

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
FIRST SESSION — FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE  
8th Day**

**Monday, February 20, 1961**

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

**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, seconded by Mr. McDonald:

**Mr. Martin Semchuk (Meadow Lake):** — First, Mr. Speaker, allow me to congratulate you on your election to the high office which you now hold in this Legislature. The people of your Constituency should be very proud. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will serve this Assembly with honour, dignity, and impartiality, and I certainly wish you every success.

I would also like to thank the people of my Constituency for the faith and the confidence they have placed in me and this Government by electing me as their representative in this Legislature. I would also like to assure the friendly folks in the Meadow Lake Constituency with the hope that we will continue to warrant their faith and their confidence.

Mr. Speaker, being a newcomer to this Assembly, I should probably tell you how impressed I was with the opening ceremonies of this Legislature. It made me realize some of my duties and my responsibilities to the people of Saskatchewan, and I must admit Mr. Speaker, that I felt rather small and somewhat humble. However, after listening to some of the speeches made by the Members opposite in this Legislature, I must say I do not feel quite so small.

This being 'Brotherhood Week' I feel quite charitable towards the hon. gentlemen opposite, and will therefore discuss such matters which I think most of us will agree on. As I was going to work this morning, (probably it was due to the fact that it was the beginning

**February 20, 1961**

of a new week) I thought what a wonderful world this would be if all of us, when we wake up each morning, think for a moment of how best we can serve our fellow men. How can we ease some of the tensions and some of the fears in the minds of the people in this mixed up and divided world of ours? I thought that surely there is a purpose and a reason why we are put on this earth. Surely it was not for the purpose of dividing people; our purpose is not to set our workers against our farmers, or our farmers against our workers, and our business people against the other two. Surely there must be much that we have in common if we all work to produce the wealth of this nation. All we ask is something close to a fair share of the wealth that we produce and the services that we sell: the worker, the farmer, the professional and business man — all of them, Mr. Speaker.

What do we really want? As a business man, what do I really want? I want a reasonable home, food, clothing, education for my children, some recreation, and reasonable assurance for old age. That is what I basically want. Is it too much to expect? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. With our capacity to produce goods and services in this country, I think that it is the least that we should expect.

Being mainly concerned with the north west corner of our province, I wish to congratulate the great spokesman for the people of northwestern Saskatchewan, the Member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). I wish to congratulate him on the capable, straight forward, and sincere manner in which he moved the Address-in-Reply. There is much in the Throne Speech, Sir, which indicates that our people will continue to benefit by the good programs that this Government has instituted and is continuing to give to the people of Saskatchewan.

I also wish to congratulate the Member for Saskatoon, (Mrs. Strum). Although a newcomer to this Assembly, she impressed us tremendously with her thought-provoking and informative address; I certainly was impressed.

Having felt the need to more and more effective spokesmen for northwestern Saskatchewan during the past few years, I was delighted on the evening of June 8th last to hear that the Member for the Battlefords was re-elected with a comfortable majority. I was also pleased to hear that the C.C.F. candidates for the Redberry and Turtleford Constituencies were also re-elected to the Government side of the House. I felt, Mr. Speaker, that we had a team — a team that had seldom ever been equalled in the history of the north west, and it is therefore

with some concern, Mr. Speaker, that I view recent legal developments in the Turtleford Constituency which were no fault of the elected Member, but at the same time I look forward with high hope that after the 22nd of this month the people of the Turtleford Constituency will be represented for at least sometime during this Session of this Legislature.

Due to the fact that former Meadow Lake Constituency representatives have not deemed it necessary or desirable to focus attention on northwestern Saskatchewan, I feel that a great number of our people in this province have a somewhat blurred and incomplete picture of our north west, and I feel therefore that it is my duty and responsibility to present to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan, and for your consideration, the possibility of exploration and development of our natural resources, and the problem and opportunities in that challenging part of Saskatchewan.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Semchuk:** — In order to speed up exploration and development of our natural resources, roads had to be built. Today we have a good network of roads and highways. We also know that it takes roads to bring people. It takes people to bring development, to bring ideas and exploration and the subsequent utilization of our resources. We must stress the need of building a strong north-south traffic pattern. I think it is becoming more and more important in our province and in our nation, and I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to note that improvements are being made in regard to No. 4 and No. 26 Highways. These are our main north-south highways for the west side of the province, and are essential to speed up this development program.

There have been thousands of miles of essential access and fireguard roads built in the northern area by this Government — something which was not done before. These access roads are starting to bring dividends to the people of this province; the road to Canoe Lake, some 90 miles north of Meadow Lake; the Buffalo Narrows Road some 173 miles north from Meadow Lake; the La Loche Road, the continuation of that road on to La Loche. These are all great road-building programs, opening up a multitude of opportunity for exploration and development of our forests, our water, and of our mineral resources in that part of the province.

Regarding the La Loche and other roads in the northern part of our province, Mr. Speaker, I wish to

**February 20, 1961**

state that in our considered opinion, federal responsibility must evolve to tie this vast country of ours together by building north-south arterial roads just as the John A. Macdonald administration built the railroad to tie this country together east and west from coast to coast. I feel that the greatest defence this country can have, is to have our own people working in our northern areas, working and living in our northern areas, and what seems to be an oversight on the part of the Federal Government in the far north to build roads and to develop resources without providing adequate outlets to the south which are essential, not only for the development of resources but also for the industrialization of our prairie provinces. We must have access to our northern areas, if we are to supply manufactured goods and the products of our farms to the people working in the far north. Or, as is happening now, are we going to let other countries from across the Pacific or the Atlantic supply the needs of the people working and living in our northern areas?

We have, Mr. Speaker, at the present time both a white and native population in our northern area. They are not trained to meet the demands of the present, or the future technical needs of modern living. Many of these people prefer living in the north; they like it there. I have lived in the northern half of our province all my life, and I certainly wouldn't want to change. We must respect these people's choice, I think, when we think in terms of integration. Roads into the north have greatly enhanced the native's opportunity, and has assured him greater economic security.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend this Government on the present trend of giving technical training to displaced and unemployed persons. I had occasion to visit with some of the young native people who are taking trade training at the trade school in Saskatoon. These young people are very happy and are getting along very well. They have asked me to convey to this Government their appreciation and their thanks.

I am somewhat sorry to see many of the vocations in handicraft being replaced by cheap machine-made products imitating handicrafts. This creates, I think, a lack of opportunity to express this personal ability. I had the opportunity of visiting the Co-op Native Handicraft Shop at Lac la Ronge. One must see the work done by the people of that community in order fully to realize and appreciate the need of similar craft shops in other parts of our province, and I think it is up to us to promote that idea.

At this time it may be opportune to point out the vital part that music and art have played in satisfying the yearning for personal expression. Music has proved to be one of the most effective vehicles for the successful integration of the many ethnic groups within our nation. We have not used music to the same effect with regard to our native population.

With the thousands of beautiful fishing lakes in north-western Saskatchewan, and I think they are some of the finest lakes you will see anywhere, and the new Provincial Park established by this Government, and with these new and improved roads and highways our tourist trade is expanding at a very good rate, but as yet our water resources are almost untapped. It has not been fully realized, I think, by the people in the southern part of the province that for thousands of years these waters have been ready-made landing fields, waiting for the airplane. This is a factor which has not received adequate publicity. People with ideas can come in and see for themselves the multiplicity of opportunities awaiting expansion and development.

Roads, power, and raw materials are so interdependent, Mr. Speaker, that to ignore one of these is to refuse the effectiveness of all the others, and that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what former administrations in this province did, only they did not ignore one — they ignored all the factors. During that great industrial expansion period after the War, this province was not in a position to industrialize; we couldn't industrialize. We did not have adequate supplies or electrical power; we did not have natural gas; we did not have adequate access to highway systems to get at our raw materials. It is a different picture today. Now industry can establish almost anywhere in this province, and be reasonably sure of an adequate supply of the essentials necessary for a profitable operation.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Semchuk:** — That, Mr. Speaker, is what industry wants; that is why industry is establishing in Saskatchewan now, I might say in spite of the adverse publicity which is constantly pouring out from the Members opposite.

I sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, how long a member of the Board of Trade or the Chamber of Commerce would last if he had taken that same kind of attitude towards his own community.

**February 20, 1961**

**Government Member:** — Not very long.

**Mr. Semchuk:** — I might say that our telephone and radio communication in the northwest has been expanded and is providing excellent service not only in the far north, but in the more developed areas. I was pleased to attend the official opening of the new dial telephone system in Meadow Lake which utilizes, I understand, some of the most modern equipment to be found anywhere in Canada. I am also happy to know that long-distance radio-telephone service, the first of its kind in Saskatchewan, I am told, will be made available to all villages and hamlets not already served, and within a radius of 30 miles of the Meadow Lake exchange. This will reach communities such as Green Lake, Blue Bell, Golden Ridge, Loon River, Horsehead, Sandy Ridge and Barthel. It is a great thing for the people up there.

With reference to agriculture, it must be remembered that our area is one of the heaviest producers and shippers of cereal grain, cattle, and hogs in western Canada. In fact we have some of the largest grain storage facilities to be found anywhere outside the Constituency. This area is vulnerable to water run-off problems, and a flood control program is becoming essential. I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that the expanding community pasture program instituted by this Government is serving a very desirable purpose, and has improved greatly the economy of our part of the province. This is indeed a worthwhile program, and I wish to express our appreciation to the Minister of Agriculture.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Semchuk:** — The Green Lake Community Farm Project carried on by this Government should be of interest to many people in our province. The purpose of this program was to teach the Metis people in Green Lake and surrounding area good farming practice, proper operation and repair of machinery, the care of tools, livestock, woodworking, and so on. This program has succeeded beyond our fondest hopes. These people are doing a magnificent job on their farms, and are learning well, but probably more important than this is the fact that many of these people are finding useful employment on farms, garages, and service stations, and leading useful and normal productive lives.

Due to the improved health and welfare services in our province, these people are reproducing at a faster

rate than ever before. However, the population of Green Lake remains almost static. During the course of the last few years, approximately 800 young people from Green Lake have integrated into our population in the various parts of our province and our country.

