

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
FIRST SESSION — FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE  
9th Day**

**Tuesday, February 21, 1961.**

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

**CORRECTION**

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I make a correction with regard to some remarks I made yesterday. I attributed at one point a statement to the “International Federation of Free Trade Unions,” and my reference should have been to a statement by the “International Labour Organization on referral from the International Federation of Free Trade Unions.”

I thought too, Mr. Speaker, that the House would be interested in a statement which I have released to the press with regard to the Saskatchewan Savings Bonds, and with your permission I shall just read the pertinent parts of the statement. It has reference to the Saskatchewan Savings Bonds which were first announced about December of last year, but for which details were not completed at that time.

I am announcing now that the bonds will bear interest at 5% and will go on sale on March 1st. They will be dated March 15, 1961, and will be redeemable at par sometime after September 15, 1961. If they are held to the date of maturity, March 15, 1971 they will be redeemed at a premium of 3%. Interest payments will be made annually by cheque. The bonds will be available in \$100 denominations or any multiple thereof. They will be saleable only to residents of Saskatchewan under co-operation of societies who hold offices in Saskatchewan, and a maximum of \$10,000 may be purchased by any one person. The bonds will be non-transferable and non-assignable except by estates.

The bonds will be on sale for a period to be established by the Provincial Treasurer. The purchase price will be at par if the purchase is made by March 31,

**February 21, 1961**

and interest to March 15 will be added on if purchases are made later than March 31. The sale will be handled by agents authorized by the Provincial Treasurer to include all branches of a chartered bank in Saskatchewan, and five major investment firms in the province, and the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Limited, which I understand will appoint as its agents the Credit Unions. These agents may in turn appoint sub agents. It is expected that the sale of the bonds will be held yearly and that \$4 to \$5 million will be raised annually from this sale.

### **MOTION OF CONDOLENCE**

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Also, Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I am sure that all hon. Members will have heard with regret of the death of the mother of the Prime Minister of Canada, the Rt. Hon. Mr. Diefenbaker. All of us will know that Mrs. Diefenbaker has lived to a very ripe old age, and she has not been in good health for sometime. Nevertheless we know that her death will be felt very greatly by her son, our Prime Minister. I knew that the Members of the Legislature would want to join in expressing our sympathy at this time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thatcher)

“That this Assembly learns with profound regret of the loss suffered by the Rt. Hon. John G. Diefenbaker, the Prime Minister of Canada, on the death of his mother, Mrs. Florence Diefenbaker, and extends to him its most sincere condolences, praying that Divine Providence will assuage his grief.”

**Mr. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself and my colleagues with the remarks of the Provincial Treasurer in this connection. We are all aware of the deep attachment which the Prime Minister had for his mother. We know that she will be missed, not only by him but by others, and our sympathy certainly goes out to the family at this time.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

## WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon);** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to welcome a group of students from the Grosvenor School in Saskatoon, with their teacher.

I am sure all the hon. Members will join with me in saying how pleased they are to have them with us today and we hope their trip will be an enjoyable one, and also a profitable one.

## 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. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, may I first of all congratulate you on your election to your high office. We were all, I think, rather pleased that you did not put up too much resistance in being escorted to your Chair. We all recognize your capacity for fairness in conducting the affairs of this House.

I wish also to extend congratulations to the mover of the Address-in-Reply, the hon. Member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). I know of no M.L.A. in the House who works more strenuously on behalf of his Constituency than the hon. Member for the Battlefords. I wish also to single out for special congratulations the new lady Member representing the Constituency of Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum) for the wonderful address which she gave during the course of her maiden speech.

I wish also to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) on having delivered a fine address to this Legislature yesterday.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**February 21, 1961**

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — His was an address delivered with dignity and regard for the Opposition and with regard to the people of this province. It was indeed a wholesome type of address — the kind of address which I think befits a Member of this Legislature. The hon. Provincial Treasurer is respected by people in all walks of life, not only for his personal integrity but his integrity as a public servant.

I wish again, and regretfully to take note of the fact that Opposition criticism has followed the usual pattern of not proffering any constructive criticism or any constructive counter-proposal to the Speech from the Throne. I wish again to point up the fact that although the Opposition maintained there was little of significance in the Speech from the Throne, there were things that were contained in the Speech that are of real significance to the people of this province. Sometimes I rather think, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition almost expects a super-spectacular event, and I am almost led to believe that even though this administration were to successfully put a man into space, and send him to Venus and back in bouncing health, it would still be considered of no great significance, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that things have been done and references are made in the Speech from the Throne to things that are more meaningful in terms of benefits to the economy of Saskatchewan and to the people of Saskatchewan, than the great endeavours of sending a man into space.

I would like to mention a few of them. His Honour's address speaks of the continuous strides and progressive development of our province. It mentions having undertaken last year the largest — or the current fiscal year — the largest highway program in the history of this province. It announces that 2500 miles of dust-free highway is now available to the travelling public. Mr. Speaker, it is recognized throughout Canada that Saskatchewan has a particularly difficult problem in providing highway services. It is generally recognized that there are more miles of highway per capita in this province and that distances per capita are the greatest in all of Canada. It is recognized that with the limited financial resources available to this province, the Department of Highways has done a most efficient job in providing highway services. In addition, Mr. Speaker, it is well-known too that the benefits of assistance made by the provincial treasury for the development of municipal grid road systems is well received, and is recognized as a major effort on the part of this administration in the development of better rural roads.

It is mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that 6,000 miles of the 12,000 miles of grid road program has been completed. This is of significance, Mr. Speaker. It mentions, too, gravelling of grid roads and that assistance for this is now available to municipalities. It mentions, Mr. Speaker, great expansion of the buildings and facilities on the campus of our university of which we are all proud. It specifically mentions the opening of the new biology and arts buildings on the university campus in Saskatoon, and it tells of plans for new university buildings on the Regina campus of our university. These are all significant things in terms of providing better service in many fields to the people of our province.

It makes reference to the completion of the Technical School at Moose Jaw which will accommodate some 1400 students. I am certain the hon. Leader of the Opposition appreciates the value of the Technical School in his home city of Moose Jaw.

