of 12 floors, it would be increased to 13. This, Mr. Speaker, is a tremendous palace for the civil servants. I understand that there's going to be ground storage for cars, and perhaps a private elevator for Mr. Cass-Beggs.

On November 14th, Mr. C.E. Smith, a senior officials of Saskatchewan Power Corporation, stated the cost of the building at \$6 million. This has again been repeated as late as February 8th, 1961. Mr. Speaker, when I think of how many \$500 bills this Government has squeezed out of the low income farmers, we on this side of the House feel no need for such elaborate buildings. We think this sum of money would be more wisely spent, if the power could be given to the farmers who reside within reasonable distances of power lines, who have up to this time not been able to pay the \$500.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The Hon. Premier said the other day that this would not cost the taxpayer one nickel. If this were logic, Mr. Speaker, then I would suggest to the Government that this should have been done ten years ago. However, it will be the farmer and the small urban consumers who will be paying the bill for this multi-million dollar building. I, as a farmer, resent the Government going into such elaborate buildings, and I feel that the majority of the people in the rural areas do not see the need for such a building.

Now, Mr. Speaker, both the Premier and the Minister of Industry and Information have failed to answer the charge of the Leader of the Opposition that there are fewer people engaged in manufacturing today than there were in 1944. D.B.S. figures show that in 1944 — 12,361 people were employed in Saskatchewan manufacturing. The Government's own agency, The Economic, Planning and Advisory Board, now estimates there are only 12,300 for 1960. When the Premier and the Minister of Industry were questioned in connection with this, they became indignant, and resorted to name-calling. They can squirm and twist in any way they desire, they can boast about Saskatchewan's development all they like, but the facts are facts. Official figures show that there are fewer people in manufacturing than there were 17 years ago when they came into power, despite any factories which may have been established since that time.

February 17, 1961

We continue to insist that the reason for this lack of development are the policies of the Socialist Government.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Boldt: — We, on this side of the House, believe that there should be political, economic and religious freedom in every Government and in every party. But, what we do not believe in, Mr. Speaker, is that “The Commonwealth”, which is the official organ of Socialist propaganda, should advertise Government Crown Corporations. I have here on the first page of “The Commonwealth” The Saskatchewan Transportation Company advertisement paid for by the 59% of the people who voted against this Government. On page 2 we have another ad, almost one third of the page of the Department of Mineral Resources, the Minister, Mr. Brockelbank, and the Deputy Minister, Mr. Cawley. Who’s paying for these ads? Third, The Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Board have a big ad in “The Commonwealth”. Fourth, we have the Saskatchewan Mineral Sodium Sulphate Division, advertising in Saskatchewan where there isn’t any hope of any sale for this mineral. This should be advertised in the American papers, where there is a market for it. Fifth, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office: There is a whole page paid by the people of Saskatchewan. Number 7, Saskatchewan Power Corporation, a whole page; Number 8, the Saskatchewan public Service Commission; Number 9, for sale in the want ads — Saskatchewan Government used cars, trucks and panels, a whole list of them; Number 10, The Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development, the Minister, Mr. Turnbull, Deputy Minister, Mr. Arnason. All these ads are being paid for by this Government’s taxpayers.

A few weeks ago the CCF Party advertised that they were broke. I suppose the Crown Corporations were behind in paying for their ads, because a few days later they announced that they were solvent. The Government has paid up its bills to “The Commonwealth” and they are now out of debt. Using public funds to put out the socialist propaganda sheet is an unethical and a dishonest practice and I can assure the Members of this House, if we should form the Government, there will be no advertising in any political papers.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The Premier the other day promised the people of Saskatchewan (and I quote):

“The Government has no intention of asking for increased rates this year.”

This was in reference to the Government Insurance rates.

I believe the people of this province will take that promise very lightly when they review the promises made by the

CCF candidates in the last election. The slogan that the CCF workers were using, at least in my Constituency, was 'A Party that keeps its promises'. Well, I would like to inform the Members on the other side of the House that Mr. Fines, speaking in Rosthern and reported in the 'Saskatchewan Valley News', explained the proposed CCF medical plan which will be established on the same basis as the present hospitalization plan: "The cost of the medical plan will be no more than the hospitalization plan." \$35 to \$40 — (note that)."That will be within the reach of everyone."

The Leader of the Opposition stated two months after the election that the hospitalization tax was raised, and two weeks later the Minister of Health reported that the hospitalization tax would be increased, from \$17.50 to \$24 for the individual and from \$35 to \$48 for a family.

While I have this clipping in my hand, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to inform the Minister of Industry and Information (Hon. Mr. Brown) what Mr. Fines had to say with regard to gas in the Rosthern area: (I'm quoting from the 'Saskatchewan Valley News'):

"Natural gas would be brought to at least 100 additional communities. The communities selected would be those which promised good returns. In his opinion, Rosthern stands a good chance to get gas next year (1961), while it is expected a second line will be built to Prince Albert."

That is Mr. Fines' opinion. I hope it is also the opinion of the Minister of Industry and Information who is in charge of gas.

I would also like to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, a few words in regard to local government reorganization. The Premier, the other day when discussing the make-up of the Committee said that he thought that perhaps there might be more Liberals and Conservatives on this Local Government Continuing Committee than Socialists. I would like to put that record straight. Apparently some municipal man and taxpayers have got Mr. McAskill all riled up about the Committee being Government-loaded. Frankly, I think it is. I shall hope to prove it. Mr. McAskill took a blast at Martin Pederson, Dave Steuart and Wilf Gardiner on November 21, 1960:

"Although I am not aware of the political affiliations of all the members of the Committee, I would like to point out that Tom Garland, the Acting Committee Chairman who is President of S.A.R.M., was at the time of his appointment to the Committee a Progressive-Conservative candidate for the provincial election."

That's what McAskill stated.

February 17, 1961

“H.J. Maher, who was appointed to the Committee by S.U.M.A. is a former Liberal M.L.A., and Albert Douglas, appointed by the School Trustees, is a President of the Liberal Association of his district.”

Mr. Speaker, those are three people who were named as non-Socialists. I am not here to say that the other members on this Committee are Socialists, but if Mr. McAskill had known of any of the others that were politically affiliated with the Liberal or Conservative Parties, he certainly would have mentioned them.

Some Hon. Members: — We know he’s a Socialist.

Mr. Boldt: — Now, who are the members of this Committee? When the Continuing Committee was canvassing the area — I am referring to the regional meetings last fall — pamphlets were being sent out to the various municipalities, and I will read from some of the pamphlets that were sent:

“The Local Government Continuing Committee was appointed three years ago to study reorganization of boundaries, structure, responsibility, and finances of local governments of Saskatchewan.”

Who do these members include? It includes three members from the Association of Rural Municipalities; three from the urban, three from the Schools, one from the Hospital Association, one from the Health Department, and four from the Provincial Government — four Cabinet Ministers.

Mr. Speaker, what amazes me most is that this is all printed in small print but it states in big, black letters: “The Committee also has advisers from local government associations and key Government Departments, and in addition a full-time technical staff of its own.” Those, I believe, in my opinion, have done all the work for this Continuing Committee, and I shall hope to prove it to you.

Mr. Speaker, I have the report here from this Local Government Continuing Committee as of March, 1960. On the last page of this report is the Vice-Chairman, Premier T.C. Douglas, and he said the other day that he did not know whether the Government was going to accept all the recommendations made by this Committee. Mr. Speaker, the Premier is the Vice-Chairman, and if he does not know what is in the report, then I would suggest to him that he should have resigned from the Committee and get a man on to it who would give attention to his responsibilities, and give the report to us.

In addition to this Committee, the Government set up an office in the Legislative Building in Regina, Room 320 in the last fiscal year. On page 189 of Public Accounts we have the list of the members who are on the pay-roll, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan if they knew that

in the last fiscal year, \$67,800 was spent by this local Government Continuing Committee on administration alone. I think the people of Saskatchewan would not mind if the Local Government Continuing Committee members received the \$67,000, but when I look over the list (and I am sure all of the Members have looked it over), the 15 members of the Local Government Continuing Committee received in wages \$1,617.50. Their travel and vehicle expenses were \$1,398.76. The total expenses for the members of the Continuing Committee was \$3,016.26. I would suggest to this House that I hope the Local Government Continuing Committee has done more work than they had been paid for.