Mr. Speaker, I will devote the next few minutes of my time to what I believe to be one of the greater problems facing our farmers, and that is the need of more export markets for farm products. We realize, of course, that this is a Federal Government responsibility, but this problem concerns not only the farmers, but every worker and almost every business man in our country. Our manufacturers explain that to barter our farm products is not the realistic approach to this problem. They say we would put our manufacturers out of business, and our labour force out of work. This sounds logical and I can appreciate their concern. However, I do not altogether agree with this line of thinking.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the millions of hungry people in the underdeveloped countries are not manufacturers of consumer goods. They do not produce automobiles, cameras, or safety razors. In fact they produce very little of anything in the line of manufactured goods. However, geographically these areas can produce raw materials such as cotton, and so on which we do not and cannot produce here, and which could be processed into consumer goods to our advantage. This would, of course, stimulate industry and create employment on an every-expanding scale. But greater perhaps than this is the possibility of trading food for food. We could process such foods as they produce, such as rice, cocoa, pineapple, walnuts, tea, coffee and so on. I visualize a national food board with wide powers to enable these organizations to go into the underdeveloped countries, and into the hungry countries, and negotiate long term trade treaties. We could help these people produce raw materials, grow foods which they could trade for our butter, our pork, or any food that we can produce economically.

Of course, from a humanitarian point of view this is a much more practical means of liberating people than the high tension and political jockeying for power that we witnessed today. If we do not liberate these people, the Communists will, and even a hard-headed business man should see the feasibility of some plan of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the increased grants to education and the increase to the Student Aid Fund which has been forecast in the Speech from the Throne.

**February 20, 1961**

I am glad to hear that provincial park development will be expanded, and that the north roads and highway programs will be accelerated. Because of these and many other good programs mentioned in this debate, I will be pleased to support the motion.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, in joining in the debate may I first of all associate myself with those who have already expressed their congratulations and good wishes to you, as a result of your election to the Office as Speaker. My own wishes come not only because of my high regard for you, Mr. Speaker, but also because of the fact, as you know, your Constituency happens to include the place of my birth, the area in which I grew up and the area to which I returned to teach for a number of years, and so my congratulations are especially warm in that regard.

I want also to join with those who have congratulated the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply. The mover, the Member from the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) has been my neighbour, as far as Constituencies go, for sometime since his Constituency and mine do join, and since a number of the people from my Constituency make use of some of the facilities which his Constituency provides. He applied himself in his usual vigorous and aggressive way to his task of moving the Address-in-Reply.

The seconder of the Address-in-Reply is not quite a neighbour, Constituency-wise, but removed only by a very few miles, and I add my congratulations to the lady Member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum) on her first address in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some suggestion from Members opposite that the pronouncements and



announcements of the Speech from the Throne should be viewed with something less than enthusiasm because it did not contain long lists of announcements of new legislation. Members of the Opposition should hardly need reminding that it is not necessary to buy a new or a bigger car each year in order to demonstrate that they are going some place, or in order to go some place. Nor may I say does a Government necessarily need new legislation, or vast numbers of new programs each year, in order to continue going places. Sometimes it is better to get mileage and value out of that which we have. Frequently it is better to complete existing programs before initiating new ones. Certainly because this Government has had the foresight in previous years to enact that legislation to give it a basis for operation, should be no reason for criticism at this time. Since, however, the suggestion has been offered, let me for a few minutes remind the Legislature of the scope of some of the programs referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

For example, there are a great many of our farmers who are intensely interested in diversifying their farming practice, and as a result they are interested in the announcement which suggested a continuation of emphasis on the part of the Department of Agriculture of a pasture development program. Farmers are interested in these opportunities for diversification, because they realize that many of the marketing possibilities which exist for livestock products are greater than those for which markets must be found abroad. Goodness knows, Mr. Speaker, since the former Liberal Federal Government lost all of our markets for livestock and livestock produce outside Canada, they have to be interested in this kind of development.

Farmers cross the province, too, who make a tremendously large investment in farm machinery have been impressed with, and have been vocal supporters of a program of agricultural machinery testing to which reference is made in the Speech from the Throne. Certainly, it will be welcomed by all members of the Saskatchewan community that the South Saskatchewan River Project is continuing with a considerable alacrity. I think we might note here that this is a project concerning which we were never able to get a commitment, to say nothing of action, from any Federal Liberal Government. A failure in this regard was marked by the words of one speaker as "a national tragedy and a national disgrace." These were words used by the Leader of the Opposition back in 1949. Certainly if the failure of the Federal Liberal Government in 1949 to do anything about the dam was a national tragedy, and a national disgrace it was

**February 20, 1961**

such more so six years later.

It seems to me, too, quite worthy of mention in a document such as the Speech from the Throne that the Farm Water and Sewerage Program which was started in 1960 will be more than doubled in 1961. Certainly there will be many farmers in communities throughout the province who will be pleased to note that the program of rural electrification and of bringing gas to more Saskatchewan communities will be extended in 1961. One can imagine what the Members of the Opposition would have said had these items not been referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

With regard to education, there is reference in the Speech from the Throne to new capital to the Student Aid Fund. There is reference to increases in school grants. This, admittedly is not a new departure for this particular Government, but people will welcome the news that the program of steadily increasing school grants is to be continued. There is reference to the fact that there will be new construction of the new Regina campus of the University of Saskatchewan. There is reference to the fact that the new Technical Institute located in Moose Jaw is ready for a full 1961 program.

The Speech from the Throne tells us there will be a new Mental Health Act placed before us for discussion. It announces also a new institution for mental health purposes located in the City of Prince Albert. When we refer to the section dealing with social welfare, there is reference to a low rental housing program presently in the course of construction and this is coupled with an invitation to other communities in the province to take advantage of this program.

The same section of the Speech from the Throne reveals proposals for an improvement in our penal facilities. Certainly it is worthwhile to mention the fact that a major transportation line, the Petrofka bridge, will be completed during the year. The acquisition of more land for camp and picnic facilities is another vital improvement, adding to the growing number of recreational facilities in the province.

There is one other new program to which I refer only briefly at this time, and that is the Saskatchewan Savings Bond which is referred to in the Speech from the Throne. These bonds in amounts from \$100 up will provide an opportunity for Saskatchewan people to invest in their

own province; they will make it possible for us to use more adequately Canadian developmental capital, and they will provide an additional source of funds for financing growth-promoting developments such as the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones.

Mr. Speaker, all these programs and many more which I will not mention at this time certainly constitute no program of just drifting and coasting. They propose a program which will continue to extend already existing services in the province. They propose a program which will provide still more investment in the productivity of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan, as a result, will still be a better place in which to live because of what is going to be done in accordance with the statement from the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, when the Member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) closed his address the other day, he used a quotation at the completion of his peroration. You will recall that point Mr. Speaker at which, in the exuberance of his enthusiasm, he almost took off into orbit. In casting around, trying to remember what it was that he actually said at that point, I too recall a Latin quotation. This one is frequently used for translation exercises, which, if I recall it went something to the effect that 'Caesar's gaul was divided into three parts'. It seems to me, in thinking about what the Opposition has said, that we might divide their "gaul" (spelled a little differently) into three parts. As I look at those parts it is suggested to me that I could divide them as follows, first as errors, or at least misleading attempts to lead others into error. Secondly, as contradictions, and thirdly as insults to certain segments of the Saskatchewan community.

Before dealing with those in detail, before dealing with the misrepresentation aspects of their address as I want first of all to deal with some of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition with regard to representation. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that he raised the question, or tried to raise the question in his remarks as to just who represents whom in this particular Legislature. He intimated that the Liberals spoke for all who did not vote for the CCF in June of 1960. Now, it may be that his opinion has changed somewhat as a result of a press statement which appeared in the February 16th issue of 'The Leader-Post'. May I just read some of that statement to the Legislature. It is a statement accredited to Social Credit Leader, Martin Kelln. It says:

**February 20, 1961**

“Mr. Kelln was referring to what he termed an intimidation by Liberal Leader Ross Thatcher. Mr. Kelln went on to say: ‘This is the typical type of gutter politics that the Liberal Leader and many of their cohorts engaged in throughout the 1960 election and since. On the one hand they claim the Social Creditors were hired by the CCF to split the vote; on the other hand they tried to claim ‘We are now supporting it’.”

On this I notice the Leader of the Opposition was said to have no particular comment.

On this matter of representation, and the supposed resurgence of the Liberal Party, we heard a lot of talk last June and some now again, about the ‘New’ Liberal Party which is supposedly rising like a phoenix from the ashes of the old! This seems to me to raise a question of whether or not in fact there is any evidence of increasing support for the Liberal Party in the Province of Saskatchewan. So, I ask the question: What is the long-term trend? In order to answer this question, I will make use of a word, Mr. Speaker, which still makes Liberals in the Province of Saskatchewan blanche and pale. The word “1944.” I use the year 1944, because the Liberals certainly agreed at that time that at that point they had reached what they considered to be pretty well ‘rock bottom’. They elected at that time five Members to the Legislature.

But in 1944 they did succeed in getting thirty-five per cent of the vote in the province. Eight years later, 1952 they achieved thirty-nine per cent of the vote. They went up a little in that eight-year period. They cannot hardly blame the poor results for them that year on a split vote, Mr. Speaker, since in that particular election the Social Credit Party had candidates in less than half the seats, and the Conservatives had candidates in only five seats, and the Social Credits and Conservatives together only got about six per cent of the vote. It would be logical, applying the basis of reasoning of the Members opposite, for us to argue that if it had not been for the anti-Liberal vote in those seats at that time, the Government would have been returned with a greater majority.

In 1960 we find that the Liberal vote had dropped to thirty-three per cent; in other words, in eight years their percentage of the total vote in the province dropped six per cent; in fact it dropped two per cent below the percentage they got in 1944. Now

you remember that in 1944 when they got their thirty-five per cent they were going not to the left but straight down the road. One can see where they were going. They went over a little hill, and they have gone down into a deeper vale ending up with two per cent vote less than 1960 than they actually had in 1944, when they were in the depths of despondency at least.

There are some other developments during that period which should be noted. From 1944 to 1952, during that first eight-year period they recruited a vigorous new Leader for the Liberal Party. He, if you will recall, had been a Progressive Liberal. Then between 1952 and 1960 they achieved another vigorous new leader. He had been a Progressive Conservative, and then in 1960 they achieved still a third new Progressive Liberal. He had been an unprogressive C.C.F.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — The question to be raised is, where are they going for their next leader, or equally pertinent — just when are they going for their next leader?

Now, having dealt with the representation issue as raised by the Members of the Opposition, I will turn to that group of remarks which I categorize as misrepresentation, and which I suggest could be divided in general into three parts: errors, misleading remarks at least, and secondly contradictions, and thirdly, insults to some sections of the Saskatchewan community. In saying it, Mr. Speaker, may I exclude first of all most of the remarks of the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). I do this because I think all Members of the House enjoyed and appreciated the discussion by the Member from Athabasca with regard to the problems of the native population in his Constituency.

Let me turn first of all, then, to this list of errors, most of which I admit were committed by the Leader of the Opposition in his opening statement. There is, first of all, the error with regard to insurance rates, already corrected by the Premier. The province has already been assured that the statement by the Leader of the Opposition that insurance rates were going up is not true; car insurance rates remain as they were.