The Throne Speech states, too, that over 8,000 loans have been made to Saskatchewan students since the inception of the Student Aid Fund in 1949, and that a substantial increase in this fund will be requested of this Legislature.

It mentions continuation of Teachers' Scholarship Grants, although it says nothing about the grants that are also available to worthy students entering the university. Nevertheless, further assistance is also made available to worthy Saskatchewan students who wish to enter the university.

It also mentions that in spite of adverse economic factors, grants for general school purposes will be further increased. It draws attention to the continued development and progress in the construction of the South Saskatchewan power and irrigation project. This involves a heavy financial commitment for the Province of Saskatchewan. The total cost of development on completion will range somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$130 million. Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary to borrow huge sums of money for the development of this project, and I would suggest that if we are to be criticized for borrowing money for the economic development of this province, that it should also be said by our critics that they don't want these projects, because either we borrow money for them or we don't have them. It is just as simple as that. Here is \$130 million that will be expended over a period of time by this province in the

**February 21, 1961**

development of this one project alone.

I note that the hon. Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons was very much in support of this project. To be consistent, he should not now condemn the Government for borrowing money for this type of project.

Further in the field of economic development, the Throne Speech records the great progress made by mentioning the rapid development of the Squaw Rapids project, and the official opening of the Boundary Dam Power Station at Estevan, which in conjunction with the newly constructed power facilities of the Queen Elizabeth plant in Saskatoon, has doubled electrical generating capacity in the province during the past two years.

Power is essential to industrialization, and its consumption is the best criteria of industrial and economic growth. Without basic power development we cannot have industry, and the fact, Mr. Speaker, that our power consumption has gone up steadily is the best indication of the economic growth of this province.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer mentioned in the course of his address yesterday that some \$378 million had been invested in these projects: power, gas, and telephones. This is a worthy investment Mr. Speaker, and has been held up to the people of this province by the Opposition as being a burden and an impossible debt. This is not correct, Mr. Speaker. Either we go ahead with this kind of development and we borrow money for it, which is repayable by the people who use these services, or we do not have this desirable kind of development.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a particularly difficult field for a government to move into, because it is recognized that in this province we have serious handicaps in resource development. Not only because of great distances and sparse population, but also because any development that takes place in our province, with reference to electricity is difficult and expensive of development. We are not endowed with the same natural advantages as occur in provinces to the east and west of us. Comparison is often made to Manitoba; it is a very unfair comparison, Mr. Speaker. Manitoba's power development was well under way before Saskatchewan's began. That is Mr. Speaker, before a CCF Government was elected in Saskatchewan to undertake this kind of development. The Manitoba Government developed their projects at a time when costs were low and on sites that were relatively much more economical to develop. The Pine Falls plant is an example. Then too the relatively smaller area served in Manitoba, plus a more densely

populated rural area made electrification comparatively easy in Manitoba. The area served in Manitoba could be put in the southeast corner of Saskatchewan. This is some indication of the problem confronting those who have the responsibility for the power development in this province. They have done an excellent job, and this work was undertaken when, as we all know, costs have increased year by year. It is truly a remarkable achievement, in view of these handicaps, Mr. Speaker, that power has been brought as cheaply as it has been brought to our rural areas and scattered urban centres.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — It is a source of great pride to me, Mr. Speaker, to go and visit particularly the remote northern areas of this province, places like Moody Lake south of Pierceland, an isolated settlement some 20 miles from Pierceland which itself is also an isolated village, to see power installations serving the needs and bringing better living conditions to the people living in those areas. These people have and will continue to supply the answer to the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. They have done so in the last three elections. The facts are the rural people appreciate this service and the people in the urban centres also appreciate the gas services that have been brought to them. They will supply the answer, and if you were to ask them today which they prefer, to give up these services and remove what is termed as a burdensome debt, they would say, 'give us more of the same thing.'

The Throne Speech also makes reference to the fact that some 190,000 people in this province are now serviced by electrical power. It also mentions that twenty-four additional urban centres were served with natural gas in 1960, and that over 70,000 customers received the benefit of this service in ninety-three urban centres. These are makers of progress, Mr. Speaker. This kind of development provides new employment opportunities.

Reference has been made in this House to the increased number of public servants employed in both these utilities and in the public service of this province. The fact that the public service has been increased in terms of staff is an indication of a province meeting demands for services occasioned by modern circumstances. This too provides employment, particularly in the field of utility development. I know of no other way in which to meet the growing problem of unemployment, and to provide jobs for the many children who graduate from our high-schools and university to

**February 21, 1961**

take their place in life. It is by developing our resources, and improving living standards that this is done, Mr. Speaker. The efforts made by this administration in this direction have been outstanding.

I wish to refer to mineral development mentioned in His Honour's address. It mentions over 4400 producing oil wells, producing 53 million barrels of oil annually, exceeding the 1959 production by 11%. I was interested in a recent statement made by Mr. J.F. MacNicholl, Manager of the Saskatchewan Section of the Canadian Petroleum Association, when he stated that 130 companies with producing wells and the industry as a whole invested over \$800 million in Saskatchewan for oil exploration and development. Mr. Speaker, this doesn't look like this administration has frightened industry away from the province, and that it has frightened people away from the province who are actually interested in the development of this province's resources. I think that such references as; industry would not come here because we treat them like an Al Capone syndicate are completely out of order, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly no credit to the person who made that statement, and I think this statement will be resented by these people as well, who have had enough confidence in this province and its administration to invest these millions of dollars in the field of oil development alone.

Mention was made in the Throne Speech that good progress was being made in overcoming difficulties in connection with potash production, and it very modestly states that it hopes we will be in production in this particular mineral in the coming year.

I submit again, Mr. Speaker, that these are genuine marks of progress, and nothing that is said by the Opposition speakers can gainsay those well established facts, because the people of this province daily see the evidence of these hallmarks of progress.