Who received the other \$64,745? Well, at the head of the Department of this Local Government Continuing Committee's office there is a fellow by the name of Mr. Brownstone, who received \$10,980 plus travel — \$580.33. He received over \$11,000. We have a man by the name of Claskey, \$6,551; W.M. Harding, \$9,366. J.M. Reid, \$5,511.86; Sufrin, \$9,059.66. This gentleman, Mr. Sufrin, I am given to understand from the Local Government Continuing Committee regional meeting in Rosthern that he was the man who drew up the boundaries. I find no expense account for him. Now, if he had a \$5,000 expense account I don't think it would be unreasonable because he should have been visiting municipalities, if he drew up the boundaries. But I am given to understand by the Municipal Secretaries whom I have contacted that they have never seen him. Therefore, I have every reason to suggest that the boundaries were drawn up in this Room 302 of this Legislative Building.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Boldt: — This Continuing Committee received \$64,745 and the members who were elected to do the work received \$3,016. I would suggest to you, and leave it for your judgment to say whether or not this committee was Government-loaded:

The Leader of the Opposition stated in the House a few days ago that, "he who pays the piper plays the tune". Who do you suggest has given all the recommendations to this committee?

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I was really amazed when Mr. McAskill on November 21, 1960 said that the four Cabinet Ministers who are members of the Committee, attended only a few meetings and that they acted only as an advisory committee. If he is trying to protect the Cabinet Ministers, I am sure the people of this province will still hold the Cabinet Ministers and all members of this Committee responsible for the report which is to be brought in. As reported a few days ago, the final report of the Local Government Continuing Committee has been signed by all members of the Committee except those gentlemen representing the Provincial Government. Here again Mr. McAskill was trying to defend the Cabinet Ministers when he said: "Government members of this Committee have not been asked to sign." He said,

February 17, 1961

“They have played such a small part in the work of the Committee and had actually attended very few of the meetings.”

I do not think for one moment that Mr. McAskill can fool the people into believing that the Cabinet Ministers are not aware of what is in that report. I estimate that this Continuing Committee will cost the Government in the neighbourhood of ¼ million dollars, and we need not worry who has helped to prepare that report. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Chairman of the Continuing Committee has severed his friendship with the majority of the rural and small urban areas. His attitude towards the people concerned has not been one of co-operation. He has ridiculed the action taken by the S.A.R.M. in asking for a vote. He has made personal attacks on individuals. Now again he has urged the people of the province to obtain copies of the report and study it before making conclusions. He said:

“Snap decisions have been made in recent plebiscites conducted by the rural municipalities on the question of reorganization. The Continuing Committee spent three years studying the question and could not have acquired all the information it has in the few weeks required for the plebiscite.”

Mr. Speaker, local government has been in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan for a good many years, longer than the time since the Local Government Continuing Committee was appointed. It has been in the minds of municipal officials for years, even prior to the Baker Commission. The Local Government Continuing Committee, while they were sitting, having had meetings advertised, their findings advertised, and in the last few months they held sixty meetings all over the province. The people of Saskatchewan were being educated by means of television, radio, press and all means available in this day and age, and after all this advertising, all this education, some of the members of the Local Government Continuing Committee have said: “Farmers, you just haven’t got enough brain matter to cast an intelligent vote.”

I think this is an insult to the farmers of this province, and I am quite sure that the farmers could cast an intelligent vote if it were given to them.

Mr. Speaker, it has been very interesting to note what action the Government had taken had the municipalities not taken a vote. At the regional meetings held within the province we were repeatedly told that the Committee would recommend to the Government that no vote should be taken on this issue. I believe that stand taken by the Continuing Committee forced the hand of the S.A.R.M. in taking a vote, and it also indicates that the rural people do not want to be pushed around by a City Commissioner.

One of the questions which came up at the regional meeting which I believe should be answered from the floor of this House is, what part did Messrs. Brownstone, Harding, Sufrin,

Smiley and Reid of the Continuing Committee staff play in formulating policy, and whether any of their recommendations have been accepted by the Committee. It is also reported that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, at the last Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities Convention promised that the map of the boundaries would be in the hands of the municipal officials within two weeks. They first appeared, Mr. Speaker, in newspaper editions of October 28, 1960. Why were they not in the hands of the municipal officials before the June 8th election? This question the Continuing Committee has repeatedly been trying to answer for the Government and I believe it is none of their business to answer the question — it is the Government's business. They haven't been able to answer it satisfactorily.

I heard the question being asked in Rosthern, and I believe it is up to the Premier of this province to say why the answer was not in our hands before the June 8th election.

I think, and I believe that this Government should make a clear-cut statement on the matter. If changes of local government are desired and deemed necessary, we on this side of the House have great confidence in the personnel of the rural and urban associations concerned. We feel they are capable of managing their own affairs, and need not be dominated by a central government. Any desire of a change should be left in the hands of those concerned. I would, therefore, recommend to this Government that if a change in local government is desired by the Association concerned, they should be the negotiators. The issue of local government has created widespread interest in the province; it is a very contentious issue. Principles and personalities have been attacked and I think we should heed the advice of a wise old man when he said, "It is better to remain silent and be thought a fool, than to open your mouth and leave no doubt."

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the amendment and against the motion.

Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should pursue the usual formalities, when I rise to speak in this debate, and I do wish to congratulate those who have taken part in this debate before me — the mover and seconder of the Address, the Premier, and, of course, the Leader of the Opposition. I want especially to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for the very great and powerful address that he delivered here this week. I also wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the new Members on this side of the House who have taken part in this debate. I am sure you will agree with me that they have certainly won their spurs in their first attempt to speak in this Assembly. I congratulate them very much.

February 17, 1961

I also wish, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you on the very high appointment which you have received as Speaker of this Legislative Assembly. I have every confidence, Mr. Speaker, that you will fill this position with honour to yourself and that at all times you will preserve the dignity of this House.

I wish also to thank the members of my Constituency — there may be some of them listening today — I hope there are, for the honour they conferred upon me last summer, and the confidence they placed in me, in electing me as their representative to Regina for the fourth consecutive term.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Horsman: — I want them all to know, that regardless of political affiliation, that if at any time I can be of any service to them they know where to find me and I will be only too glad to be of service, because I consider that I do not only represent the Liberals in that seat, but I represent all the people who live there.

There are one or two questions of major importance before the people of Saskatchewan today. One is the proposed change in municipal boundaries, on which you have listened to a very good talk just now. It is a matter that I do not intend to go into.

The other, which not only affects the people of Saskatchewan, but the people of Canada, is this New Party which is being formed. I want to say this Party has already been formed. To all intents and purposes this Party is functioning now. As a matter of fact, they nominated and elected a member in Peterborough, Ontario.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that they were not quite so fortunate at Medicine hat, but at the same time, they had a candidate up there, so that proves to me that this Party is far from being in the process of formation; it is already in operation.

I can readily understand, Mr. Speaker, why the CCF wish to join with a large and powerful group like the labour unions. I can understand that. It is much harder for me to understand why the powerful labour unions (and I say they are powerful) would want to merge with a political group who have no strength in Canadian politics, and whose influence and public appeal has diminished over the last number of years. This Party, Mr. Speaker, has no strength to speak of anywhere in Canada, except in Saskatchewan. Everyone knows well that their popularity and strength as a national party has diminished steadily for a long time. All we have to do is look at the small group they have in the House of Commons today, and remember the larger group they had a few years ago. You might say, "Well, what about the Liberals?" Well, we haven't many down there right now either but that will be all fixed up as soon as the next election comes around!