Secondly, the Leader of the Opposition, you will remember, referred to the fact that this friend of his had gone down to get a car license and he was

**February 20, 1961**

told there was no form available, which is a perfectly normal thing for this time of year. On that he went on to suggest that there was going to be an increase in car licenses. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand the "Saskatchewan Gazette" of February 3rd, and I read from Page 79 this: A copy of an Order in Council:

"The Executive Council has under consideration a report from the Provincial Treasurer dated January 17, 1961 . . ."

and it goes on to outline what the fees for car licenses will be for this coming year. This was at least a week before the Leader of the Opposition spoke in the House. The rates had been made public at that time, and anyone who had read them would know that the Leader of the Opposition's friend could be certain that he could purchase his car license at the same rate as he paid in 1960; and they would perhaps know, too, that this would certainly be no more than what he would pay for it if he had bought it in the Province of Alberta for the same vehicle. It probably would have a 90% chance of being less than he would pay for it had he bought it in the Province of Manitoba.

Certainly you will recall that the Leader of the Opposition said that he had it from a good source that the grants for the university had been cut by \$350,000. He might have had it from a good source, but certainly not a reliable source, because as the statements in the Budget and Estimates will prove when they are brought into this House properly, Mr. Speaker, the operating grant for the university will certainly be greater than it was in this present year. The operating and capital grants together will certainly be larger than were the operating and capital grants to the university in the current year, and some additional arrangements have been made in order that there is even more building in addition, with regard to the university. So there is another one.

He made some reference about the gross provincial debt. Here I give him the benefit of the doubt. I don't think he really meant to be wrong, but certainly the way in which he said it was such as to give the wrong impression. Because he said that the gross provincial debt had increased from \$140 million to over \$400 million. Now then, if he was thinking about 1944, then the \$140 million is a wrong figure. It should have been \$218 million, so he was about 25% wrong there, if he was thinking, as he said he was, of the gross provincial debt. The \$140 million is close to the net debt at that time, so it appears that he was comparing the net debt at that time, in 1944, with the gross debt in

1960. He was wrong with regard to the figure he gave as to the cost of the Power Corporation building. He was wrong with regard to the information he gave as to the size of the building in comparison to some building somewhere or other in the States. He gave inaccurate information with regard to some industries. You will recall that the Premier pointed out one of these industries which he suggested had disappeared had, in fact, been built and was in operation in the City of Moose Jaw, and another one is employing considerably more men than he had reported.

Mr. Speaker, there is a list of some of the errors; insurance rates, car license costs, university budget, provincial debt, cost of the Power Corporation building, comparative size of the Power Corporation building, inaccurate information with regard to some industries. I submit that, never in the history of this Legislature have there been so many errors made in such a short time.

I turn now to the second category of the remarks of the Opposition, namely those in which they contradict themselves, or in which there is some implicit contradiction. They pleaded or they said they were pleading, you will recall, the case of the unemployed persons in this province and then went on to criticize the actions of the Government, many of which have resulted in creating employment opportunities. This is particularly true, I suggest, when they criticize the size of the public debt, much of which has been invested in employment-creating activities. Not only short-term opportunities, but the investment in power, in gas, certainly this has had a good effect on long-term employment opportunities in the province. Now, the need for the Power Corporation building and the economic justification for it has already been referred to by both the Premier and the Minister of Industry and Information. Let me just add this, since I am talking about employment, and talking about the contradictions of the Opposition, who are for employment, but for less spending on the part of the Government. This building will give a great deal of employment, first of all, to those in the construction industry but it goes much beyond that. It will use Saskatchewan steel, steel which is rolled and fabricated in Saskatchewan, industries, which were not here until rather recent years. This gives employment. It will use Saskatchewan cement. This will give employment in an industry which was not present in Saskatchewan until comparatively recent years. The cement is going to be taken there in bags made in Saskatchewan, an industry which was not present here until recent years. This building will use Saskatchewan bricks, thereby giving

**February 20, 1961**

employment to people in the part of the province where Saskatchewan bricks are made. People will be employed; they will have purchasing power, additional purchasing power with a result that our stores and our services and our business generally throughout the province will benefit.

The second contradiction, which I suggest there was in the remarks of the Members opposite, had to do with the old, old chestnut of the Liberal Party, when in Opposition. That is, that they could reduce taxes and increase services. Well, they tried this one on the people of Saskatchewan last June, they didn't get very far with it. They suggested in the recent Ottawa meeting of the Federal Liberal Organization, that this could be done on a federal level as well.

In this regard I want to read a part of the comment from an editorial in the "Star Phoenix" of January 12, 1961. It is speaking of what the Liberal Party has said it would do at this rally. Here is what it says:

"What makes the substance of the deliberations at the Liberal rally so difficult, is, to distinguish facts from fancy, to determine how much is political window-dressing and how much the Liberals believe they can perform and most important of all, intend to carry out."

That seems to me to be the valid comment to this suggestion made again the other day, that they could reduce taxes and increase services.

Thirdly we had the attempt to plead the case of the municipalities. I remember the Member from Saltcoats, after speaking a considerable length on this said, "I have a closed mind." It was an entirely unnecessary remark, Mr. Speaker; he demonstrated it very well. But he said it and I submit that if the problems of the municipalities are going to be met, then there is no place for closed minds such as he indicated were present on the other side of the House.

I would like to say a brief word about the increase in assistance to local governments in a period of less than a decade. During a period of less than a decade, school grants have increased from \$6,000,000 to \$25,000,000. Twenty-eight million dollars I believe it is in the current year, Mr. Speaker. Assistance to



municipal roads increased from about \$800,000 to approximately \$6,800,000. In addition, in this particular year the bonds of local government debentures were purchased to the extent of some \$5,000,000.

The fourth contradiction to which I want to refer is in regard to their dealing with industrial development. Here they would have us believe that the only reason why there has not been more industrial development is because of something associated with the present Provincial Government.

I want to give them a reason from another source, and I wonder if the Members of the Opposition will deny this has been a valid reason for some lack of industrial development in the Province of Saskatchewan. Here was a man, who said that “three factors which I have briefly touched upon; high tariffs, high freight rates, and a lack of irrigation have all contributed to make Saskatchewan a province almost without industries.” I ask the Opposition if they are willing to disagree with these as being strong deterrents. I ask them because these were remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition in 1945, as referred to in the Hansard of Parliament at that time. Tariffs are even higher today; freight rates are even higher; irrigation admittedly is on its way, but not with any thanks due to the Federal Liberal Government.

But the fourth and the main contradiction I submit, comes from the statement of the Leader of the Opposition that the Liberal Party is not moving to the left. This is the fundamental contradiction of the Liberal Party. This is the reason why Liberal Parties (spelled with a capital ‘L’) stop being liberal, (spelled with a small ‘l’.) They just can’t make up their minds, Mr. Speaker, which ‘L’ to choose. This has been their fundamental dilemma all down through the years. They say they will not move to the left; they say they go straight ahead. They refuse to recognize the fact that the world is moving and that the pressure of science, both physical and social, the pressure of public desire is moving to the left. And they are pulling so hard to restrain they inevitably move themselves not straight ahead but to the right. This has been the history of the Liberal Party in Canada and Liberal Parties elsewhere, who try to maintain that kind of restraint.

And again I think there is some evidence coming out of the recent meeting of Liberals all across Canada, that this is a dilemma. And again may I refer to an article in the “Star Phoenix,” dated January 12th, written by Bob Moon. In discussing the conference he says:

**February 20, 1961**

“A quiet and hitherto almost imperceptible conflict within the inner soul of the Liberal Party has now erupted in a proposal (for what, Mr. Speaker?), in a proposal for national economic planning.”

This from the people who are not going to move to the left. And then he goes on to say this:

The full scope of this proposal is difficult to gauge at this stage, for its surface manifestations are somewhat obscure, its phraseology sufficiently vague to give a flexible interpretation.”

No, Mr. Speaker, this is of course a difficult position of the Liberal Party. It is what the Member for Arm River would call weasel-worded. In other words “its surface manifestations are obscure, its phraseology sufficiently vague” so as to allow them to move them in whichever position they think it is bent to say they’re moving, depending on the company they are in. Now it goes on to say that:

They stirred up a lot of contention at the committee level, but in fact never got to the floor of the House, and since the resolution which the committee had, harkened back to the days of the MacKenzie King Administration and the white paper of 1945 . . .”

You will recall some of the statements made at that time, Mr. Speaker: Here was the party which in the words of its national leader had seen a “new heaven and a new earth” and were going to move steadfastly towards that; this is the party which now says it’s not going to move to the left. I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is the fundamental contradiction of the Liberal Party and the reason again why capital ‘L’ Liberals cease being small ‘l’ liberals. Those are the contradictions which I suggest are implicit in the remarks of the Members opposite.

I turn now to the third category and that is to the category which, I regret to say, I think must be called insults to certain sections of the Saskatchewan community. I think first of all of the oilmen, because the Leader of the Opposition took it upon himself to put words in the mouth of oilmen in this province with regard to their opinion of the Saskatchewan Government. It reminded me, you know, of the pronouncement of another Liberal leader, about oil, in this Legislature. This was back in the days when, I think it was the Progressive

Liberal who was the leader.

He said there would never be any oil discovered in the Province of Saskatchewan so long as there is a CCF Government. And I recall the hilarious scene in the House one year later when your predecessor, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Swift Current at that time, speaking in one of the debates, produced a bottle of oil from one of the oil wells in your Constituency, Mr. Speaker, and took it across the House and presented it to the Leader of the Opposition. The developments of the oil and gas industry in Saskatchewan have contributed a very great and a very much appreciated amount to the Province of Saskatchewan in recent years. The production is increasing. In 1960 the industry produced some \$106 million worth of oil. It had an average daily production of 145,000 barrels. This constituted nearly 30% of the total Canadian output.