Well Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my attention directly to the activities of my own Department, after expressing very keen appreciation to the Power Corporation, for the service that it has brought to the farmers of Saskatchewan. I would like first of all Mr. Speaker, briefly to review some of the agricultural events of the past year — some of our problems. Now hon. Members of the House will recall that a year ago we had a supplementary estimate of \$6 million in the agricultural vote of this House to provide emergency assistance to those farmers who had their crops snowed under. This provision amounted to \$6 million — the Federal Government shared



half of this cost but we still had a heavy obligation in transportation assistance on behalf of farmers who found it necessary to ship in feed and fodder from outside sources of supply.

I want to mention Mr. Speaker, in connection with this, that we in Saskatchewan live in a very hazardous, natural, agricultural environment, that often calls for heavy emergency expenditures of this kind. It is unfortunate that this \$3 million so sorely needed for emergencies could not have gone into the development of roads and those things that are strictly within the provincial jurisdiction.

We were very fortunate in having a good spring, last spring. The early rains gave us one of the best forage crops that we've had in our history, and as a consequence we did have well above a normal crop harvested under very satisfactory conditions. Therefore, all in all, production-wise Saskatchewan had a good year. But, we must realistically again, face the future. We're all aware of the fact that subsoil moisture is deficient. We are aware that we may again have a widespread drought and grasshopper infestation, and we must prepare for these eventualities. We have on hand sufficient chemicals and supplies readily available to farmers at very reasonable costs Mr. Speaker, and again I mention this to the House; from a cost of \$3.00 per acre for grasshopper control, for chemicals, I should say, used in grasshopper control, \$3.00 an acre in 1949, by bulk purchase we have brought this cost down to 15¢ an acre at present. These are things that have been done on behalf of our farm people; this represents a very substantial investment, but we believe it's worthwhile to have ample supplies on hand in order that we can move readily to control insect infestations.

I would like to say something about the newly created Family Farm Improvement Branch. A year ago, Mr. Speaker, at this time, the plan was merely in its thinking stage. We had no organization set up as yet, and certainly we had no applications on hand. We have done well in our first year of operation. We had quite a number of administrative and technical problems to surmount in our first year of operation, but I am glad to report that we were able to complete some 750 installations, and that at the moment we have over 4700 applications on hand, of which some 1500 have been serviced by technical servicemen. So we enter the new fiscal year well equipped to increase the number of farmers that will receive this service. This is a very well-received service, and a very natural follow-up to the

**February 21, 1961**

rural electrification program. This program, like many others Mr. Speaker, was criticized in this House, and it is hard for me to understand why a program of this kind should be criticized. It's true, we're subsidizing this program, and with every justification, Mr. Speaker. We recognize the economic disadvantage of the farmer in providing these services on his own initiative, and paying the high cost that he would have to pay both for supplies and technical service, so we give the farmer these services, and I predict Mr. Speaker, that we will be expanding this program to meet increasing demand, and my hope is that the Provincial Treasurer, in the allocation of his budget in the future years, will be able to allocate sufficient to this branch to meet the demand requirements.

I should also like to make reference to AMA, which is the Agricultural Machinery Administration. This is a new field of activity initiated in this province for the testing of farm machinery for performance and use under working conditions in Saskatchewan. Not only for performance and use, but for any mechanical defects that might develop in new machinery, particularly. It has been very well received. The farmers of Alberta Machinery Testing Organization, and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that the Alberta Government is co-operating with us, and is providing to us a token grant to carry on this work, and is also paying for the reports which we send to the farmers of Alberta. I am hopeful, and I have reason to believe, that Manitoba will also co-operate in this new field of endeavour, and it is my hope that the three provinces together can combine their financial resources to provide a still better testing service for the farmers of the three prairie provinces.

I should like also to make reference to the northern pasture development. This has been a good program. We now have some twelve bush pastures under development. The land developed and cleared to date will carry 8,000 head of livestock. If we are to increase the numbers of livestock in this province, we need to look to the north. The possibilities there Mr. Speaker, are tremendous. We hope too, that these pastures will not only encourage other people to clear land, and to seize the opportunities of producing more cattle by developing land for grass, but we also wish to assist those farmers who do not have sufficient land resources to expand in this direction. These community pasture facilities add stability to farm income in these areas.

I should also like to mention Mr. Speaker, the land clearing program on Crown Land. Not too much is said of this — it is not as spectacular as some other programs — a good deal is said about farm credit, but in the case of Crown Leases, it might interest this House to know that since this program has been inaugurated, nearly \$9 million has been spent by the Provincial Department of Agriculture in clearing land on behalf of Crown lessees, and the total land cleared to date is some 600,000 acres. This has been a benefit, not only to the Crown lessee involved, but has been of benefit to the entire economy of the province.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Just a brief reference to crop insurance. Everyone in the House knows the basis of the Agreement between the Federal and Provincial Governments. Here we have inaugurated a program this year. Applications and information have been sent out to some 40,000 farmers. I cannot say to the House at the moment as to whether there will be crop insurance areas set up because 25% of the farmers in an area representing 25% of the acreage must file applications before an area can be declared. We will know this by the end of February, and as hon. Members know, the date for receiving applications has been extended, and the Members will be asked to amend The Crop Insurance Act accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to the economic problems confronting the farmer. I regret that time is running out, and I am not going to trespass, I can assure you, on any of the time of the following speakers. In the post-war years significant developments have taken place in the agricultural industry that have transformed our view completely as to how we ought to treat this industry in an economic sense. Gone are the days where we can continue to depend on the so-called law of supply and demand, as a means of governing agricultural surpluses. This is completely out of date, Mr. Speaker, because I submit that farmers operating in the kind of economic environment they are today have set costs and their total income must meet their total costs. This has been far from accomplished, Mr. Speaker.

Let me give some examples. The farmers of this province now have some 40,000 more tractors than they had in 1946; 40,000 more combines; 47,000 more trucks. Because of mechanization and the transformation of the industry, demands have grown for better service in transporting children to schools involving greater distances. There have been many bad effects from this

**February 21, 1961**

great technological advance. We can mention, for example, the general trend from the agricultural industry to other segments of the economy for employment; the thinning out of the rural population; the drying up of small hamlets, towns and villages in favour of larger centres. These are some of the consequences of mechanization, Mr. Speaker.