Mr. Speaker, this Socialist CCF group and the labour unions are trying to get the farmers to join them in their political alliance. Well, I would just like to know what chance the farmers would have in a group like that. Their policy would certainly be formulated by the delegates who attended their conventions. There's no doubt about that. Now, suppose this is true. The CCF have always said that their policy was formulated at their yearly conventions which they hold every summer. There's no kick on that; every political party does that, or should do it, and I think every political party does formulate a policy at their conventions. That is a democratic way to do it. Now, suppose this is true. Then what group at the conventions to be held in the future would formulate policies for this New Party which they talk about? At any convention — and everyone has attended conventions — not only political conventions, but many other kinds — and we know that the most powerful and largest group at those conventions are the people that formulate policies — they always do. We know well, and everybody else should know that the majority of delegates who would attend any convention of this New Party in the future: The majority of them would be representatives of the labour unions, and would be in a position to formulate policies favourable to themselves, regardless of the wishes of the smaller groups who might be in attendance.

Why should this group expect the support of the farmer? There is such a conflict of interest between farm and labour groups. I was pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union did not see fit to lend their support to this new political group. What chance would the Farmers' Union have, to help formulate policy favourable to agriculture in a convention that would be formulated by the delegates from the labour unions. There's no question as to who would run this party. Members of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union know well that, to enter politics and support any party would be the death-knell of their organization. That's one reason, of course, why they wouldn't join this party.

The Saskatchewan Farmers' Union may not be as strong as it should be, but it does have the support of many Saskatchewan farmers from all over this province, and I think that every farmer in the province should be a member of the Farmers' Union. They speak at least with the authority of their membership, and what they say is generally listened to with a great deal of interest and respect. Now, why should they enter politics and be gobbled up by the great powerful labour unions? Labour unions, Mr. Speaker, were not organized to help anyone else but labour — that's what they were organized for. They were organized to advance the interests of their members, and they have done that, and I would say here today without any fear of contradiction,

February 17, 1961

they have done a very good job for their members; they have been chiefly instrumental, at least, in getting shorter hours for their members; shorter hours with more take-home pay; better working conditions, which in many cases they needed, and needed badly; pension plans, which they also needed, and many other benefits which have been the result of what the labour unions have done for their members. But I have never yet heard a labour union leader stand up anywhere and say anything about the state that agriculture was in in this province.

Government Members: — Oh, nonsense!

Mr. Horsman: — I have never heard one of them do that yet. All right now — I listened last summer and read about the do they had in Montreal when they were trying to organize this Party. I listened to speaker after speaker, and I never heard one of them ever even mention the farmer, at any time. I heard them mention what they could do for their labour unions, but never heard what they could do for the farmer — never heard anything about it at all. But that is not surprising. They weren't organized to help farmers.

I think that the recent grain handlers' strike out at the Pacific coast shows only too clearly just how much sympathy labour unions have for farmers, when they walked off the job and refused to load our wheat, right at the height of the shipping season. I wonder how much power the labour unions want. If they don't want more power, what's the idea of going into politics? When about 300 men on strike at the Pacific coast can hold up the whole western grain trade. It seems to me that that is too much left in the hands of a few people. These men knew well the condition of agriculture; they knew the farmers' granaries were full; they knew the elevators were full of wheat; they also knew that grain prices were very low. They knew that, too. They knew that wheat is the cheapest thing in Canada today, but they knew (what is more important) that shipping should go on uninterrupted.

They knew that the livelihood and very existence of the farmers on these plains depended on them getting their

wheat to market. It was not the first time that labour unions out at the coast have held up the western grain trade. They did the same thing about two years ago. It matters not to these men that the ships were waiting in the harbour for cargo, and they have gone to some other country for wheat, in which case they would have lost the sale of thousands of bushels of wheat, which they probably did. All they were interested in was their own interests — the advancement of the interest of their own labour groups.

Now, how much business we may have lost over that strike no one knows, but we do know that ships will not go to a port with a cargo unless they are certain when they get there, that cargo will be loaded without delay.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we should find out the conflict of interests between the farmer and labour groups. I have here a short editorial which I took from the ‘Saskatoon Star-Phoenix’ December 14, 1960, and I want to read a little of this because it says something about one of the oldest Members of this House — a man that I have always respected; I have always respected his opinion, and this gives him sort of a pat on the back, so I think I should read part of it. I quote:

“If there were an award for the most forthright political statement of 1960, the ‘Star-Phoenix’ would unhesitatingly nominate Saskatchewan’s Mineral Resources Minister, Hon. J.H. Brockelbank.

At the recent New Party Seminar conducted at Calgary, Mr. Brockelbank plainly stated that the success or failure of this New Party depended on resolving the present conflict of interest between farm and labour wings of the new political . . .”

This statement by Mr. Brockelbank is rather hard to reconcile with those of Mr. Stanley Knowles and Premier

February 17, 1961

T.C. Douglas, both of whom said that there is no difference in the goals of farmer and labour. In the light of recent events, it appears that Mr. Brockelbank's appraisal of the situation is more accurate than either that of Mr. Douglas or Mr. Knowles.

Then it goes on here to talk about the rail strike, and so on, and says that:

“Mr. Frank Hall, Chief negotiator of the Railway Unions involved in the present strike, attacked the principle of freight rate freezing. His remarks went beyond the temporary rate freeze attack, until the House received the report of the MacPherson Commission on Transportation.

“The Crows' Nest Pass grain rates have evoked Mr. Hall's ire. He described them as inhibiting railway earnings. Also, Mr. Hall said that the railways should be allowed to make the money they can by increasing rates on captive traffic.

“Mr. Hall's concern for railway earnings is apparently linked with the fact that Canada's railways would experience considerable difficulty meeting the wage bill that general increases for non-operating employees would entail.

“Whatever Mr. Hall's motives for advocating such changes in railway freight rates are, it is difficult to see how the operation of the Crows' Nest Pass rates or the policy of raising rates on captive traffic would benefit the prairie farmer.

“It appeared much more likely that such rate changes would amplify the effect of the cost-price squeeze currently burdening Canadian agriculture.”

Then it goes on:

“These differences of labour demand show a complete disregard for the farmer. Labour is quite willing, apparently, to profit at the expense of the farmer. In the light of this consideration, it is interesting to note that the average yearly wage for a sweeper at the terminal elevator, before the last round of increases, was \$5,100 per year. The average personal cash income for Saskatchewan farmers was less than \$1,250 in 1958.

It appears that Mr. Brockelbank was the only realist present at the New Party’s Calgary Seminar. He, at least, recognizes the existence of a conflict in interests between farmers and labour. It is note-worthy, however, that no suggestions for resolving this were forthcoming at Calgary.”

Well, I think Mr. Brockelbank was probably the only realist present. He did recognize that there was a conflict of interest between farmers and labour. There is one thing that no one can talk themselves out of, and that is this, that the strike of the West Coast Grain Handlers was a strike directly against the farmer.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to explain to the House that . . .

Opposition Member: — That’s no point of privilege. Ask you question!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I do have a point of privilege, because the hon. Member has been reading from an editorial which misrepresented me. You cannot exploit my point of privilege — I have the right to express an opinion on that. It was not a case of a conflict — this is a question of privilege . . .

Opposition Member: — That’s no question of privilege, Brock!

February 17, 1961

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I have a right to speak, after another Member has . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. Member has the right to state his point and privilege, but he cannot make a speech on a point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that I have been misrepresented by the article read by the hon. Member, and it is my privilege, I think, under those circumstances to correct as briefly as I can, without making a speech, and I hope to be able to do that.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, make it in your own time, Brock.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — If the hon. gentleman opposite will keep quiet for a minute — if he had kept quiet, I would have been finished long ago. What I was pointing out was that the newspaper should have said that I was pointing out . . .

Opposition Member: — You don't even know yourself.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . the division which was being created by other political parties, and by the press had to be taken care of, Mr. Speaker. That is the point — not that I said there was a conflict.

Mr. Horsman: — Mr. Speaker, I clipped this article in good faith and took it from the paper. No doubt Mr. Brockelbank saw the article many months ago, and had a chance then to refute it if he had wanted to.