The second group to which I refer, Mr. Speaker, as having been the butt of insults from across the way, were the public servants of the Province of Saskatchewan. We had the Leader of the Opposition referring to that "army of political workers on the payroll." We had the Member from Saltcoats equating all, as far as I could gather, of the public service with public heelers. We had his reference that there was some kind of a plan in the wind to move five hundred propagandists for socialism over the local governments. This would include all of our school superintendents, all of our Ag. Reps. our social workers and some others. I really don't know how he got the figure of five hundred, but that is his problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that as far as the Government is concerned, and I am sure it's as far as the people of Saskatchewan are concerned, we have good reason to be proud of the Saskatchewan Civil Service, and I think that you will not find a better one anywhere in Canada. I also submit this, that you will not find anywhere in Canada a closer adherence to the proper rules of merit, with regard to appointment and promotion of civil servants than is observed here in the Province of Saskatchewan. I am proud of the relationship of the Government with the public service and the relationship of that public service with the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Member from Saltcoats referred to some twenty-five people, I think, whom he said were known as CCF supporters. About half of them are still in the public service in one capacity or another. I don't think these people object at all to it being known or

**February 20, 1961**

being said that they adhere to the CCF point of view. Certainly the Government does not object to it being known or being said that these people are, or may be adherents of the CCF point of view. But these people will, and the Government does, object to the insinuation that they are in their position just because of some political relationship and not because of other qualifications. I want to refer to only two of these who were mentioned by the Member from Saltcoats. One, the Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the other the Deputy Minister of Education. I suggest that you will look from one end of Canada to the other and you will not find people better qualified to fill these posts than the people who fill them now.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — The position of the Government is this: We have not appointed these people just because of political affiliation. But it is also this, we are not going to deny such people the opportunity of employment in the public service nor are we going to deny the people of Saskatchewan the value of their employment just because of their political affiliation. This, I may say, goes beyond the supporters of our own party. I could remind this Legislature of a former Conservative Premier of this province who was taken on to the public service after this Government was elected in 1944, who gave a very excellent contribution in his work. I could remind them of more recently a former Liberal Member of the Legislature who sat with some of my friends opposite in this Legislature and who is now a part of the public service. Why, I could mention the name of a wife of a former Liberal Member of this Legislature employed in the public service and I could mention others.

I would think it is high time in the name of decency that we have a halt to much of the kind of talk such as we have heard about the civil service from across the way in this Session.

But the lower choice of their insults, and I think that is the right word here, Mr. Speaker, was kept for the Members of the Local Government Continuing Committee. Now, one of the Members opposite said something to the effect of “where did this idea come from anyway”. Well, the idea of possible reorganization of municipal governments has been around for a long while. It might have come from looking at what has happened in some other provinces, in Alberta, in Ontario, or some of the states across the line. It might have come from reading a

report of the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council, a council or commission set up by the Liberal Government before 1944, who gave their reports in 1944. I want to read a bit of what they said about this matter of municipal boundaries. I am quoting from page 83 of their report:

“The difficulties of rural municipalities in fulfilling their responsibilities were brought to the attention of the council in a number of submissions. The rural municipality of Chaplin states that the income of municipalities was too unstable and the municipal unit too small to enable them to look after road costs. The rural municipality of Mantario proposed adjusting municipal boundaries to include larger areas of the means of properly financing health services. The related problems of school-financing, hospitalization, medical services were all presented as reasons for considering the enlargement of present municipal units. The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities stated that proposals of changing municipal boundaries were worthy of careful consideration. The council was impressed by the great interest expressed in all phases of rural municipal problems and the evident belief that an adjustment of the boundaries would be one approach to this solution.”

So the idea has been around for a long while that this was an area which needed careful study.

With regard to the existing commission, the Local Government Continuing Committee, that idea came at the time of the provincial local Government conference in 1956. The idea was first suggested at that conference by Mr. Duff Noble, who was at that time President of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. Mr. Noble made the suggestion and finally a resolution proposing to set up the committee was put before the meeting. The other municipal people agreed to it. Mr. Noble said:

“I would like to have that resolution read again, Mr. Premier.”

Mr. Fines read the resolution, and Mr. Noble is recorded as having said, ‘Agreed’.

Now, the Committee was set up and the idea of the Committee was accepted by these three local government

**February 20, 1961**

organizations, the Association of Rural Municipalities, the Association of Urban Municipalities, and the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association. It was accepted by their conventions, and each appointed three members to the Committee. The Cabinet appointed four Ministers to act in an ex officio capacity, more or less. Representatives of the local government organizations included one or two people who were then presidents of these organizations, and at least one person who is now vice-president. As mentioned previously one of these subsequently became a Conservative candidate, one a Liberal candidate and had been a Liberal Member in the Legislature before. From the hospital association came Mr. Bourassa of Regina, associated with the Grey Nuns' Hospital, and from the health regions came Mr. Fahlman of Kronau, also a rural municipal reeve. The local government employee groups added one each in the form of members who would have voice, but no vote. As chairman, the groups were agreed to select a highly respected Saskatchewan citizen, a one-time member of the city school board and chairman of that board, a Vice-President at one time of the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association, Mayor of our second largest city, President at one time of the Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association, and later City Commissioner there. These are the men, Mr. Speaker, subject to such comment as these from the Opposition. These are the men who supposedly have squandered hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money. These are the men who, in that misdirected imagination of the Opposition, are recommending, supposedly, a plan which, supposedly, would socialize farmers, build a stronger political machine, enable the Government to hire more barnacles, turn five hundred more propagandists loose on local government.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I haven't heard such an emotional attempt to stir up fear since the days when the Liberals used to say that if you elected the CCF you won't have any more elections, and there was a chance that your churches will be burned down in the bargain. This is nothing but a straight attempt, not to ask people to rely on their reasoning, but a straight attempt to scare people so that they won't rely on reason.

Now, the Government's position was clearly stated by the Premier as recently as last Wednesday. I want to take the opportunity of restating on behalf of the Government, since the question has been raised again. What the Premier said at that time was this:

“We propose that when the Committee has prepared its report and submitted it to us, just as quickly as we can to put copies in

the hands of every Member. We will have it printed and sent to all the local governing bodies in the province, municipalities, school districts, union hospital districts and so on, and then when they have had a chance to study it, sit down with them and decide which of these recommendations can be implemented, which are practical and which we consider impractical either for the moment or in the long-run.”

I repeat and emphasize on behalf of the Government the words of the Premier expressed just a few days ago in this Legislature.

Now the Opposition has put before us an amendment. May I suggest that the amendment which they propose asks us to vote lack of confidence in the Committee, and in its work before we have seen the report of the Committee, before we have had any opportunity to study the reasoning behind it. I submit, to do so by this Legislature or by this Government, would be to insult the integrity or the intelligence of these men who have spent so many arduous months in preparing this report. We obviously cannot prevent the Opposition from insulting these men if they want to, but the Government doesn't propose to join them in their insulting.

I want to turn not to the other discussion which has received a lot of attention during this debate, and that is the discussion of psychiatric services in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think it is noteworthy that in the discussion to date, from the opposite side of the House, at least, that there has been so far as I can recall, no reference made and no credit given to the statement in the Speech from the Throne that we are this year extending these services by making use of the existing institution in Prince Albert. This is no small or particularly easy or insignificant step, Mr. Speaker. To do this, and to operate this institution for a full year will undoubtedly cost a sum of money in the neighborhood of three-quarters of a million dollars or more.

Admittedly, the use of the present Sanatorium building in Prince Albert as an extension of the school for mental defectives, is not meant to be a substitute or an alternative for the small regional hospital idea. But it does provide additional facilities for a closely related service; it does extend the assistance for a group of people who are somewhat similarly handicapped. The need is great. I am sure every Member of the Legislature has, as I have, been in homes in which some of these children were, and would appreciate something of

**February 20, 1961**

the load, something of the difficulty of the emotional strain, the physical hardships which this can place on parents, particularly mothers, in those homes. The need for this kind of service which will be added to by using the Prince Albert Sanatorium in this way is indeed very great.

May I also say this. It is not just enough for a Government to balance the total cost or the total program of that Government. It must have some consideration, too, to balancing internal services in the Government. We cannot proceed with one service too rapidly at the expense of others. The question for a Government seldom is to do or not to do one particular thing: the question almost always is to do one thing, and as a result not to do another. Much as all of us would like to emphasize more health, and welfare, we must in fairness to health and welfare services themselves, have proper consideration for the economic investment which makes the payment of those services in future years possible.

Let us look for a moment at the choice which the Government had in this particular year. We had the possibility of constructing at Yorkton, and getting a regional hospital into operation in whatever time it took to build, or the choice of making use of the services and the facilities possible at Prince Albert.

It is evident, I suggest, that by choosing to develop the Prince Albert Sanatorium, as a school for defectives, this could be made available in a shorter period of time, and it could be made available with less capital cost. When it was done it would, in fact, serve more people, serve about twice as many people. It seemed to us that the most economical use of time and money, and the most productive thing to do in terms of promoting good health, was this year to proceed with the adaptations at Prince Albert, so it could be used as a school for mental defectives, and to postpone the procedure at Yorkton this year. May I say, this is no permanent shelving of the Yorkton development, or of the general plan, and may I quote some evidence to back up that statement.

First of all, during the current year, or during the year to come, about \$400,000 will be paid to the Yorkton General Hospital. This is to pay the Yorkton General Hospital for changes it has made, or will make in its buildings, to provide services which later will be jointly used by both the General Hospital and the small regional mental hospital. In other words, this is a first stage in the development.



I give you further evidence that people need not be concerned that this is a shelving on the part of the Government, and it lies in looking at the record of what this Government has done in the field of psychiatric services generally. In order to relieve congestion, there has been spent at Moose Jaw, a sum of \$8 million in building the school for defectives there. To improve existing institutions, at Weyburn a new wing for those who are mentally ill, and who are suffering from tuberculosis as well, has been built, and a new nurses residence, which helps to relieve some of the congestion in the main building. Other renovations of changing their roof pattern, had made usable, space which previously wasn't usable, or has made it much better space. Something in the neighborhood of \$1½ million was spent in that regard. At North Battleford, two new wings, accommodating some one hundred and twenty patients have been added. Psychiatric wards have been extended from one to three of the general hospitals in the province. There is one at the University of Saskatchewan making a particularly valuable contribution. There have been seven full time mental health clinics established in various places throughout the province. In addition, there are eighteen part-time mental health clinics in the smaller centres. A number of the health regions employ teacher-psychologists who make a contribution to the preventive service. There is the vigorous research program, the most vigorous in all of Canada, jointly financed by Federal and Provincial Governments, undertaken in connection with the University Hospital in Saskatoon. And to this can be added the facilities provided later this year at Prince Albert.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is good evidence as to the intentions of the Government of this field. I point out that in the last four years alone, the appropriation for mental health, in terms of operating costs, has increased by about 45%. In the last four years alone there was a capital expenditure of about \$3½ million.

The main test after all, the main evidence of good work in this field, is in the number and the rate of discharges. It is in the terms of the number of people who are restored to health and opportunity. Let's remind ourselves that as the rate of discharge increases, we do in fact, increase the facilities because it makes it possible to use it more fully for more people.