It might interest the House to know that in the agricultural population of Canada, for example, in the period 1946 to 1959 the number gainfully employed dropped from 692,000 from a gainfully employed population of 1,200,000 to 692,000. It's going on all over the country, in the United States as well, and since this province is mainly an agricultural province, and a province which, because of moisture, is a low productivity area, the liquidation of farmers from the farms has been of greater significance. This is the reason the population has gone down in the province, Mr. Speaker. What are the causes of this trend? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not because of the mechanization of the industry altogether that this has taken place, but it is primarily due to the cost-price squeeze that the farmer finds himself in. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that a delegation of 1,000 farmers went to Ottawa not too long ago, seeking redress for the money that they had already lost because of the cost-price squeeze. According to the submission made to the Federal Government at that time, it was stated that the farmers of this province on account of wheat alone, had lost some \$500 million in the three-year period 1954-1956 as compared to the previous three-year period. This is a tremendous amount of money. They asked for deficiency payments to help make up this loss in income in part at least.

I have had information gathered in regard to farm income, and on the basis of this information, for example, in 1957 which was a normal year, the total farm cost including wages, depreciation on machinery, taxes, health, educational services etc., this total cost to the farmers of Saskatchewan, some 100,000 of them, was \$711.8 million. Then I turn to determine what the gross income was for these farm people, and I find that their gross income in 1957 was \$586 million. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the industry as a whole went in the red by \$125.8 million in 1957, and conditions have grown steadily worse since then. This is big money we are talking about, and this is a heavy burden; it is too much of a burden to be asking the farmer to carry.

As I stated, the mechanization of the industry has removed the possibility of the family farm being

self-sustaining by virtue of its own resources. Farming now is a very exacting business the same as any other business, and the income required by the agricultural industry as a whole must be equal to the total cost that this industry is expected to bear, not only for farm operations but for providing local government services as well. This is the crux of the local government problem, and a provincial government problem too, wherein there are increasing demands because of mechanization for better services which are of course legitimate demands. As I previously stated, it is in this manner that we make progress, however, people must have the money to pay for those services. The big objection by the farmer is that he has not sufficient money to maintain services at the present level without talking too much about increasing services. He is aware of the fact that his income problem must be solved and when this is solved, Mr. Speaker, the major problem facing local governments and provincial governments will be solved as well.

For a solution to these great economic problems we must of necessity look to the Federal Government which has responsibility for national policy and fiscal policy, and has control over interprovincial and export trade.

I was very much interested in the recent national convention held by the Liberal Party. I was particularly interested in their agricultural program, because in this House I have heard year after year hon. Members opposite get up and suggest that somehow it was within the capacity of the Provincial Government to correct the mistakes and the negligence of our national Government in regard to farm income. So it may be very interesting to make some observations on the policies that came out of the national Liberal conference in Ottawa recently. I would have thought that the Members of this House and other people from Saskatchewan who attended that conference would have insisted upon agricultural policy that would have solved the income problems of the agricultural industry. I submit that the policies that went before the platform finally adopted by the national Liberal convention falls far short of achieving that objective. They have done a good deal of hollering about what Mr. Diefenbaker has done, and what he didn't do on behalf of agriculture, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that with slight variations the program on which they hope to be elected in this province in the next federal election, is identical to the Conservative program, and it is based on the same economic philosophy that surpluses must be made to disappear by the workings of the law of supply and demand. That is, by making farm prices so unattractive

**February 21, 1961**

to farmers that they will get out of a particular line of production. This is what we have had during the whole post-war period.

One of the revealing statements that emerged from this convention — I wonder sometimes why these policies are developed — I think they are going to miss the mark. The prairie members, it said, persisted at the closed door session, but when the final policy came out it was satisfactory to them. One observation was made by a representative from Yorkton, who said this:

“The motion was supported by Mr. . . . of Yorkton, and other speakers who contended it would give western Liberals the kind of political talking point they needed. They had earlier warned that they could not win prairie seats without such a program.”

I suggest to them that they will not win any prairie seats on the program they adopted at their national convention. Here is a condemnation that comes direct from some Members sitting right in this House — a condemnation of former federal Liberal policy, when they said and I read from the text:

“Although Saskatchewan agriculture has shown a greater increase in efficiency and productivity over the post-war years than any other major Canadian industry, it is confronted by prices which have declined over the past ten years while the farm costs have risen by one-third.”

Mr. Speaker, out of seven of those ten years there was a Liberal Government in power in Ottawa. Here is a concrete admission by them that agriculture came to what they termed stagnation when they said, and I quote again:

“Here is a measure of the cost-price squeeze. Here is the situation that has led to intolerable low income in farming, and to a tremendous migration from agriculture and stagnation and ineffectiveness in Federal Government policy.”

Seven of those years, Mr. Speaker, there was a Federal Liberal Government in power in Ottawa. Inadvertently they made a self-confession, but unhappily, Mr. Speaker, they did not come up with a proper solution. What did you think was offered? One more dollar than the Conservatives are offering. They are offering parity, they say,

based on efficient production, parity on three hundred bushels. I submit the implementation of this proposal would drive the agricultural industry deeper and deeper into the depths of depression, Mr. Speaker. I mention again that for one year alone this industry in this province alone was deficient by \$125 million in meeting its obligation.

Bold new policies will be required, and Mr. Speaker, I haven't any strong political sentiments regarding solving the farm problem. If the Liberal Party does it, I will give them full credit for it. If the Conservative Government does it, I will give them full credit for it. If they do it, but over the years, Mr. Speaker, and I think all within reach of my voice will agree that they haven't solved the basic economic problems facing the agricultural industry, and I plead that they reconstruct their program and that it be similar to the kind of program that we will have when the New Party presents its farm program, which I can assure you will guarantee to the farmers of Canada that never again will they have to fear because of lack of adequate income to meet total farm costs.