Opposition Member: — He wants to take up some of your radio time!

Mr. Horsman: — You know, he was brought up on a farm — I know where he used to live, and I suppose he is still a farmer at heart and did recognize the differences in the interests of the farmer and labour.

I have another short newspaper article here taken from one of the old farm papers of the west, 'The Farm & Ranch Review'. This speaks about this same thing; it doesn't mention Mr. Brockelbank's name, however:

"There's an old story about a lighthouse keeper awakened from the soundest of sleeps by the unaccustomed silence when the evening cannon failed to fire. The West Coast grain handlers' strike brings this story right up to date that it is to be hoped that a lot of farmers will now be awakened from their dream by the almost horrible silence of those who have so loved, and at such great length that singing the song of farmer-labour marriage.

"It is small wonder that union promoters can find little to say. They cannot fall back on the usual gamut of blaming . . . management and ownership and let industry shoulder the responsibility of passing the buck along the line to the producer. This time management ownership and the primary producer are pretty much the same thing.

". . . Union demands for wage increases and extra holidays for 325 grain handlers, or to put it another way, lower money for less work with the farmer paying the difference. Labour leaders hope to have the prairie farmers over the barrel, and they did have. Faced with the cost-price squeeze at home, and bulging granaries, the farmer must exploit to survive by tying up some 14 million bushels of grain at the terminal elevators, and about 20 vessels waiting to load, the Canadian Labour of Congress Union forced its will on helpless farmers.

"Organized labour's stand is particularly irresponsible at this time, with unemployment figures at post-war high, they are none-the-less demand more for less, and with the world grain trade undergoing major changes, Canadian farmers are struggling to get their foot in the door for a few expanding markets in Asia.

February 17, 1961

“... exports are pushing grain costs at this particular time, and could put Canada’s grain trade at jeopardy for years to come. These things apparently mean little to the grain worker or the Canadian Congress of Labour as long as they can win their selfish way.

“As far as prairie farmers are concerned, the terminal grain strike has sounded the death-knell to any political or economic union between farm organization and the powerful labour union.

So I think that sums up the situation very well. That is a very old and very reliable farm newspaper.

Now, then no one wants to deny labour their rights. Certainly labour has rights, and I would be the last one to say that they shouldn’t have the rights that they now have. But their rights in common with the rights of other groups are limited, they are limited rights. The rights of the labour unions are limited at the point where they interfere with the rights of other people or other groups. They are limited at the point where they seek to enforce demands that will injure the social and economic order on which the nation as a whole depends for its very existence. Freedom to bargain for better wages and better general working conditions are the undenied rights of labour. No one will try to argue that point, but they also have a responsibility towards the total social group that forms the nation. They have that responsibility. Now we hear a lot of talk about freedom these days — trouble all over the world, talk about people that are not free. In Canada we never think much about our freedom because we’ve always been free. We never think that there might be sometime when we might lose that freedom. But freedom can be lost, Mr. Speaker, by its abuse, and I think that if labour leaders abuse the privileges that they have, and I am sure that sometimes they do, that their freedom might be lost by its abuse.

In the defence of freedom, we must be on guard continually against individuals or groups who preach freedom, but who practice tyranny, and who talk loud and long about their democratic rights, but who don’t hesitate to interfere with the rights of other people.

Now I have another short article here, from the “New York Tribute,” talking about the strike of the

transport workers in the States on the Hudson ferries and the Grand Central, and I'll just quote a few lines of this, Mr. Speaker, because it is a case exactly like the west coast grain strike as far as I can see.

“. . . that any small body of men shoved by reinforcements from outside, should have the power to incapacitate public transportation, first the Hudson Ferries and then the Grand Central and progressively decide to advise the city on the necessities of life. The public as the innocent bystander is made the victim, and most of the population becomes a battleground in a contest of strength. It has to make out as best it can, and if any public defender could make himself heard above the tumult, he'd probably be told 'the public be damned'!"

And if anyone had gone out to the coast at the time of that western grain strike, and mentioned something about what they were doing to the farmers out there by going on strike, that's exactly the answer they'd have got there. They'd have told you, "The farmers be damned."

Now, Mr. Speaker, labour has one great weapon that the farmers can't use — that's one of the reasons why they can't get together, and that great weapon of labour, of course, is the right to strike. Now no bunch of farmers could ever go on strike. They know that. It's simply out of the question. Now suppose you could work it some way so the farmers did go on strike — suppose they'd hold butter and eggs, and meat and everything else off the market. Who would they be striking against, Mr. Speaker? In particular they'd be striking against the labourers, who were supposed to be, according to many people here, their partners in this new political alliance. It seems rather strange that such a thing should happen, but here we have an instance of it right at the west coast, and they're trying to organize this New Party, and they want the farmers to join it. Yet, a labour group would go on strike directly against the farmers, and there is no way that anyone can wiggle out of it. The grain that was on the track in the boxcars belonged to the farmers; three of them, The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool Elevator, the Alberta Wheat Pool, and the United Grain Growers are all farmer-owned elevators. But, what difference did that make to the labour men. We had the

February 17, 1961

facilities there to load that wheat, and we owned the wheat. When these men walked off the job the farmers couldn't even go and hire another crew and put them in there to load the wheat — that wouldn't have been allowed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is justice I'd like to know what injustice is. If that is justice, I don't think it is. As I say, if the farmers went on strike, and if this party was formed, does anyone think it could make any difference to a group like the West-Coast Grain Handlers? If they wanted another raise in pay, even if they knew that they were allied with the farmers in a political party, would it make any difference to them, if they wanted to go on strike and boost the grain handling charges to the farmer? I don't think it would.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough along that line to convince most farmers that if they think this thing over, there is no place for them in a political alliance with the CCF Socialists and the labour unions. Mind, I have nothing against the labour unions, but I think they have power enough now. If they don't think so, why do they want to go into politics? When one group of men go on strike, as railroad men almost did, they could have brought the whole economy of this country to a standstill. Yet do they want to go into politics for more power or want? I think they'd be far better off where they are, where they can make representation to any Government that happened to be in power. The best thing they can hope for, if this party is formed and comes out as a national party, is to lead a very small group on the opposition side in the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before commencing my remarks on the Speech from the Throne, I would like to take this opportunity of expressing to you, Mr. Speaker, my best wishes on your appointment to your high office of Speaker of this Legislature. At the same time I would also like to extend, to all new Members of the Legislature, my welcome on the fact that they have received the support of the largest group of citizens in their Constituency, in the past election. I am sure whether we are sitting on the Opposition side of this House, or on the Government side, that we all realize that we have responsibilities no matter what political party we are supporting. We have

responsibilities to our voters back home in our own Constituencies. So I say that I think that congratulations should be extended to all new Members of this Legislature, and also to those who have been returned as Members for their Constituencies in the last election.

I would also like to extend to those who have received promotions on the other side of the House, my best wishes to them also, in the work they will have to undertake during the next four years. I know it is not going to be an easy job, and I can assure them that those of us on this side of the House will do our best to see that it is a very difficult job. Such a difficult job that when four years have passed the people of this province will realize the type of administration that has been running this province for the last sixteen or twenty years, and they will go to the polls and turn out the so-called socialist Government that we have across the way.

Before commencing my regular address, I would like to call to the attention of the people of my Constituency one or two things that have been left out of the Throne Speech this year. I noticed in reading the Throne Speech of two years ago, the Government of this province took pride in the fact that two centres in that particular year had become cities. In the present Throne Speech, the newest city in this province, which was one of the milestones in the history of this province during the past year, was ignored. The Government didn't make any mention of the fact that that was a sign of progress in the Province of Saskatchewan during the past year when they wrote the Throne Speech for this present year. I think that the citizens of the City of Melville should feel very left out, because of the fact that the voters of that particular city have supported the gentlemen opposite, the majority, for the past number of years, both in provincial and federal campaigns, only to find that they would be neglected and left out; when other cities have been mentioned in the Throne Speech, and the people of the City of Melville have been entirely neglected by this Government.