I must pay tribute here to the work of the staff who have made this rate of discharge improve. Let me point out what has happened with regard to this rate of discharge. In 1944, and I know, and I recognize, and I admit all of the difficulties, and I don't want to

minimize them at all, that existed at that time, but to use it as a starting point, the discharges were 62% of admissions. In 1960, the discharges were 78% of admissions. What does this mean in terms of people? Well 62% in 1944 admissions, meant three hundred and eighty-four people moving back out to health and opportunity, but 78% of 1960 admissions, meant one thousand two hundred people moving out into health and opportunity. If anybody wants to compare what is being done here, and what is being done in other provinces, may I refer them to the statistics of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, which show that in 1958 the operating expenditure for patients in mental hospitals in Saskatchewan, stood at \$9.10. The only province coming near to that was British Columbia \$7.70; in Alberta \$6.80; in Ontario \$6.40; in Manitoba \$5.30. I think it well to remind the Opposition of this, when they are talking about mental care. It is only a few years ago that these same people who are so vocal now, Mr. Speaker, supported the party in power at Ottawa which refused to include mental hospitals in a proposed national hospitalization plan. Now I admit that the national hospitalization plan, was if I may quote: "A phantom plan," insofar as the Liberals were concerned. It was a never-never plan, or perhaps I should say it was an ever-ever plan, because they were forever talking about it. The Leader of the Opposition sat in the Federal House in support of that Government. In terms of callous treatment of the mentally ill, the grossness of the Federal Liberal Party, in their refusal to include the care for the mentally ill was matched only by their callousness in refusing a national hospitalization plan. They said the time wasn't right. According to them I am amazed that they didn't think of the necessity of holding a plebiscite before they could have it. I think this again illustrates this fundamental contradiction of the Liberal Party. It won't go left, and it can't go ahead on vital matters without going left, and so it compromises and rationalizes by saying that the time isn't right, and we have to wait to be sure that no votes are going to be lost, so we must have a plebiscite. The movement of the Liberal Party is measured not in years but in terms of generations.

I want to turn also to the topic of the public debt which was raised in this House by the Leader of the Opposition. He said that the public debt, the provincial debt, has gone out of all reason. Now let me review again, not only figures, but purposes. The gross public debt of this province, as I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the fiscal year 1943-1944 was \$218 million. By the end of December 1960, the total had increased to \$432 million. Now this is almost admittedly twice as great, in terms of gross public debt, as it was before. May I submit, that it is not just the total figures, but

the composition of that debt which is important. There is some debt which produces, there is some debt which stimulates growth and leads on to even greater productions. There are other kinds of debt which doesn't of itself produce, and which only very indirectly influences the growth of wealth in the community. Now, in 1944, the part of the debt which could be called the wealth-producing debt, was about \$50 million, and that part of the debt which could be called wealth-producing has increased by 1960, to about \$378 million. In other words, it is more than seven times as great, admittedly. This, Mr. Speaker, is not of course just an expenditure. It has been an investment which has done what? It has been an investment which has provided employment; it's producing and carrying electricity; it's distributing natural gas; it is carrying an increasing and increased volume of telephone messages; it's an investment which has resulted in decreased costs on farms, which has added comfort and convenience to farm homes, and urban homes; it has made industrial development possible; it has facilitated business because of better telephone service; it has made television available throughout the length and breadth of Saskatchewan. This is an investment which is providing, in addition to these matters, providing not from taxes, but from its earnings, the money to pay for interest and to provide the sinking funds necessary to repay this investment. It has made possible, in addition, the sale of millions of dollars of equipment throughout the province.

Now, as to the remaining portion of the debt, and here again I am not questioning its usefulness, or the necessity of acquiring it at the time it was acquired. But I do say this, that the remainder of this debt had been acquired because of relief which was paid, because of highways which had been built but not paid for, because of public buildings built and not paid for, and because of revenue deficits which had been incurred in previous years. This portion, this non-wealth-producing part of the debt, has been reduced, from \$167 million to about \$53 million, as at the end of December 1960. This is the part that must be repaid out of taxes. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the portion which is repaid by the activity it stimulates has been increased; the portion which is repaid out of taxes has been decreased. In terms of security, and in terms of economic and social benefits, the province of Saskatchewan is immeasurably better off, because of that portion of our debt which has been increased.

May I raise this question? It is not just the cost of borrowing which must be considered, but there must

**February 20, 1961**

also be considered the cost of not borrowing. Obviously the cost of not having borrowed would be that of doing without electrification, or without adequate production of electricity, or with doing with a greatly inferior telephone service, and a number of other uses as well. The other cost of not borrowing, Mr. Speaker, is of course to allow private enterprise to undertake this production and development. I wonder if the statement of the Opposition that the debt is too high, isn't in fact, the father of a thought, the father of thought which they dare not utter, namely, that these public utilities might have been done by private enterprise, rather than by public enterprise.

To look at the debt in another way, it is necessary to look at the net debt. In other words what we owe, less what we own. May I use the years from April 30th, 1944, to March 31st, 1960. The gross debt, again, was \$218 million in 1944. At the end of March 1960, \$386 million, increased by about one and three-quarters times. The assets which we have accumulated, including cash, investments, sinking funds, loans to and investments in Crown Corporations, have increased greatly too. They stood at \$73 million in 1944, and they stood in 1960 at \$369 million. In other words, while that gross debt increased by one and three-quarters times, our assets increased by more than five times. Over \$60 million of that increase in debt is due to additional investment in Saskatchewan Government Telephones, and \$250 million has been invested in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation during that period. May I just add one thing further? This picture, which is a good picture, still doesn't include all of what we own, in fact, because it doesn't include anything for surpluses which have been retained over the years, and reinvested in the Power Corporation, and in Saskatchewan Government Telephones. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation has reinvested some \$17 million, not counted in here, and Saskatchewan Government Telephones have reinvested some \$18 million not counted in here.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the true position of Saskatchewan's financial picture is, that our net debt stood at \$145 million, in April of 1944, and at April of 1960, stood not at \$145 million but at \$17 million.

I turn now to some comment on something which has also been a favorite topic across the way, namely, the New Party. There is a song in the stage play "Oklahoma," Mr. Speaker, which I believe says "that the farmer and the rancher should be friends." Maybe it's "the plowman and the rancher should be friends."

The Members of the Opposition, in the last week or so, in this House, have set new words to this song. They say now “the farmer and the worker can’t be friends.” I doubt whether it will be a best seller. They base part of this talk on the suggestion that this is a movement which will develop class prejudice. I would like to say this, I have never for a long while heard so much talk capable of causing prejudice, and capable of causing hard feelings between one group and another, as I have heard from Opposition benches during the last few days. May I submit that in regard to dealing with this difficult and important matter of class prejudice, if it does exist, the way to remove it is to remove the extremes of opportunity which exist for different groups in Canada. The fact that these extremes of opportunity do exist, is one of the most damning indictments of the two parties that have held office in the national Parliament in Canada for so many years. The New Party, far from fostering class prejudice, is designed to eliminate the cause of class prejudice, by removing the differences in opportunity which do exist, and this is the only way it will ever be done.

I am sorry to hear the Member for Wilkie say that trade unions are interested only in themselves. Well, anyone who has taken any time whatsoever to consider the history of the trade union movement, in Great Britain or in Canada, or in the United States, or here, will know how completely inaccurate and misleading and unfortunate that statement is. May I just have reference to some of the interests which trade unionists in Canada have shown with regard to other people. I know that in every national convention of the Canadian Labour Congress, the Canadian Congress of Labour as it was before 1953, a speaker from farm organizations has been invited. I know that in almost every one of those conventions, if not every one, resolutions with regard to farm problems have been passed. A number of those resolutions arose from the present Minister of Public Works, in this Legislature. May I just put on record, Mr. Speaker, some of this evidence. I start first of all with a resolution passed in 1958:

“Be it resolved, that since the continued decline in farm income is a grave concern to all citizens of Canada, the convention supports in principle the program of the organized farm movement for parity prices which is intended to secure fair prices for farm products to ensure an adequate return for the labour of the basic producer.”

**February 20, 1961**

This was passed at the Canadian Labour of Congress Convention in 1958.

May I read from a press release, March 9, 1959? This was in connection with the farmers' approach to Ottawa at that particular time: Mr. Jodoin, President of the C.L.C. said:

“Labour gives its full support to the farmers of this country in their effort to win a standard of living commensurate with their contribution to our economy.

The C.L.C. believe that the farmers had a good case, and we urge that the Federal Government give the delegation a sympathetic hearing, and to take favourable action on the farmers' brief as quickly as possible.”

May I refer to the statement contained in the memorandum to the Government of Canada on January 28, 1960:

“Although net farm income has shown some improvement during the last year, the change has not been of such proportions as to ensure farmers of the degree of economic security they have a right to expect. The current Session of Parliament provides you with an opportunity to add to their well-being, not only in terms of their own legitimate interest, but as a matter of concern to the country, generally. We have in mind deficiency payments as one specific measure.”

I think that is enough to indicate how unfortunate it is that Members should get up in this House, and say that trade unions have only their own interests at heart. It is not just with regard to economic matters. The trade unions have been in the forefront of the struggle of people for better health measures, better welfare measures, better educational measures as well. Things which affect them, yes, but affect the whole of the community as well.

Opposition Members of the Legislature in the last few days have dragged up almost every possible conceivable incident, including one which did not happen at all and tried to make labour look like the big, bad wolf for the farmer. I suggest that the farmers of Saskatchewan will know that, except for wheat, the main products of their farms are going to have to depend upon

domestic consumption. This being the case, the farmers will know it is to their advantage that trade unions and others in this field have been able to get wages which give to their members a higher purchasing power. The greatest consumption of meat, eggs and vegetables comes with decent wages. May I suggest that, instead of this amplification and exaggeration of differences which comes from the Opposition, which divides people, it is much more profitable to look at the similarities which unite people, as does the New Party.

Now, I want, since the matter has been raised, to refer briefly to some of the groups, in addition to farmers and to workers who have been attracted to the New Party idea, and to give some of the reasons which they have stated in their own words. To do this, in order to point out that it is the similarities of needs which draw people together, and that this is what we have emphasized, I want to read a statement passed by a group of people in the City of Toronto, not CCF and not Canadian Labour Congress, in which they analysed their position and made known why it was they felt that this movement was necessary. They referred to disastrous unemployment; the chaos of the business cycle; the ruin of the small farmer; the continuing neglect of the Atlantic regions; the plight of our aircraft and uranium industries; the scandal of our slums; the lack of adequate mental and dental care for all; the grievous waste of talent; to the inequality of educational opportunities.

They went on to speak of new problems with which we are faced: — nuclear armaments, automation, deteriorating position in world trade, the cost-price squeeze in agriculture. It is these people, Mr. Speaker, who feel keenly that we have not satisfied these kind of needs of people who are being drawn together in this political movement. Now, some people are worried as to what the New Party will look like. Well . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Could you please tell us what you have been quoting from for the last few minutes?