**Mr. Danielson:** — What is your program?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Some people say, how can this be accomplished? How can you provide farmers with a high level of income and at the same time meet the problem of increased production? Well, increased production should not be a bad thing, Mr. Speaker, provided we have policies that will provide markets for our surplus products outside Canada, for people who are hungry. It is said from the most reliable authority that two-thirds of the people of the world go hungry. I suggested before in this House that we might use some of the money which is now going for defence and which we all admit does not provide defence any more be used to extend credit to under-developed countries, the hungry countries, and thereby not only provide a market for our agricultural products, but assure a continuing market for the many industrial products that Canada's industrial set-up can produce in abundance.

It is in this manner that we can improve living standards in these under-developed countries. This is a good investment, Mr. Speaker, not only in terms of goodwill and proper human relationships between people but it will also prove to be good business.

I would take my hat off to any Government that would work vigorously in this direction. But the Liberal

**February 21, 1961**

platform here says it is worried about surpluses and who is going to suffer the consequences of getting rid of surpluses? We know the farmer has been paying the bill so far. For example, a year ago an announcement was made that floor prices on hogs would be lowered, and as a consequence our farm people went out of hog production. Our hog production in this province, or marketing I should say, dropped 34%, and our hog production went down about 25%. This is not good. This is the way the law of supply and demand works and which is supposed to exonerate governments from any responsibility for maintaining farm income. Our Liberal friends, in concocting their policy, say this, and again I quote:

“We reaffirm, the Convention said, our belief in flexible price support for major products, so that governments would be relieved of carrying excessive stocks.”

What does this mean, Mr. Speaker? This means that the farmer will be asked again to carry the loss by putting prices so low that he will be liquidated out of business.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I submit, Mr. Speaker, that under present circumstances this cannot be done without great injury to the farmers concerned, and to the entire economy of the country. I submit that in face of the general depopulation of rural areas, and reduction in numbers of those gainfully employed in agriculture who sought employment in other industries, in light now of the increasing unemployment problem in other industries. I submit a prosperous agriculture could absorb all of the unemployed that are in Canada today. Farmers need help; they need help to operate their costly machines more efficiently. A prosperous agricultural industry could provide employment for another 600,000 people.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would permit a question?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Not at the moment. I must say to the hon. Member that I will be finished in just a minute. I'm not going to trespass on anyone else's time. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that bringing in policies of this kind are not only good for the agricultural industry, but they are good for the entire economy of Canada, and they are part and parcel of finding a solution to the growing problem of unemployment.



My time is up, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Would the Minister permit a question now, Mr. Speaker?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — When I'm through, yes. Because of the reasons I have enumerated, because the Address of His Honour indicates continued progress and further development of the future of this province, and because the group on this side of the House believes in the policy of planning production in the interests of serving the needs of all the people, not only of Saskatchewan but all of Canada, I support the motion.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, before the Minister sits down, would he permit one question? He has been telling us about all the advantages of socialist planning and agriculture. Now, I want to ask him this question: Why is it that recently all these Socialist countries such as China, Poland, Russia, Czechoslovakia are over here buying our wheat? We have surpluses, yes, but they cannot grow enough agriculture under their system or enough feed to feed the people.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, the reply to that is very obvious. This is an indication that they need it, and I am not interested in their techniques of production or their economic philosophy or anything else. The fact is that the Chinese people, 600 million of them need food. If other countries have misfortunes and crop failures we should be prepared to feed them too.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Your system has failed! Your system is for you.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That's a pretty small one, Ross. Pretty feeble!

**Mr. Ian H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to congratulate you on your high office as Speaker of this Assembly, and

**February 21, 1961**

I know you will be fair with us at all times. And I also congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. Unfortunately, I can't see fit to congratulate any of the following speakers from that side of the House, because I have sat here now for two weeks and I have heard very little. Most of the speeches from that side of the House were criticism of the Leader of the Opposition and very little else.

I have the great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, of representing that Constituency which has always been an exceptional asset to the Province of Saskatchewan, namely Souris-Estevan, and while I feel that it is one of the most progressive portions of this province, I might point out, that they have turned their back on socialism and joined the eastern half of the province and have got into the Liberal camp.

We have natural resources in Estevan and together with the water supply that was available, it gave Saskatchewan Power Corporation an opportunity to locate their huge boundary dam installation. Most of the developed oil resources in the province are located in the Souris-Estevan Constituency. We have better-than-average grain farmers to produce better-than-average crops in our area and many of these people I have the pleasure of knowing personally.

At present we have good highways leading to our city and we are served by both railroads, the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National. However, we are waging a tremendous battle along the Soo Line at the present time to get the Canadian Pacific Railways to keep the railroads and the last passenger trains service to our community. Now it is hoped that the Board of Transport Commissioners, which is having a hearing on this thing, see fit to keep that last passenger train intact. It happens to be one of the railroad lines that made money in the past year of business, and we simply do not want to lose any of our services at this time.

Now, in the transportation field we have quite a problem in our Constituency and that is the bus system. We have tried to get bus services extended from Carnduff to Gainsborough, and the Government saw fit to have the municipal hospital located in Gainsborough. The senior-citizens' home is located in Carnduff and these people have no means of getting back and forth except by charity. I will hope that the Government will take a second look at this problem and try to see that the people in that

eastern end of the Constituency get some service to which, I believe, they are entitled. The Crown Corporations, I was always led to believe, were for service and not for profit, yet when we ask for a bus, they say it is not profitable.

We also, in Estevan, have an airport, which has great possibilities for the future. Since the war Estevan has struggled to keep the airfield and the buildings in shape. These facilities were indeed a boon to the city in the days of the oil boom, because they provided a great deal of accommodation when accommodation was at a premium. Now much of the credit for the purchase and the maintenance of these buildings must go to the mayor of Estevan, Mayor Nicholson, who has been the mayor of that centre for some twenty years and has just been re-elected to another two-year term. Prior to that, he spent five years as an alderman on the town council, and I have had the pleasure of working with that gentleman on the city council of Estevan.