As well, only today I have also received an answer to a question from the Minister of Public Works, which again I think will indicate to the people of the City of Melville what they can expect from the Government we have in office in the Province of Saskatchewan at the present time. Only the other day the Premier of the province, and I believe the Minister of Industry and Information in the province, made the statement that they

February 17, 1961

were constructing a new Power Corporation building in the City of Regina, because it would be cheaper not to have to pay rents to people of the City of Regina, it would be cheaper to have their own building.

The other day I put a question to the Minister of Public Works with regard to a public building which was promised by the Premier of this province to the people of the City of Melville during the election campaign of last June, and it was also promised by the candidate of the CCF Party, in addresses that he made to the people of that community. My question was this: "What plans have been made for construction of a public building in the City of Melville?" This is the answer that I received from the Minister in charge of the department: "No plans have been made with the Department of Public Works for the construction of a public building in the City of Melville, since present requirements can be met more economically by renting accommodations."

Now I don't think that there can be two rules in the Department of Public Works, but there can be in this Government. In the City of Regina, it is much cheaper if the Government builds a new building at the cost of six millions of dollars, at least, of the taxpayers money, but in the City of Melville, when they asked for the construction of a public building, the Government tells them it is much cheaper to rent accommodations around the City of Melville, rather than to build a building. So I find that in the Government there are two measuring sticks to decide what the policy they will take will be. Two separate measuring sticks, and I think that the people of Melville should be made aware of the fact.

Government Member: — People know about it now all over the province.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, in the few moments that are allotted to each one of us to say a few words on the air, I would like this afternoon to particularly make reference to the statements that have been made by Members of the Government during the course of this present debate. To make reference to arguments of the Premier of this province, and also arguments of the Minister of Travel and Information, which he made in his address yesterday to the Members of this Legislature, both with regard to industry in the Province of Saskatchewan, and also with regard to the issues facing the people of the Turtleford Constituency, when they go to the polls next Wednesday. During the

course of the remarks of both the Premier and the Minister of Travel and Information indicated that statements made by the Leader of the Opposition in his address on Tuesday were not correct. They said that he was misinforming the people of this province. One of the examples stated by both the Premier and the Minister had to do with the construction of a pulp mill in the City of Prince Albert. I think we should once again review the facts with regard to the situation, and the promises of a pulp mill made to the people of this province, and to the people of the Prince Albert Constituency, prior to the election in 1956.

The Minister of Industry and Information is reported to have made this statement:

“There was a definite expectation that Saskatchewan would get a pulp mill in 1956, when the Government made the announcement about it.”

Here are the facts, the Minister must have been reading what the Premier said in 1956. The Premier deliberately created the impression that there was a definite agreement to proceed with the construction of a pulp mill. The Press announcement was issued jointly by Mr. Douglas and Mr. R. Campbell, and it appeared in the Leader-Post June 1st, 1956. The Press statement said this:

“The Prince Albert area will be the site of Saskatchewan’s first pulp mill, to cost between fifty million and sixty million dollars. Construction will get under way this Fall.”

A definite statement signed by the Premier that construction would get under way that Fall. The mill with its logging operations, would give direct employment to three thousand persons, and will have a payroll of about nine million dollars annually. Most of the employees will be located in Prince Albert, and company officials estimated the population to that city will eventually be double its present 18,000 as a result. The output of the mill will go to the United States, a firm that owns shares in the new enterprise has agreed to take 100% of the production. That is what the Premier told the press in the middle of the 1956 general election, and I don’t think that the Premier can deny that he made the statement. This is what the Minister for Industry and Information has probably been reading. This press report was deliberately designed to leave the impression that there was a definite agreement to proceed with the construction of a pulp mill in Prince Albert in the Fall of 1956. After the announcement was made, the Liberal

February 17, 1961

Leader at that time asked the Premier for a copy of the agreement. He did not get the agreement. All he got was the usual personal abuse from the Premier of this province.

In the 1957 Session of the Legislature there was passed a Motion for a Return showing a copy of the agreement. It was tabled as Sessional Paper No. 79, 1957. It was not an agreement for proceeding with the construction of a pulp mill, it was merely an agreement granting the company, Waskesiu Forest Products Ltd., an option on timber lands, while the company investigated the possibility of the project. The option commenced on May 4th, 1956, and continued for six months. Some extensions were granted. This is a very different thing, I submit, Mr. Speaker, from an agreement to proceed at a definite time for the construction of a pulp mill, as the Premier said in his press release. There is no doubt that he was definitely misleading the people of this province in making the statement that he did, as the facts point out.

There had been several similar option agreements before this, and no pulp mill resulted from them either. The Prince Albert pulp mill announcement in the middle of the 1956 election is a glaring example of the misrepresentation indulged in by the Premier for the purpose of creating the impression there is extensive industrial development in this province. This example is all the more despicable, because it was made in the middle of a general election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in his address of yesterday, the Minister of Industry and Information is reported to have said: "If any party is to be condemned for an inability to attract industry, it should be the Liberal Party." I believe I remember another statement that was made, during the course of this debate, in which one of the Members stated that we couldn't have industry because of the fact that the basic industry in this province is agriculture, and it wouldn't maintain industry. Well I am going to state here this afternoon, that the great majority of the industries we have today, after 17 years of socialist administration, are because we have an agricultural economy, and most of those industries have been built around that agricultural economy in this Province of Saskatchewan, and other industries have not been brought to this province by this Government. Only because of the fact that our farmers required various services during that period of time, we had industries in order to provide services to the farmers of this province.

When any Minister of a Government in this province stands up and states that the basic industry of agriculture will not maintain industry, I state that he is insulting the primary industry of this province. We all realize that Canada as a whole started as an agricultural area. How do my friends think the Province of Ontario was started? It was an agricultural province originally. There is no reason to use that as an excuse for the fact that they have not in the last 17 years been able to introduce industries into this province. The Minister went on to argue that there was virtually no industrial development. As a matter of fact, all but two of the larger industries, now operating in Saskatchewan, were here before the election of the CCF. Many of them were here before the CCF came into existence.

Mr. Thatcher: — They'll be here a long time after too.

Mr. Gardiner: — I have here a list of industries in operation before the days of CCF Government, and the approximate annual values which these industries had by manufacturing. I am only mentioning the industries, or groups of industries, where the annual value added by manufacturing is over one million dollars, and here we have the list.

Bread and bakery productions — \$5½ million;
 Breweries — \$7 million;
 Carbonated beverages — \$7 million;
 Flour mills — \$6 million;
 Meat packing — \$9 million;
 Sash, door and planing — \$2 million;
 Saw mills — \$1 million;
 Printing and publishing — \$7½ million;
 Oil refineries — \$28 million;

making a total of \$73 million. There are just a few of the larger manufacturing industries established in this province, before the period of CCF Government. There were numerous smaller manufacturing industries the number of such would be very large. In 17 years of CCF Government, only two larger industries, such as those I have mentioned, have been established in this province, and they are the Cement Factory and the Steel Mill. In the case of each of these, the Government had to guarantee loans, for a large part of their initial capital. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that the information that I have placed before the people of this province, proves the arguments that were used by the Minister of Industry and Information, in his address yesterday, were figments of his imagination.

February 17, 1961

Mr. Speaker, in the province at the present time, and I want here to refer to the address made by the Member for the Battlefords in moving the Address-in-Reply. The Leader of the Opposition referred to Aesop's Fables, when he was making reference to the Premier of this province, and I am going to tell him that he wasn't very far off. You know, most fairy stories have been written so that mothers and fathers can read them to their children to put them to sleep. I remember the other day that the lady Member for Saskatoon was speaking, and that she had done a very good job, because the Minister in front of her was sleeping in his seat. So, I am quite sure that the fairy story that she was telling to the people of this province was doing its job, it was putting people to sleep.