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — I said I quoted from a group of people who met in the City of Toronto, who are neither CCF nor C.L.C., who decided to meet to discuss and to endorse the New Party idea.

**Opposition Member:** — Who were they?

**February 20, 1961**

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — There were engineers; the chairman was a doctor; the guest speaker was a university economist, a former Rhodes Scholar . . .

**Opposition Member:** — Was Tim Buck there?

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — No, no, I think that the last association that Tim Buck had with any political party, was when he supported the Liberal Party. I recall great big ads about this, all over Canada, not so many years ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to what the New Party is going to be. In the future, as has been true in the past, of the CCF, it is farmer and labourer yes, but not just farmer and labourer. The present and the past makeup of the CCF in Saskatchewan should provide a pretty good image for those who want to look at it. We have had support of farmers and labourers, and of other liberally minded persons. The Saskatchewan political leadership was found in the form of a teacher, (M.J. Coldwell), a farmer; and our present Leader, a minister by occupation. The presidency of our provincial organization has gone in turn to farmer, teacher, housewife, university professor and farmer. This is the make-up which one finds in our provincial conventions, and this make-up of similar occupation groups will continue. They will continue to make the policies. Do you know the amazing thing to me, Mr. Speaker, is that if this New Party is of such insignificance, of such inconsequence, as the people opposite would have us believe, why do they make such a loud noise about it? Why take up so much time in this Legislature talking about it?

It reminds me of an old story, which I won't tell, which all of you have heard the Premier tell: it's an awful lot of noise about one little prune, if it is a little prune. Now, Mr. Speaker, may I just say this, we have heard from the Members opposite that they weren't opposed to labour, and we have heard some of the remarks which they made with regard to labour in the last few days. It would be extremely enlightening to have the Member from Wilkie, for example, go into the Constituency of Mr. Pearson or Mr. Martin, and make the address which he made about trade unions here. Some of us will remember too, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, not so very long ago, who was extremely keen to get Premier Smallwood of Newfoundland to come to the province here and speak at a series of banquets. This was a man who passed labour legislation concerning which an opinion has been stated by the International Labour



Organization. There was a meeting of people from trade unions all over the world, and they looked at the labour legislation, of what I think at that time was the only Liberal Government in Canada, and after prolonged and careful investigation, they decided to condemn it as being “not compatible with the generally accepted principles concerning freedom of association.” These are the people who say, “We are not against labour,” but get up and rail against it in almost speech after speech. Here we have a group of people whose leader was interested in inviting to this province a Premier of a Government who passed legislation, which the International Labour Organization said is not compatible with the generally accepted principles concerning freedom of association. This I think is the best evidence we may find, that the Liberal Party isn’t going to move to the left, but because of this fundamental contradiction, which I spoke of before, is certain to move not to the left, but to the right.

May I say again, this movement is not based on class difference, it is based rather on removing those obstacles to opportunity which make class difference possible. It is based on the similarity of needs to the rights and aspirations of people generally. Mr. Speaker, because the Speech from the Throne presents a program which I said earlier is going to make Saskatchewan a still better place in which to live, I shall support it.

**Mr. Ed. Whelan (Regina City):** — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to associate myself with other speakers in congratulating you on your elevation as Speaker of this Assembly. I am sure that you will be fair and just.

I would also like to congratulate the mover of the motion, the hon. Member for the Battlefords, for his very forceful and effective address, and I congratulate the seconder of the Motion, the hon. Member for Saskatoon, Mrs. Gladys Strum, for her very pertinent and challenging address.

Again, before I begin my remarks I would like to thank the Regina voters for electing me as their representative in the Legislative Assembly. I would also like to extend, as the first Regina Member to speak in the Legislature this Session, a warm welcome to the city to all of the Members on both sides of the House and to their families. I hope that you will have an opportunity to meet some of the friendly people who live in Regina City.

Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign, an old

**February 20, 1961**

acquaintance of mine, a Liberal opponent, made the statement that if four CCF Members were elected for Regina City it would complete a bridge foursome. I say that the person who made this accusation had a complete disregard for the facts. In my short experience as a representative for this Constituency, I have found that the Members are kept busy, very, very busy. I must say Mr. Speaker, that I am pleased to be associated with the other three Members for Regina City. First there is the Hon. C.C. Williams, Minister of Labour, who is always approachable, hard working, sincere, attends all functions, meets all delegations, probably one of the most conscientious Members ever to sit in this House. I am also pleased to be associated, Mr. Speaker, with Marjorie Cooper, who is a hardworking, sincere person, courageous, persistent, respected, an excellent representative, and I'm sure that all of you will agree, one of the ablest Members of this House.

I am also very pleased to be associated with, and I would like to congratulate my colleague, the Hon. Allan E. Blakeney who, like myself, was elected in the election last June, for I think that all of us will find in a few short months, that he is an efficient representative, a competent and meticulous administrator.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, one of our opponents said, that the election of a fourth member would complete a bridge foursome. I don't know where he got his information. I know, though, that I haven't time for bridge myself. Perhaps he is judging us by the way he would represent this city of Regina. But, if my past experience is any evidence then I say as is so often the case with Liberal opponents, Mr. Speaker — the statement was inaccurate, ill-advised, and grossly unfair. As an elected representative Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the indulgence of the House for a moment to try to set out what I shall attempt to do as a representative of the Regina Constituency.

First, I shall endeavour to hear representation from any person, group of persons, organizations, regarding any problem that comes within the provincial jurisdiction. Second, I shall endeavour to exercise my best judgment in interpreting such representation to my colleagues, to the Ministers of the Crown, and to this Legislature. Third, I shall endeavour to promote and suggest legislation that is beneficial to my constituents and to the province as a whole. Fourth, I shall attempt and endeavour to implement the platform my Government presented to the electorate prior to my election. Fifth, I shall endeavour to listen carefully to objective and unprejudiced criticism. Sixth, I shall endeavour to present an accurate picture of the activities of the Government to the people of the province, and to the people of my Constituency.

Mr. Speaker, you may ask, "Who are my constituents? How big is the Constituency of Regina? What are its problems?" Well Regina has many people within its borders, and many are from different racial backgrounds, different religious

backgrounds. There are people in the Constituency of Regina who came originally from England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, the Ukraine, Austria, Hungary, Germany, Yugoslavia, Romania, Poland, Bulgaria, Serbia, the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, from France. There are also in my Constituency, Mr. Speaker, descendants of the native population of this country, the original people of Saskatchewan. What this adds up to is a rich cultural cross-section of our country. Within the boundaries of the Constituency of Regina City, there are one hundred and ten thousand people, covering an area of forty-two square miles. Regina is a growing, thriving, energetic community. It is indicated by the city officials that the population will reach a figure of two hundred and eight thousand, Mr. Speaker, by the year 1980. I would like to point out to this Assembly Mr. Speaker, that for the period beginning January 1st, 1951 more than ten new residents have arrived in Regina every single day. This indicates, I think, quite clearly the rapid growth of the city of Regina.

Regina, of course, Mr. Speaker has in its borders many civil servants. They have their homes here. They represent a good portion of the working force of Regina city. These civil Servants work for the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, the City Government. They have said to me many times that they appreciate the fact that only in Saskatchewan do the Provincial Government employees enjoy bargaining rights. I am sure the Members opposite will realize that their colleagues, their counter-parts in other provinces, have given only collective begging to the civil servants in the provinces where they are in power.

I had the opportunity and the pleasure Mr. Speaker, of working for the people of Saskatchewan for a period of ten years. I found them good to work for; I found the people of Saskatchewan to be fair and objective. When I decided to enter politics I knew there were a good many precedents for civil servants entering politics. I would like, just in case there is any criticism such as I have heard outside of the Legislature, to call to the attention of the Members opposite a couple of names like Pickersgill, and Pearson, who established this precedent.

**Mr. Kramer:** — And Patterson.

**Mr. Whelan:** — I found that the civil servants, Mr. Speaker, were industrious men and women of integrity. Regardless of their political affiliation. I found them to be dedicated people.

**February 20, 1961**

This includes some former M.P.'s and M.L.A.'s from the group opposite who are civil servants. I was proud to be associated with them, and proud to be a part of the civil service group and to represent them in this House.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the civil servants, federally, provincially and at civic levels are the unsung maintenance men and women of democratic government.

Much has been said about the development of Crown Corporations. May I say this: as a representative of Regina City, I appreciate the fact that there are Crown Corporations within our borders to provide employment. I feel too that the merchants and the employees themselves appreciate the fact that public ownership and Crown Corporations have brought employment and business to the city. Let me illustrate; at the end of the year 1959, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation had within the city of Regina, 837 employees with a payroll of \$3,525,000; The Saskatchewan Government Telephones had a staff of 755 with a payroll of \$3,015,000; The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office had 292 employees with a payroll of \$1,070,000; The Saskatchewan Transportation Company had a staff of 108 with a payroll of \$460,000; and The Fur Marketing Service had 13 employees and a payroll of \$57,000; All of this adds up to 2,005 employees with a payroll of \$8,127,000.00 in the Regina Constituency.

Now I would suggest this Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite make their position clear so that the merchants, the business people, the employees of these publicly-owned businesses have a complete understanding as to what their intentions are and what their policy might be. I know that there is criticism regarding unemployment, and therefore, I am pleased to note that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has decided to build its Head Office building in the city of Regina. I think too, Mr. Speaker, the fact that they have twelve buildings now spread over the city could hardly be as efficient as putting them together under one roof. This will be more efficient and will help the operation of the Power Corporation.

Now this criticism regarding the type of building that is going to be built, its cost, and how it is going to be built, this criticism is being levelled because it is a publicly-owned corporation. If it were privately owned, would the people who were going to pay for it, the consumers of the utility, have an opportunity

to make any representation? I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there would be no opportunity. Let me show you what I mean by a quotation from the Maclean's Magazine, May 10th, 1958. Let me describe the type of building that was constructed by a privately-owned corporation in the city of Vancouver.

“In the heart of the business section a gleaming pillar of glass, almost 300 feet high, was flashing in the sunlight. It is built on the principle of a Douglas fir with a hollow steel core for a trunk from which floors project like limbs within the translucent envelope of the outer walls. It is the B.C. Power Corporation's pride — a ten million dollar building, triumph of architecture and public relation, proclaiming to the province that Canada's largest privately-owned utility is as up to date as the guided missile.”

Then it tells about the offices of the men high on the 21st floor.