Now, Estevan used to be a judicial centre with a fine court house, both modern and beautiful and its surroundings were a picture-place in the city. However, we used to have a resident judge and just recently, the Government saw fit to change their judicial centres, leaving Estevan out. I ask the question: Why is this Government trying to make justice pay for itself? It is obvious that the administration of justice has become some sort of a political football. We had a good judge at Estevan who was both young and active. Yet today, a large centre like Estevan, has no judge and we object strenuously to losing any of our services. For example, from December 6, 1960 until January 24, 1961, there was no judge to hold court in Estevan. During that period, there were eighteen estates pending with widows and children awaiting the outcome.

I am responsible for the welfare of the Souris-Estevan Constituency for the present time at least, and I should like to hear from the Minister as to his aims and objectives and whether or not it is the intention of the Department to make justice pay for itself, dollar for dollar. At present we are served by the judge from Moosomin, who, I understand, is ready for retirement. I feel, that there was no good and valid reason why a young judge was removed from Estevan when he could have handled easily Weyburn, Arcola and Moosomin, as well as Estevan. "Humanity First," was the slogan of this Government before it got into office, but I contend that removing our judge from that city, makes justice only for the rich. At present, there are some thirteen judges serving twenty-one judicial centres in Saskatchewan.

**February 21, 1961**

Now in my short time in the political field I have made some observations and I should like to offer these as requests to the Government, in the hope that they will be sympathetic to our problems and try and do something about them.

Firstly, I might suggest to the Government that Highway No. 18 be completed from Carnduff to the Manitoba boundary. At the present time it stops short at Carnduff and we lose a lot of traffic, both local and tourist traffic, to North Dakota, where they can travel on blacktop. If this road is completed in blacktop, we will have a black ribbon from the Manitoba boundary through to the City of Regina.

I also suggest, that Highway No. 9 from the North Dakota boundary to our lake resorts of Carlyle and Kenosee should also be completed and blacktopped. Any travellers on a weekend will know what I mean when I say that that road at the present time is most dangerous and dusty and it certainly would help the tourist trade if we had that highway blacktopped. Since the Constituency of Souris-Estevan supplied this Government with a good deal of its revenue, these requests are not out of order.

Now, while I am on the subject of highways, I suggest too, that on the wide highways, like Highway No. 39 from Weyburn to Estevan and from Estevan down to Oxbow, the speed limit should be raised from 60 miles an hour to 70 miles an hour by day and 55 miles an hour by night. With the new cars and new transportation we have, these speed limits are not unrealistic. In the meantime it would release our policemen who sit along the highways nabbing motorists for other police duties. I noticed in the State of Montana the last time I was down there, there was no speed limit at all except where marked and I seldom found any of the travelling public pass you, if you were travelling in the neighbourhood of 70 miles an hour. I think that the speed limit should be raised also on the Trans-Canada Highway, which is another wide highway. The visibility in Saskatchewan, because of our flat terrain, is very good most of the time.

Now, the Souris-Estevan Constituency, during the past ten years, has prospered and a good deal of the prosperity in our area has been due to the development of the oil industry and the satellite industries it brought with it to that area. The general influx of people brought a good deal of money to the area and our city expanded and jumped from about 4,000 people to a city of 9,000 people almost overnight.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank;** — Will the Leader of the Opposition please listen?

**Mr. MacDougall:** — The oil boom lasted for about three or four years and suddenly it ceased. Now, the legislation that was passed, which I say was very questionable, was the legislation on the road allowance tax. There are many things to consider in this business and I don't believe the Government should make it difficult for business and industry to stay within our boundaries by grabbing at every straw of taxation, because it just simply tends to drive industries away. If other provinces can make concessions to these industries to try to attract them within their boundaries and to hold them, then I suggest we should do likewise. I suggest that we have not got the biggest oil fields in Canada or the most productive ones either. However, we have certain assets and one of them is the proximity to the major markets in the east. A good oil well in Saskatchewan will produce somewhere in the neighbourhood of one hundred barrels a day, while over in Alberta, a good well can produce anywhere between three hundred and approximately two thousand barrels a day. Saskatchewan crude oil too, is not as desirable in most refineries as is Alberta crude, because of the high sulphur content.

Now, if Crown Land costs are cheap, this would stimulate interest in our province and in the oil industry. The Government policy, regarding handouts to co-operatives is another deterrent to industries having faith in our Government. This produces an unfavourable investment climate and you cannot blame companies for locating in other provinces where they are sure of more favourable treatment. In the interest of investment by private enterprise, there should be no tax concessions or favours granted to the co-operatives, unless we are prepared to make these same concessions all along the line.

I have here a copy of the February 2nd issue of a magazine "Oil in Canada" and it shows a number of wild cat wells, drilled in Canada, and here is what I find; In Saskatchewan there is one, in Alberta there are fifteen and in British Columbia there are four. The oil companies, I point out, are still searching for oil elsewhere.

I will also mention geophysical parties work, and I find as of January 15th, there was only one working in all of Saskatchewan, while eighty-eight crews were at work in Alberta and British Columbia and nine in the North West Territories. Again, I have a copy of the different lands, being auctioned off in Alberta for oil and gas. To date, there are some seventeen different land sales listed as against two in Saskatchewan.

**February 21, 1961**

Again, I point out, this Government need only sit back and ask themselves why. It won't be long before even the furthest of the back benchers will be going to wonder about their Government, with exception of course of those whose brains are too bleached from brainwashing.

At intervals of four to five years since about 1945, this Government has alternately been trotting out the threat of confiscation of mineral rights and lulling the farmer into a false sense of security. During the past six months we seem to be in one of those periods, where the Government is taking unto themselves the minerals by threat of forfeiture. Notices are sent out six month prior to the Crown taking the minerals over. There is no final notice of warning, Mr. Speaker, it is six months in advance then you lose your mineral rights. And I suggest to any farmer, that they might just as well check any favorite attention that they get from the Government, because it might mean the confiscation of their mineral rights.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — On a point of order, the hon. Member is absolutely wrong.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — The mineral tax is nothing more than a nuisance tax with the purpose of taking over all mineral resources to the Crown. This is unjust, because frequently you are taxing people for something which might not even be there. It is an amazing thing to note, that if your oil and gas rights are forfeited, you cannot get them back. However, if it is the coal rights involved, you have up to five years to redeem them.

Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is not true either.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! If the hon. Minister has a correction to make he can do so at the conclusion of the speech.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — Thank you. In short, this plan of mineral taxation is a confiscatory one, and no one knows whether or not paying the tax would ever be justified in financial return. No one is certain how many, if any, minerals lie under his land and it maybe one hundred years before any mining is started. The value of minerals might never cover

the taxes. Natural products hidden beneath the earth are of no value whatever until they are recovered.

Now, when the CCF Party came into power, its bid for public support was bolstered by the promise that they would clip the wings of large corporations and financial institutions. This went over big in agricultural Saskatchewan. However, now the farmers are feeling the same pressures that industry felt before. When the press pointed these things out that sooner or later all would feel the pressure of socialist demands they were criticized and bitterly denounced. Such would never happen; socialism was good for the down-trodden.

Well, the turn of events, Mr. Speaker, indicates that these warnings of the newspapers were well founded.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment to the motion; I cannot support the motion.

**Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, before speaking to the amendment I wish to congratulate you on your elevation to the office of Speaker. I know you will conduct this House in a fair and impartial manner. I should like also to congratulate everyone in the House who has participated so far, with particular attention to the Members of the Opposition who have done a very good job so far in opposing the Government, and in showing the people of Saskatchewan that they are not what they are cracked up to be.

I will try, in the few moments that I have, Mr. Speaker, to contribute my little share.

I was rather amused the other day when the Minister of Education got up and mentioned that the Members on this side of the House had accused the Government of coasting and drifting. Well, I personally think that the Members who did mention that were probably slightly wrong, especially when the Minister went on to elaborate on the Throne Speech, comparing it with a new automobile. He was comparing the Throne Speech with that of a new automobile. It's all right to want to have a new automobile, but he said, "They were quite content to drive the old automobile and get mileage out of it". Well, they are certainly getting the mileage, Mr. Speaker, but what the Minister forgot to mention is the fact that the automobile is still on the blocks; they wheels are turning, the mileage is going, but they are getting nowhere.

**February 21, 1961**

Then the Minister of Agriculture mentions the great agricultural problems that we have. We may have agricultural problems, but under a free enterprise system one of our biggest problems is probably over-production, and trying to solve the question of transportation to get this production to the less fortunate people of the world.

Is he suggesting a socialist system as they have in China under the Communists? He said that the systems which have been advocated here have been no good. If that is so, why doesn't he mention it?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I did not suggest that whatever!

**Mr. Coderre:** — He said the other systems were wrong. However, Mr. Speaker, in speaking a few moments ago on the question of the amendment to the Speech from the Throne, which I believe is of tremendous importance because it involves the freedom of the people, and freedoms of local government. Before you can consider the freedoms of local government you have to go back in time to find out where or how we got these local governments. From what I can gather, Mr. Speaker, the first type of local government was the family unit. That was the first local government, but for some reason or the other families banded together and formed tribes and out of these tribes they appointed some to educate the hunters, to educate the arrow-makers, and these became your first school groups, administered through the chiefs and councils.

But for some reasons where other, larger tribes were taking advantage of these lesser tribes, you found that they were being sort of driven together and they gathered together into larger tribes and formed nations. The chiefs of these nations eventually took advantage and control of the people and became almost totalitarian, until you come into the Middle Ages, where you had the establishment of what we call the feudal system. Liberal movements of these days, liberal-minded people of those days, realized that it was very necessary for the people to have local government, and they have shed blood in this world, Sir, in order to get this freedom of local government.

Eventually we have been handed down what we have today — our local municipal governments. These groups of people, or local government, were formed, and in many fields they were not in a position to administer such things as international affairs, or roads until we moved on into the present time; so that the senior



governments were given the options and the right to administer and help the local, junior governments to participate in their types of government. However, I still see the need of a central government to administer the many things that local governments are unable to administer, because it is beyond their economic scope of their ability.

History is repeating itself, Mr. Speaker. This present administration, due to their greed and desire for more power, and requiring more bureaucratic control, are gradually trying to take away the rights of the people and local self-government. It is a right that should be maintained. Liberal policies, Mr. Speaker, have always been to give the right to the individual to judge for himself what should be best for him and his immediate family. I believe in that Mr. Speaker, and I believe we should be sure of maintaining that freedom. Consequently, this is one of the reasons why an amendment was added to the Address-in-Reply, asking the Government to grant the people of Saskatchewan, through their junior governments the right to decide for themselves as to what type of government they should have. Let them decide, and not have an authority established by the present administration laying down the rules and regulations as to what type of Government they should have. It is just like the Government coming along and saying, you have a choice of how to die: do you want to be shot-gunned or do you want the rope? We still have not had the assurance from this Government that before any change of local government will be given to the people they will have the chance to express themselves on a ballot.

I concern myself greatly with that, Mr. Speaker, and for that reason I have to support the amendment — because it guarantees the freedoms of the individual and the rights of the people of self-government.

I believe Mr. Speaker, that the inalienable right of every human being is the right of association with whom he wishes. I also believe Mr. Speaker, that no legislation should be on the statutes of any province that would deny this right to any individual or to anyone. I believe Mr. Speaker, that if he be a business man, he should not be forced through any economic pressures to comply to rigid policies of manufacturers or distributors or rigid regulations established by governments. I believe Mr. Speaker, that if he be a farmer, he should not have to conform or to submit to the dictates, controlling his way of life, through economic pressures,

**February 21, 1961**

and again through controls established by government. Be he a professional man, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that a man should have to conform to the dictates of any monopolistic associations, or be he a wage earner, to work under conditions or wages below a decent standard of living, or have to conform to dictates of every monopolistic union boss or manager.

Every man Mr. Speaker, is born free; every man should be free, providing, though, that his freedom does not infringe upon the freedom of anyone else. Freedom of expression Mr. Speaker, is sometimes denied. I believe that they have been recently denied.

We have a problem that is so pressing in this province; the problem of unemployment. I was rather concerned Mr. Speaker, when I picked up the paper on February 8th, 1961, to find that there was a demonstration of the Regina unemployed which was planned to take place on the day the Legislature opened, but it had been called off. The only reason it was called off, according to the press release which was issued jointly by the Regina Unemployment Committee, and the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, was the fact that the Premier was not prepared to see them. Apparently he does not believe . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. That statement is absolutely false.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Corrections can be made at the close of the speech.