Now, with regard to the issues in the by-election that is being held in this province at the present time. The Premier of this province, in his address in the Throne Speech debate, and also an address to the people of Turtleford, both in literature, and over radio and T.V., has definitely indicated that he feels there are certain issues in that election. His candidate in Turtleford has come out and stated he thinks there are certain issues in that campaign. I do not know how many of you watched T.V. the last two Sundays and saw Mr. Wooff appear on the T.V. screen. He was questioned by a reporter from the City of Saskatoon, and was asked what he thought the issues of the campaign would be. The reporter said, "Do you think the question of municipal reorganization will be an issue in the election?" "Oh, no," said Mr. Wooff, "We can't consider that as an issue, because it is before a Continuing Committee and they haven't brought down their report yet." That was the reason he gave for not using that particular issue. Then the reporter said, "What do you think about pre-paid medical services?" "Oh yes," he said, "that will have to be an issue, because we have a plan for pre-paid medical services." Well, I am going to state to Mr. Wooff, in case he doesn't know it, we also have a Committee discussing the question of pre-paid medical services, in this province at the present time. The Premier is stating to the people of Turtleford that unless they vote for the CCF candidate, they may not get pre-paid medical services. He is denying the statement that he made here on Tuesday evening, on the floor of this House, when he said to the Members of this Legislature, "I will not rest until the day that pre-paid medical services are put into effect."

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of privilege. I never made reference to the hon. Member.

Opposition Members: — Sit down — sit down!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I think it is in the rule book in regard to . . .

Opposition Members: — Oh, sit down!

Mr. Gardiner: — I think the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources is worried, but I don't know why. I am not certain where the hon. Premier is, but at the same time I remember quite distinctly him making the statement, and the early remark Tuesday that he would not rest until pre-paid medical services were put into effect, and what did he say on top of that? "I have a mandate from the people of this province that was given to me last June 8th, to put in a pre-paid medical services plan."

Now, Mr. Speaker, now he goes to the people of Turtleford, this Premier of ours and he says, "Unless you people vote for the CCF candidate in your Constituency, you are standing a chance of losing pre-paid medical services."

Opposition Members: — That's smoking it out . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — You know, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health I think is perturbed because of the fact that he does not get a chance to get much of the glory out of this question of pre-paid medical services. He is the Minister of Health, in charge of that particular Department, but when it comes to the question of pre-paid medical services, the Premier wants to make all the announcements himself and I am quite certain . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Sir, I am afraid I have to restrict a certain amount of reference, derogatory reference, to a Member who is not present. That is one of the rules of the House.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, I don't know if I said anything derogatory to the Premier, I might have said something derogatory to the Minister of Health.

February 17, 1961

Hon. Mr. Erb: — On a point of privilege. Anything that suggests Government policy, is quite probably for the Premier.

Mr. Gardiner: — It is quite proper, Mr. Speaker, in the case of Health, in the Province of Saskatchewan, at the present time. Most of the other Ministers make the announcements for their own Department on most occasions, but in this case it appears to be the Premier's prerogative to do the talking on the question of pre-paid medical health, to the people of this province. There is a committee that is costing the people of this province thousands of dollars at the present time. They announced the other day they were going to Europe, and at the same time the Premier goes to Turtleford, and he tells them, "I've got a plan." What's he got this committee out there for, if he's got a plan? What has he got this committee to study this question for, if he is the Premier of this province, and has a plan to put into effect? He's been telling us this for 17 years now, that he has a pre-paid medical services plan for the people of this province.

About three weeks ago two gentlemen came to the City of Regina. One of them was the leader of your present CCF Party, which will disappear this summer. The other was the vice-president of the Labour Congress, for the Dominion of Canada. Do you know what they said? They said that Mr. Diefenbaker, the Prime Minister, in appointing the Hall Commission, was just looking for an excuse to get out from under, and not have to provide the people with medical services. Here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Knowles was appearing before a committee which was appointed by this Government in order to get out from under before the last election, and not have to put into effect pre-paid medical service. I might state here, Mr. Speaker, that when the Throne Speech was handed down by this Government, a year ago, there appeared in that Throne Speech an amendment to the effect that the Government was going to bring Legislation into this House, to provide the framework for the people of this province of a pre-paid medical scheme.

I want to know where that Legislation was last year. It never appeared. Every Member across the way stood up and voted for the Throne Speech, in which the Government stated it was going to place before this House Legislation providing the framework for providing the people of this province with pre-paid medical services. The other day I heard the Premier making fun of a previous

Government —

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Don't be impatient.

Mr. Gardiner: — Which, just before the election, placed on the statute books of this province a medical health plan. I heard him make fun of that particular plan. Well, I am going to say here today, with regard to prepaid medical services, that the Premier of this province knows today that he is not going to see the day as Premier of this province that we'll have prepaid medical services, because he's going to get out from under; he's going to be leaving us before long, and I'm afraid this committee by the time it travels around the world won't have time to come back and make a report in time for the Premier to consider the question of prepaid medical services before he takes over the leadership of the New Party in the Dominion of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a committee considering the question of medical services — I have here in my hand the report of the committee with regard to medical services that have been made by men of ability in this province — four of them within the last 16 years. Each one of them recommends prepaid medical services. Now Premier Douglas says "If it's the last thing I do — I'm going to put into effect prepaid medical services." He was told in this report in 1950, the cost to the people of this province would be \$40 thousand; he was told that the provincial Government should go ahead and put in a prepaid medical plan. In fact one of the members of this committee is on the committee that's meeting at the present time, and considering this problem all over again. If you go back to the Sigurist Commission, which was appointed by this Government — he didn't have to wait for this committee — the Sigurist Commission recommended prepaid medical services. Then you go back to 1943. There is one Member of this House still sitting in the House who was a member of that committee that brought down this report that I have in my hand recommending prepaid medical services. This is a report passed by all the Members of that committee, a unanimous report by Liberals and CCF members of the committee together, and then legislation was put in this House by the Liberal Government which would make possible the formulation of policies to provide the people of this province with medical services, and that is what yesterday, the Premier of this province (or the day before yesterday) laughed about in this Legislature — laughed about this legislation which was approved by Members of his own party who were sitting in the

February 17, 1961

Legislature in 1944, — legislation to provide a policy of providing medical services to the people of this province.

I want to join here this afternoon with the Minister of Health in congratulating the Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League, because here is an example Mr. Speaker, of an organization separate and apart from Government control which has done a marvellous job in the field of health that has been presented to them, done a particularly good job in solving the problem of the people who have suffered from tuberculosis in our province. I would suggest here today, Mr. Speaker, that there are other problems in the field of health in this province at the present time, other pressing problems that can no longer await solution, and I make reference to the problem of mental health, a problem today in which the province of Saskatchewan is losing its place as one of the leaders in the field of mental health in the Dominion of Canada. I take for my information with regard to that statement, the statement by Dr. Lawson, one of the government employees in this province, who in an address at Yorkton, states "That Saskatchewan has lost first place in the field of mental health in the Dominion of Canada." I think, Mr. Speaker, that in this one field alone it is a disgrace that the Minister of Health should have to admit that his Government has placed it in a position where the employees of his department tell the people of this province that we are going backward in Saskatchewan — we are not keeping up the pace with the rest of Canada — in providing a solution and care for our mental health patients.

Mr. Speaker, I think that possibly one of the reasons why mental health has become the serious problem that it is at the present time is because of the fact that possibly we have been taking the wrong approach for many years. I am not only accusing the present Government of continuing this approach for I think it is something that each and every one of us as citizens should consider, as to whether or not our people might not take a greater interest in the problem of those suffering from mental disease, if they had a greater part to play in helping those individuals. If we were to provide them with an organization separate and apart from Government and take the question of mental health out of politics entirely. We have seen last year following the election that politics did operate in the field of mental health in the Province of Saskatchewan, and here in a Session where we are going to pass money for the construction of a liquor warehouse in the Province of

Saskatchewan, costing \$1 million — a liquor warehouse, Mr. Speaker, a branch of the Government that's been taken over by the Premier of this province since the last election. He is going to go ahead and approve the construction of a liquor warehouse, when the Government has said that they cannot go ahead, until further funds are found, with the construction of a hospital to assist the mentally ill in this province.