Mr. Speaker, the consumers in British Columbia have nothing whatsoever to say about the type of building that's been constructed.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Whelan;** — Let me point this out, because of the fact that this is a publicly-owned utility, because of the fact that it is a good example of public ownership, the Members opposite have a chance to come in this Legislature and criticize, if they like to, but I say they are not criticizing, Mr. Speaker, I say that they are using political hatred and prejudice rather than honest criticism, while they ridicule public ownership, yet it allows them the privilege of abuse for political gain.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, there is some discussion about whether or not there has been any industrial development in the province of Saskatchewan. I know that if we were to present to the Members opposite pamphlets from the Industrial Development Office, or from any Government agency, they would say “Oh, you can't believe that,” therefore, I thought I would try to find a source of information that would suit them, that they would consider reliable. In leafing through “Marketing Magazine,” a

**February 20, 1961**

house organ put out by Maclean-Hunter, and mailed to business firms throughout Canada, I discovered an ad. Its glowing adjectives are far more effective than anything that I have been able to put together. Therefore, I offer it to the House as evidence, and particularly to the Members opposite, evidence of the industrial development and from a very reliable source, may I say.

“Saskatchewan is the largest, highest, first, newest, most modern, fastest growing market on the prairies. It is true Saskatchewan has the largest major construction project in Canada underway — the \$200,000,000 South Saskatchewan River Dam. Saskatchewan reports the highest income from agriculture of any prairie province; it has Canada’s first potash mine, cost \$26 million to construct — has Canada’s newest steel pipe and rolling mill, cement and sewer pipe plant . . . Saskatchewan’s two major markets, Regina and Saskatoon, are booming with new population, new construction and expanding industries. Reach this market via the Leader Post, Regina, Saskatchewan.”

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Tell us what they are selling.

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, I like the hon. Member from Arm River, but I’d like him a lot better if he’d shut up and let me finish my speech.

Mr. Speaker, just to list some of the industries that have come within the borders of Regina Constituency, I would like to place on the record of this House the following industries which have come to Regina within the past few years. First — The Saskatchewan Cement Corporation, with a capital investment of \$9 million; Prairie Pipe with a capital investment of \$3 million; Interprovincial Steel — capital investment of \$15 million; Dominion Bridge — capital investment \$1 million; Clay Products — \$2 million; Liquid Carbonic \$750 thousand; Martin Paper Products — \$800 thousand, Continental Paper — \$750 thousand; Imperial Oil expansion \$3 million; Co-op Refinery expansion — \$2 million; for a total capital investment of \$37,300,000.00 within the borders of Regina Constituency.

I think that the Industrial Development Office, and the new Department under the leadership of the Hon. Russ Brown should be congratulated for this type of

development in my Constituency Mr. Speaker.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, Regina has within its borders many democratic organizations. These people work together to develop the community as a whole. Foremost in this, I think is the Regina Labour Council. I had the honour and the privilege of serving as a secretary of this body prior to the amalgamation of the two labour councils, and two labour congresses. I discovered while I was secretary to the council, the best delegates, the most energetic and the strongest people in the council, in Regina City were the sons and daughters of farm people. I thought, as I heard the speakers opposite the other day, how illogical it was to warn the farmers against labour, for in many instances they'll be warning the farmers against their own sons and daughters. One generation of farm people fought against the grain trade, against mortgage companies, and against political patronage. This generation Mr. Speaker, as delegates in the Regina Labour Council fight against discrimination, against exploitation, and against political labour-baiting. Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker, of the type of people in the Council, that have risen to prominence in labour organizations across Canada. One young man who came from a farm went to work at the Co-op Refinery; he is Neil Reimer and he became the president of his local union; he is now the Canadian Vice-President for Western Canada of The Canadian Labour Congress. He is also Mr. Speaker, the Canadian director of the Oil and Chemical Workers Union. This man came from a farm; he has a co-op background.

We also have within our Constituency a very active Canadian Mental Health Organization. They do very effective work visiting at the Saskatchewan Hospital, and their rehabilitation program is an excellent project. They have brought the people of Regina to understand and to realize the problems of mental health. I certainly hope that the organization expands and that they continue to educate the public regarding mental health.

Regina Constituency also has, Mr. Speaker, a very active business organization in the Regina Chamber of Commerce. It has an effective secretary and a capable staff. It has many active committees and we understand that their meetings are the best attended of any meetings in western Canada.

There is one particular group of people in Regina

**February 20, 1961**

city that I would like to pay special tribute to and this is the Co-op organization. These organizations began a good many years ago. Perhaps, the most effective and the most noteworthy accomplishment was the organization of the world's first co-operative refinery, now in the city limits. It was organized in the thirties, and today it is worth \$16 million; it has returned in savings to the people of Saskatchewan approximately \$18 million; it employs 275—280 people and supplies petroleum and gasoline products to the farmers, and urban people of Saskatchewan and Manitoba at cost.

Regina is also the headquarters of the world's largest farmer owned and controlled producer's marketing co-op — The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. To give you a couple of other illustrations of the remarkable co-operative development in Regina I would like to point out The Sherwood Co-op Association with 20,000 members. It is consumer owned and controlled, and is the largest retail co-operative in Canada.

There is also a good credit union development in the city of Regina, the largest of which is the Sherwood Credit Union, with 8,500 members, and \$7,200,000 worth of assets. The members, by owning and controlling their credit facilities, provide this service at cost. These organizations Mr. Speaker, are a monument to Regina and to Saskatchewan people, and are evidence of their belief in democratic ownership and control. They are concrete examples of mutual self-help.

If you will allow me Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn briefly to what I consider are some of the future needs of Regina city. I think that this Assembly will agree that there is a need for good housing in the rural areas, in the hamlets and the towns, and on the Indian Reservations in the province of Saskatchewan. I would like to congratulate the civic government, the Provincial Government and the Federal Government for going ahead on a low cost, low-rental housing project in the city of Regina. I would like to see future study of pre-fab and pre-cut housing to provide adequate housing accommodation for the farmers, for the people who occupy urban areas, for the large and small communities. A recent survey in our city clearly indicates that there is a desperate need for better housing in the city of Regina. I would recommend to all Members of the Legislature that they read this survey very carefully. I know that 109 units is a good start, but I believe that we should think in much larger terms when we consider the housing situation throughout the province, in places like Moose Jaw, Saskatoon, on the farms, in the villages, and the hamlets.



There are two things I think that a housing program like this would accomplish. (1) It would help meet the unemployment problem, and (2) it would fill a proven need.

There is another problem, Mr. Speaker, in the Constituency that I think should get some attention. It is a problem that pensioners, widows, retired farmers, and young couples, who have fixed or limited incomes, are facing. It is a problem of trying to pay taxes, buy clothing, and buy food. I think that there should be a complete review of the taxation procedure to try to alleviate, and solve this problem.

If I interpret it correctly, Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the hon. Member for Saltcoats the other day, while he was flapping and crowing about counting chickens, were to the effect that he was opposed to the principle of taxation on the basis of ability to pay. I challenge him to repeat this statement to the citizens of this province who are on a fixed or limited income. I would like to point out to the people and to the Members opposite that it was their party that fixed the pensions for the senior citizens in this country at a disgraceful \$46 per month.

I am very interested Mr. Speaker in the university campus being established within the city of Regina. I think this is an excellent development; I believe that it is the type of thing that will bring educational opportunities to all of the people in southern Saskatchewan. I would like to see the facilities enlarged as quickly as possible. I understand there is a prediction that 5,000 students will attend this institution by the year 1980.

I was going to make some comment on the item in the Speech from the Throne regarding the institution that's going to be used for mental defectives in Prince Albert. Because this matter has been touched upon by the Provincial Treasurer I won't go into detail except to say that I think this is an excellent development, and I also feel Mr. Speaker, that the regional hospital as proposed for the Yorkton area should be not long delayed. I also state, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as the Yorkton hospital is completed, you will find that the people of Regina are passing resolutions in different groups asking for the same type of regional hospital for the Regina area. I believe that Saskatoon is also interested in this type of project. I believe that this type of hospital will head off chronic cases of mental illness. I believe that by keeping patients close to their friends and families, there is an

**February 20, 1961**

excellent chance that we will be able to cure mental illness in its early stages.

Mr. Speaker, in my Constituency there are a number of native Canadians who no longer live on the reservations, and have taken up residence in Regina. They have talked to me on a number of occasions about the need for additional education, welfare, and health services. I am sure that this program is being undertaken as rapidly as possible, and I also feel that it should have been undertaken a good many years ago. I feel that it is a national disgrace that the Federal Government, headed up by people with the philosophy of the group opposite, had for years a callous indifference to the needs of these people. I remind this House, Mr. Speaker, it was the present Government in this province that gave the native population the vote, and it was the present Federal Government at Ottawa that gave them a vote on the federal level. No credit can be given to the Members opposite for the fact that the Indian population in this province have a vote today.

In summing up Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I appreciate, on behalf of the people of Regina, the fact that the university campus is under way. I also would like to say that in the Speech from the Throne I appreciate the mention of co-operatives and credit unions. My friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, have been in power federally and provincially, and in spite of requests from the co-operative organizations across this country, and in spite of their professed enthusiasm for the co-operatives in neither provincial nor federal jurisdictions have they granted the co-op request for a Department of Co-operation. If they still hold the enthusiasm that they profess, let us have some proof now. Let us have them organize departments of co-operation in the provinces of Quebec, Newfoundland, and New Brunswick.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that there are 109 low rental units in Regina and that mention was made of this in the Speech from the Throne. I would like to congratulate the Government on the completion of the technical institute in the city of Moose Jaw. I am pleased with the educational program that is being undertaken for the unemployed. This institute is a fine educational facility for all the people of Saskatchewan.

There is one item in the Speech from the Throne that I paid particular attention to, and I was very pleased to note that the study of pensions is being undertaken by this Government for I feel that it's the first step in providing the people of Saskatchewan with a portable

pension plan. This portable pension plan, I envisage, would apply to industry, to the professions, the small business man, eventually to the entire population. As soon as it was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, a small business man drew my attention to it, and asked me how soon we could have it available for his employees. He said he couldn't afford it any other way. He said that there were other groups in the city who would appreciate it too. I've listed some of these, who would appreciate it too. I've listed some of these. At the top of the list were the employees in the construction industry. I predict that, like the hospitalization plan, like the medical care plan, Saskatchewan will give the lead on portable pensions to all the people of Canada.

Over the years Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have had ample opportunity to pass similar legislation as outlined in the Speech from the Throne. Provincially and federally Mr. Speaker, they have stalled and stumbled and procrastinated and ignored the need, and all we have got, Mr. Speaker, is talk, talk, talk. In this House they have repeated this performance, and in this Session. One of the things that they have dwelt on at great length is the New Party. Well I say this, Mr. Speaker, the New Party is a new political force in Canada. It will include bilingual people; it will include people from organized and unorganized labour; it will include people from the farms; it will include professional people, and business people.

Mr. Speaker, if manners were money, the Members opposite would be bankrupt.