I think we've come a long way, Mr. Speaker, from the old ideals of humanity first of our Premier and of the party across the way when they have to admit to the people of this province that they haven't a million dollars to spare for mental health patients, but they have a million dollars to spare for the construction of a warehouse in which to store liquor in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think the Government here stands condemned and should hang their heads in shame when such a statement can be made in this province. So I put forth a challenge to the Government of this province that I think there are ways and means of solving many of our health problems, and also I place the challenge before the people themselves, before each one of us as individuals, and I think if the people themselves had more responsibility in this field that we would probably have more progress that we have had in the past.

As I stated, we have as an example the work and the success of the Saskatchewan Anti T.B. League to prove the fact that we might find greater progress if the people of this province had greater interest in the problem of the mentally ill, because of the fact that they have responsibility towards those people in a natural fashion, and in a personal fashion. As I make this suggestion, I know there are those who will say, that a Member of the Opposition probably shouldn't make suggestions to the Government that might prove of value, but I think that at this time of year, when we are considering particularly the problems of the mentally ill, that it would ill-behave anyone who would hold back from suggesting any possible remedy to some of the problems that we are facing in the field of mental health. So I am making that suggestion to the Government and to the people of this province, that we should accept greater responsibility that we should realize the problems of mental health that exist in this province, and I think if we present the challenge to the people of this province, they will accept, and we will probably find a solution to many of the problems in this field of health if we are to approach it in that manner.

February 17, 1961

Now, Mr. Speaker, in relation to other problems of health existing in the province today, we find that listening to other speakers, there have been increases in costs during the past year with regard to the operation of hospitals in the Province of Saskatchewan. I was dismayed to find after the election that the Minister of Health announced an increase in the Hospitalization Tax. Perhaps if it had been an increase of a couple of dollars the people would not have noticed it particularly. But the increase that was placed by the Minister of Health for hospitalization purposes actually indicated that our CCF Government in this province, our socialist friends, are no longer prepared to accept their share of the costs of health in this province, and the cost of hospitalization. They go out to the voters of this province and say: "We are giving to you the people, free hospitalization." This Government isn't providing anything today, in the way of hospital care for the people of this province. I have just received a Return today summing up in this regard, and I think it is worthwhile to read it, and it will be worthwhile for the people of this province to have this information. The question has to do with the receipts for hospitalization purposes in this province. The first question was this: "For the year 1960, what hospitalization fund revenues were received from (1) hospitalization tax (2) education and hospitalization tax (3) additional payments from the consolidated revenue? and B What were the total operating costs of the hospitalization plan in 1960?" These were the answers. In 1960 the revenue from the hospitalization tax — \$9,414,541.71. The amount received from the consolidated funds on account of the education and hospital tax, (that's the tax that is taken from us as individuals) — \$7,343,000.00. An additional payment from the consolidated fund, but they forget to mention when they put this figure down, that most of this money is received from the Federal Government in Ottawa — in the final analysis the figure on that is \$17,768,157.50, of which somewhere in the neighbourhood of between \$15 and \$16 million will be paid back by the Federal Government at Ottawa, leaving a total of possibly \$2 million paid out of consolidated revenues of this province, for the purpose of hospitalization.

A few years ago we were paying out of consolidated revenues as high as \$7 or \$8 million towards the cost of hospitalization. Today that's dropped to \$2 million, but yet the Minister of Health finds it necessary to increase the tax for 1961, in order to provide hospitalization services. I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that the extra

\$3.00 that he says went for the purpose of increased costs in hospitalization will bring in sufficient to cover the \$2 million that will this year be coming out of consolidated revenue, leaving not a five cent piece out of the consolidated revenue of this province for hospitalization in the year 11961. It is little wonder that the hospital boards and those in charge of handling the hospitals in this province have objected to the latest orders that have been issued by the Department of Health with regard to the operation of hospitals in this province.

I have in my hand a copy of the regulations and the order issued to the General Hospitals of this province by the Minister of Health, dated February 3rd, 1961, in which he states to those who are handling our hospitals that in 1961, they must be prepared to operate their hospitals at the 1960 rate, and as well, that depreciation will no longer be counted as an item of expense, with regard to the operation of hospitals in this province. This order comes after many hospital boards had considered their budgets for 1961, after many hospital boards had increased salaries of nurses and staff of their hospitals. This order comes after that has already been done, after many of those agreements have been signed. I am quite certain the Minister is aware of the fact that the budgets for 1960 have already been overspent, in many cases by as much as 5%, with regard to the over-expenditures on the 1960 budgets. The Minister of Health states to the hospitals that they must attempt to operate on the same budget that was drawn for 1960, not the same expenditures but the same budget that was drawn for 1960.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — . . . a 3% increase over last year — up to a 3% increase.

Mr. Gardiner: — I was coming to that, Mr. Minister, if you would just let me finish my statement.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — . . . right away . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Well I didn't have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker. With the hope that the Government might consider 2½ or 3% over the 1960 budget. If I'm wrong in that the Minister can

February 17, 1961

correct me — I think I'm right — 2½ to 3% over the set budget for 1960, not the actual expenditure but the budget that was established at the beginning of the year. The Minister knows full well that the average over the province of the over-expenditure of that budget for 1960 would come very close to a 5% increase. In other words, Mr. Speaker, even if there were no increases in costs in 1961 the taxpayer or someone other than the Government of this Province would have to find the other 2% in order to maintain services on the same level as they were in the year 1960. I believe the hospitals in this province are quite correct in releasing a statement where it definitely states to the Government of this Province that they do not feel that they can provide the necessary health services to the people of this province and also remain under the edict that has been put up by the Department regarding the operating costs of hospital in this province. These orders come only three years after the Federal Government has been paying half the cost of hospitalization in this province.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — That's not true — On a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — I am afraid . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Erb: — . . . the Federal Government contributed 41% toward the total cost of operation.

Mr. Speaker: — That's not a point of privilege, I'm afraid.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, there may be certain items, but the basic fact of the matter is that as far as the total costs of the operation of our hospitals today this Government is not contributing anywhere near what they were contributing a few years ago to the cost of hospitalization. In spite of that they have increased the hospital tax for the people themselves in this present year, and now they are issuing an order to our hospitals to cut down expenses or it will charge their own taxpayers an extra mill or an extra tax rate in order to make up the difference.

Now I say to the people of this province, they have been badly fooled in the last 2 or 3 years, if they thought this Government was providing them with hospitalization services, and they are going to be badly fooled if

they fall for the idea that this Government is thinking of offering them prepaid medical services out of the consolidated revenues of this province, because I don't believe this Government is prepared to do that, because they have failed to find the revenues since they've been in office. They have failed to find the revenues to provide the services that they promised the people of this province back in the election of 1944. They've failed to provide the revenue, to provide the services that were promised to the people of this province by the CCF Party in that election year.

That is another reason why the electors of Turtleford next Wednesday are going to go to the polls and see to the defeat of the CCF candidate in that Constituency, and return the Liberal candidate to this Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to leave the field of health services for a moment to deal with the other question that's an issue in the Turtleford by-election, and that's the question of the county system. I want to make this statement, I'm sorry the hon. Member for the Battlefords isn't in his seat. The other day he indicated that there was something wrong with any Member of this Legislature standing up and taking a stand on any issue that might come before the people of this province. That was the sum and substance of the statement he made when he criticized individuals for taking a stand or even making statements with regard to reorganization of local government in this province. I am going to state to the Members opposite, and I am going to state to the people of my Constituency, that as long as I am their representative, at any time that I feel that there is any issue that is of importance to them, that I should take a stand on, I shall take a stand, whether the Members opposite think that I should take that stand or not. I don't care whether the Member for the Battlefords thinks I am making a political statement, for after all I'm a Member of this Legislature, and if I haven't the right to stand up and give leadership to my people, (he was talking about leadership_ in that very address, — about the Government giving leadership). Well my friends, you and I are also called upon to give leadership to our constituents and to the people that have elected us as Members of this Legislature. When we take action, if we're to be attacked by Members of the Legislature for taking that action and taking stands contrary to their beliefs, then, Mr. Speaker, I think politics has dropped to a pretty low level. I feel as a Member that I should take a stand on issues that are of importance to the people

February 17, 1961

of this province, and of importance to the people when I serve as a Member in this Legislature.

Now with regard to the question of the operations of the Continuing Committee. One of the Members of the Legislature this afternoon, I believe it was the Member for Wilkie, had something to say with regard to expenses of the Continuing Committee. He mentioned I believe, the sum of \$67 thousand. I believe that was the amount spent probably in the year 1959-60, but in an answer to a question handed down by the Government today, we find that the total cost of the Local Government Continuing Committee since its organization down to the present date has been \$295,290.89. Almost \$300 thousand has been spent to date on the Continuing Committee. Then if you're going to go back a little further, to the beginning of this whole thing, going to go back to the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, there was an expenditure of another half a million dollars — \$500 thousand. So there is \$800 thousand that has gone to the cost of deciding whether or not we should have a change of local government in this province. Then my friend here makes another statement; he says that there is also the Centre for Community Study, which does a great deal of work along this line, to which we are providing over \$100 thousand in each and every year, and up to the present time at the end of 1960, for which another \$300 thousand has been expended to have the officials of that branch continually trying to put across the same story that the Continuing Committee and the Royal Commission on Rural Life tried to put before the people of this province. So it has cost the people of this province over a million dollars to have a few individuals come to them and try to tell them how to run their affairs in this province of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I say that it's high time that someone stood up and spoke for the taxpayers in Saskatchewan, and said that you and I and other Members of this Legislature surely have enough intelligence to solve our problems as elected representatives in this Legislature any time that this Government or any other Government — I know that all Governments have the feeling that they should appoint committees from time to time, and what I am stating here is my own personal view. I feel that we here as elected representatives have a responsibility to the people who elect us and pay us as their representatives. We haven't any right to turn that responsibility over to others to solve the problems of this province, and I think, Mr. Speaker, we could have here in the last few years,

resolved this problem and others, if we had considered them ourselves instead of wasting the taxes of the people of this province. I can think of many things that the million dollars that has been spent could have gone towards. I can think of the many advantages that my own Constituency, could have received from the million dollars that's gone down the drain on these various committees. Now we find that this last committee, instead of presenting its report when it was supposed to present it to the Government of this Province, was allowed to go out and try to popularize their program before they presented the committee report to the Government of this Province. I think probably, as the Government has stated and the committee has stated, it is one of the first times that a committee has probably tried to carry out its function in this manner. It is the duty and the responsibility of this Government, if it believes the report of this committee is correct, it is then their duty to go out and try to put this program before the people, and try to convince them that it is right. It is not the duty of the Continuing Committee to try to carry out that function. And so I state here this afternoon, that it has now become the responsibility of this Government to decide whether or not this report is correct, and to bring it in here to the Legislature.

We have presented a motion to the Members of this Legislature, requesting that the people of Saskatchewan be assured by this Government, that they will be provided the right of a vote by ballot before any basic change is made in municipal reorganization in the Province of Saskatchewan. I am quite certain, I don't know what the vote of my friends opposite is going to be, but I know what the vote of most of their constituents has been in the last few months. There haven't been too many votes in my Constituency, though it is a fact that almost two-thirds of the municipalities held votes — two-thirds of the municipalities, and down our way the majority of them haven't been holding them. This must mean that in the other parts of the province — the western half of the province and the north and central areas and in the south — that most of those municipalities must have held votes, and every one of them turned down the ideas of the Continuing Committee, and now it becomes the responsibility of each of us in this Legislature to decide whether or not we are going to give the residents of our Constituencies the right to a democratic say in how they want to govern themselves locally in the years to come. It is a responsibility which each of us will have to accept when we vote on the amendment to the Address-in-Reply, and I challenge my friends opposite at that time to stand up for their constituents

February 17, 1961

and accept the results of the votes in their areas, the results of their votes in regard to this matter, and give them the right to a say in the future of governing themselves in their own local areas.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I do want to say in a general way that the Speech from the Throne, as many Members of this Legislature have stated, has very little in it for the people of this province. I don't think the residents of Turtleford or any other Constituency in Saskatchewan would go to the polls in the next few days, and vote for a Government that has just come back with what the Premier calls a great mandate to vote for a Government which has provided so little in the Speech from the Throne.

I would like to make reference to the problem of rural telephone companies. Last year when the Government decided to grant assistance to rural telephone companies, I said at the time that it was at least a step forward, but I also suggested that the Government of this province could find a much easier way to provide the money to the rural telephone companies, and I think the Government has found that I was correct in that statement, because of the fact that with regard to making its grants up to the present time, in an answer handed down by the Minister, only 13 rural telephone companies out of over 900 companies in this province have been approved for a maintenance grant in the Province of Saskatchewan. Not one company has been paid a five cent piece yet out of the money that we have provided as Members of this Legislature during the last Session, for that purpose.

The Minister states that it is going to be paid by the first of March to the 13 companies that have been approved. Well, I hope by that time that the majority of the other companies that have placed an application and those that will be placing applications before the Government, will be approved as well and that some of that money that we voted for the assistance of rural telephone companies will be paid out. It may be a way for the Government to prevent having the deficit of last year, to see to it that they don't have to pay out money in certain cases, where the Members of the Legislature voted that money for the use of the people of the province in the last Session.

But I am prepared to say here, Mr. Speaker, that there won't be a great deal of money that was voted by the Members in the last Session out of that plan that is spent, and the majority of the money will be spent in the administration. This is an example of what is

being done. The Department of Telephones, has not even enough faith in the rural telephone companies in this province, to be honest, when they make an application to the Department for a pole grant. He has to send someone out to count every pole that has been put by rural telephone companies and make sure that it was put in before he will grant . . .

Hon. Mr. Williams: — This is an exaggeration, Mr. Speaker, there has been no dishonesty on the part of the Department of Telephones or myself. Certainly there is no dishonesty. We are proceeding with that program just as efficiently as we possibly can. Now, there are 953 telephone companies of course, and before many more weeks have passed, these conditions that were referred to, will be cleared up.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I said I felt he was saying to the rural telephone companies that he thought they were dishonest, because he feels he has to send someone out to count the poles, and make sure they put them in before they receive their grants. Send a man out and spend a complete day in many of those rural telephone companies to count the telephone poles that were put in in order to make certain that that telephone company has not asked for anything that they have not used.

Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, there must be many more simple ways of providing assistance to our rural telephone companies. But I hope that our Minister will accept during this Session, as he more or less indicated in the Speech from the Throne he may accept, some changes to the Act which will make it possible for the rural people of our province, to receive the benefits as they should do from the legislation that was passed by the Members of this Legislature in the last Session.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — No blank cheques.

Mr. Gardiner: — And I hope not, I don't think anyone is asking for a blank cheque, Mr. Speaker, I don't think any telephone company is asking for that. The Minister has complete control under the special telephone levy formed in this province, complete control over the actions of telephone companies, and if he wants to place the grants of telephone companies in this special levy, they must be used for mainly construction purposes, if the money is put into that fund. I am quite certain the Minister and the Department can find very simple ways in which they can provide assistance to all rural telephone companies in

February 17, 1961

Saskatchewan, without regimentation, without costly administration, without costing those same taxpayers money out of their pockets, in order to receive the small benefit that it appears they are going to receive if actions continue as they have during the past year, so that even in that small item, it indicates that the Government has failed to carry out the mandate of this Legislature, which we provided them with when we voted for the Speech from the Throne on legislation that was placed before the Members of this Legislature a year ago.

And so I say, here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, that for the reasons stated, I could not support the Speech from the Throne. I will vote for the amendment, which provides a democratic choice to the people of this province, with regard to the operation of their own business and I'll vote against the main motion, which would be support for the Government, which has indicated that it is no longer a responsible Government and it should no longer deserve the support of the people of this province.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly adjourned at 4:52 o'clock p.m.