People of Canada are rallying together to join forces to implement a program of their own. There is evidence that they will be effective, and the first and most concrete evidence took place before the Party was organized, in the Constituency of Peterborough, an area that is half urban, half rural, typical of most of the Constituencies in Canada. What was the result? Like a pack of wolves the monopoly interests, through the media of the press, began attacking this group even before they had their meetings organized.

The Members of the Opposition were almost hysterical, certainly illogical and emotional, after they realized what had happened in Peterborough, for they know full well, Mr. Speaker, that their future is in jeopardy. Their wild statements in this House, suggest that their political judgment is curtailed by their fears.

Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose the amendment, and I shall support the Motion.

**February 20, 1961**

The debate was, on motion of the Hon. Mr. Nollet, adjourned.

## **SECOND READINGS**

### **Bill No. 1 — An Act to amend The Stray Animals Act**

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, in explanation of the second reading of this Bill, I merely wish to mention to the Members that the demand for a mandate comes from the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, and it is intended to meet a situation where councils are having difficulty in appointing pound keepers. Under this amendment, it would be possible for a farmer to take care of an animal unlawfully running at large in the same manner that the strays are dealt with at the present time. That is he could advertise the animal in the “Gazette”, and take certain procedures, in order that any disposition of the animal is made known.

The other amendment is merely to provide a fine in cities, towns, and villages where animals are unlawfully running at large.

The other is an amendment to provide that any bylaws passed by a rural municipality in connection with the Stray Animals Act will be approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the interests of uniformity.

This pretty well explains the amendment, and with this explanation Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

### **Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Water Rights Act**

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Now in explanation of this Bill Mr. Speaker,

the amendments have to do, first of all in the definition section to make a clear distinction between ground water and surface water, and as a result of these definitions, there are other amendments necessary to some of the other sections, for example to Section 6. Thus, in the case of Section 6, the use of the term “ground water” would eliminate the very lengthy present definition of surface water, as being water located in lagoons, rivers, lakes and so on.

The next one would also extend and clarify riparian rights. That is water that’s used for domestic and stock watering purposes.

And the other amendment would give recognition to all uses of water including wildlife and recreation. That is, it would give recognition to the non-consumptive uses of water and provide for recognition for the non-consumptive uses of water.

With this explanation Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

**Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

The debate was, on motion of Mrs. Batten, adjourned.

### **Bill No. 3 — An Act to amend the Conservation and Development Act**

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — In explanation of this Bill Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that the purpose of the amendments are to permit a change of name for conservation areas, on request to the Minister, and then it would also clarify the required number of members of an area authority to form a quorum. Under the amendment a minimum quorum would be three members, and the members of the area authority can of course, be increased under this amendment by regulations. In some cases now we have very small areas included into a conservation area and it

**February 20, 1961**

may not be necessary to have representation, for such small areas of land, but under the Act now, representation is required even though a very small area is part of an over all conservation area. This would permit increasing the membership on the area authorities by regulations rather than by a provision in the Act.

The other one is to provide for representation on behalf of lands that are outside of a municipal boundary. We often designate a rural municipal council as the area authority. It is then necessary to add land to the area in an adjoining municipality and this would merely make provision for representation from this adjoining area on the area authorities.

The other is an amendment to change regulations for election procedures from the provisions of the Water Users Act to the provisions of the Rural Municipalities Act. Often municipal secretaries have responsibility for election procedures, and they are more familiar with the procedures under the Rural Municipalities Act than they are under the Water Users Act, and that is the reason for this amendment.

The other amendment provides that a quorum of an area authority will be a majority of the members of the area authority.

The next is a repeal of Section 25, and this would provide that the annual meetings could be held at any time in the year. At present, it's specified in the Act and under the existing Section 25 that the area authority must hold its annual meeting between June 1st and December 31st. This is an inconvenience to many of them, so now it will permit annual meetings to be held at any time at the discretion of the area authorities.

The next amendment to Section 59 provides an appeal to the assessment commission rather than to a judge. It is felt that the assessment commission is familiar with these matters and therefore, the appeal ought to be to the assessment commission. However, if there is continuing conflict, an appeal on a point of law can still be made to a court.

The other amendment is in regard to dissolution of an area, and this will provide — well I

should mention that under existing Legislation, where there is no area authority in existence, there is no manner in which dis-organization procedures can be taken other than through the area authorities. This would provide a method by which the Minister could proceed with dis-organization, by petition where there isn't an area authority in existence.

With this explanation Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

**Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt):** — May I ask the hon. Member a question before he sits down? This right of appeal would only be on a matter of law, is that not right?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That's right.

**Mrs. Batten:** — You are taking away then, the right to appeal on the whole question before the commission. Mr. Speaker, the question that might be appealed to the assessment commission would be a mixed question that would be probably almost completely a question of fact.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That's right.

**Mrs. Batten:** — But then, that would be the last resort unless there was a question of law that . . .

**Hon. I.C. Nollet:** — That's true.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Is there some explanation for why?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Well the explanation is the assessment commission is a competent body. They deal with and make decisions on the assessment appeals at the present time, and it is felt they can do a similar job on behalf of area authorities, and if there is a question of law, then appeal can go the courts.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

February 20, 1961

**Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Provincial Lands Act.**

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — In explanation of the change I merely point out that the authority for administering trees on cultivation leases will, under the amendment, come under the jurisdiction of the provincial Department of Agriculture subject to the Forest Act and the regulations thereto.

The other amendment has to do with bringing appropriate sections in the Lands Act in line with changed legislation, I believe in the Attorney General's Department.

The other one will provide that sales of Crown Lands other than sales to veterans can be made by regulations, thus avoiding the necessity of these sales going before the provincial Cabinet for an Order in Council.

The other one would give authority to cancel a lease where the lessee had disposed of all his deeded holdings and where such remaining holdings are much below an economic unit, or in cases where the lessee might discontinue farming in the area entirely and move to some other district. This would give us authority to cancel such a lease and repost it for public disposition.

With this explanation Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

**Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I think probably one of the most interesting parts of this Act is Section 68 and I want to say a few words on that Section this afternoon, because there have been instances brought to mind which I am sure the Minister would want to know of. I refer to the disposition of lease land after an owner has agreed to sell his own private holdings.

This may be changed after this amendment of



this Act, but today we have the position in this province where a person has four quarter-sections of land. (I am not sure about the exact figures, but this is just an illustration.) In the case of people in that district wishing to acquire parcels of lease land from the Government; so far this has been very difficult to do. The case which I have in mind is where local residents have applied to the Department, asking for one-quarter each of this land, and so far as I know this had not been granted. I think it is most unfortunate, because two of these gentlemen have settled in that area under the V.L.A. so I suggest when a situation such as this arises, every consideration should be given to these people.

In the case that I have in mind I hope to have the opportunity to discuss this with the proper authorities. I understand the local owner has made an appeal to an outside individual altogether.

I would suggest that when a case such as this arises, that the local residents should have first choice. In the event that this is not going to be the policy after the Act has been amended, then I suggest we should give very serious consideration to the policy at the present time.

**Mrs. Batten (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all this Section 17 as substituted for the old Section attempts to deal with leases on a retroactive basis — that is to say, this is affecting leases which have already been signed and are in effect, and that seems to be unfair, to put in new regulations binding people who are now operating under an old set under which they entered into leases. This is affecting contractual rights of these people, and I think this is a very poor principle, that the people dealing with the Provincial Government and entering into an agreement with the Government, should suddenly find their rights curtailed in any way by subsequent legislation. I think this is a poor principle in private life and private enterprise, and I think it is even worse when it comes to dealing with the Government, because these people have absolutely no redress.

I don't like that Section. I can't be in favour of it for that purpose, and the same applies to

**February 20, 1961**

Section 68 (b). This Section says that whether these lands have been disposed of prior to the passage of this Act or are subsequently disposed of, the Government or the Minister has the right, in certain situations to cancel the lease after having given thirty days' notice of his intention to do so.

In the first place, probably the Minister knows, but I am not sure what the Minister means when he says that a person who controlled or controls private land, and that when such a person has ceased to control such private land, the Minister may then cancel the lease. This is very indefinite. It seems to me if the intention of the Government is to form an economic unit, and is to lease land to people providing they have the adjoining land which, in many cases is a good idea, but it should be governed in that way: this should go into the lease itself. This should be made a condition that could be inserted in the lease and say that the lease is in full force and affect, as long as either of the adjoining farms is being operated or owned by the lessee as the case may be. Otherwise, this means very little. It means the people who now own a section of land and receive a provincial lands lease, as soon as they have rented this land out find that they have lost the lease to the provincial land on which they may be planning to raise cattle or something of that kind. Maybe in the meantime they have set up an entirely new economic unit for themselves.

I cannot see that this will assist the situation; I think this is again changing an agreement which has been entered into in good faith by someone. I think that under this Section the Minister is going to have to use his own discretion and decide first of all whether this provincial land was disposed of or granted, in order to supplement a farming or ranching unit. There is certainly not going to be anything in the writing indicating this was the case. It is going to be the Minister's decision as to whether it was granted to supplement the unit or not. If the Minister should think it is all right for this man to continue holding government land, he can say it was granted freely, without any desire to supplement an existing unit. If he wants to take away the land he can say it was granted in order that it be an economic unit. This is putting far too much discretion in the hands of the

Minister; this is affecting leases that were taken out prior to the Act coming into force, and I cannot see too much justification for it.

I know these leases are difficult things to deal with. I know that now, even in cases where a son has taken over a farming unit from his father, the Department in many cases insists that they terminate, they enter into an agreement to terminate the lease that they had on government land, and then they have to wait upon the discretion of the Government to see whether or not they are going to get another lease of the land, even though it is the same family taking over, and even though it is necessary for an economic unit. Maybe there is no other way of doing this but I should think there must be a better way than the one that has been suggested here, which would certainly give no consistency and no guarantee to the people dealing with the Government. We have heard a great deal of talk about the rule of law. There is no rule of law when we are going to rely completely on the discretion of the Minister, just and fair and honourable as he may be.

I am not suggesting that the hon. Minister is anything but honourable, but the discretion of one man is not a substitute for the rule of law, and I don't think we are doing the people of Saskatchewan any good by substituting ministerial discretion, where we should have firm and consistent laws and regulations governing dealings of private people with the Government.

**Mr. Alex Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, it is almost 5:30, but the Constituency of Maple Creek of course has a great many ranchers, and a great many people who own deeded land likewise have leases from the Provincial Government — Crown leases. In Section 68 (b) it doesn't say that the deeded owner, upon selling his land or disposing of his land, that his lease shall be cancelled, but it says when he loses control of his land and I think in view of that, and in view of one or two of the other clauses which I haven't had time to peruse, I wish to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The debate was, on motion of Mr. Cameron, adjourned.

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