**Premier Douglas:** — No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member makes a statement. I have the right to stand up on the question of privilege and protest an untrue and false statement being made. I have never refused to see the unemployed at any time. I have agreed to see them when they asked to be seen.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Coderre:** — Mr. Speaker, I probably haven't got the eloquence of the hon. Minister in the best way possible, but I do know that the Minister in question, did not see the delegation when they were prepared to see him on that particular day . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, that is not true — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the hon. Member cannot make statements which are absolutely false.

**Mr. Speaker:** — These can be corrected at the close of the speech.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to allow these statements to be made.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Douglas:** — I reserve the right, Mr. Speaker, to rise on the question of privilege of an untrue statement that was made.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! If you don't mind, Sir, I feel that I shall have to make a little explanation in regard to something that is apparently badly misunderstood in this House. If I may read Mr. Beauchesne, citation 126, a portion of the first paragraph.

“If a Member desires to ask a question during the debate, he should first obtain consent from the Member who is speaking. If the latter ignores the request, the former cannot insist even if he thinks he is being misrepresented. He cannot make a denial during the speech, but he must wait until the Member has resumed his seat, and then he may ask leave to make a statement, or he must wait until his turn comes to address the House. Standing Order (in our book number ten) is compulsory.

“No one has the right to interrupt a Member who is addressing the House, by putting a question to him, or by making or demanding an explanation.”

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have another, if I may, we're off the air now anyway. These are not questions of privilege under consideration — I have a piece here regarding questions of privilege.

“Members often raise so-called ‘questions of privilege,’ on matters which should be dealt with as personal explanations or corrections, either in the debates or the proceedings of the House. A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should

**February 21, 1961**

be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy. There are privileges of the House, as well as Members individually. Wilful disobedience to orders and rules of Parliament in the exercise of its constitutional functions; insults and obstructions during the debate, are breaches of privileges of the House. Libels upon Members and aspersions upon them in relation to Parliament and interference of any kind with their official duties, are breaches of the privilege of Members. But, a dispute arising between two Members as to the allegation of the facts does not fulfill the conditions of Parliament and privilege.”

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on this point of order. I am sorry I have no books at my hand. I am sure that hon. Members will agree that when unparliamentary remarks are made in the House, they must be immediately corrected, and among unparliamentary remarks, I am sure you will find included statements made by any Member in the House, in regard to particular business of which another Member had the first hand personal knowledge. In other words if one was an actor in that part, then no Member in this House can get away with telling me what somebody told me, because I have first hand knowledge of that, and if I say this is what he told me, that must be accepted.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Pardon me, may I debate this point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I don't think you can, I've made a ruling on this.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I didn't hear you make a ruling, I heard you quote Beauchesne, but I didn't hear you say, that you have ruled according to that, and I wanted to point out some of the implications on this question, because where statements are made, and in regard to the actions of another Member, the actions of which he knows or she knows very well indeed, if those have to be left to some later time to correct — I don't think that will work at all, I think any of these things that are unparliamentary and imputational in language, must be corrected at once.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mrs. Mary Batter (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. Minister, as I am sure you do too, your Honour, that where someone accuses the hon. Minister of saying something, and he gets up and says, that's not true, — that's a question of privilege, and he is entitled to deny that he made that statement but, if someone reads out of a news report, and says that a delegation was going to and intended to parade before the Legislative Buildings, and that the newspaper report states that they did not do so because they could not meet the Premier or the Government, surely this is not the same sort of thing. He is quoting from the newspaper, and if the Minister wants to deny a report in the newspaper he should take the proper steps as pointed out by your Honour to make that denial. That is not a question of personal privilege.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on this point, the hon. gentleman did not quote the newspaper in saying that I had refused to meet the delegation. That's not what the newspaper said. What he did was to say, on his own, that I had refused to meet the delegation, and I reserve the right . . .

**Mr. Coderre:** — I did not, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. I can read it word for word as I said it, because . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! If you please, I think that the quotations that I read, make it very clear that the hon. Member speaking cannot be interrupted. If the hon. Members think that they are being misrepresented or if they care to make a denial in regard to what the Member speaking has said, I think that in conformity with what I read, they should wait until the Member takes his seat. If he is not prepared to be interrupted at that time, they will have to make their contribution and their statement at the close of the speech according to the citations I read, and if my ruling in that regard is not to be accepted, then it shall have to be appealed to the House.

**Mr. Coderre:** — I will continue, Mr. Speaker. I mentioned something about newspaper clippings, and then the press release was issued jointly. I gave that point, but I said maybe the Premier had no intention at the moment to meet these people and he gave them an alternative. That is only my supposition, and I believe I have the right to suppose that.

**February 21, 1961**

**Premier Douglas:** — No, you have no right . . .

**Mr. Coderre:** — But however, he went on and gave them an alternative date. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that he was prepared to meet them but not at that particular time.

**Premier Douglas:** — That's not true!

**Mr. Coderre:** — They do mention they are concerned about unemployment and they feel it is a very important matter, and that something should be done. Sometimes I believe there were probably a couple of reasons for that — there are actions going on elsewhere. There is an election in the Turtleford Constituency, I understand, that is possibly one of the reasons why they do not want to deal with the question of unemployment at the moment. They don't want to put anything on the floor of the House prior to the results there. Or probably they are waiting until later on in the Session. The Premier would like to wait until later on in the Session to deal with this very important matter.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that unemployment is so important in this province today that it should be given top priority and if a delegation of union people and unemployed people come in to see the Premier, the Premier should be prepared to drop everything and see them.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, in more ways than one when these people are concerned about employment. They want employment; they want some security of some sort; we should see that it is discussed with them, and give the full power of the House to try and cope with it as much and as well as this Legislature can.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, for another reason, because if these people are employed, it puts a little more of that green stuff into circulation and the purchasing power is greater. Our agricultural people would directly benefit by it.

However, apart from that there are many things not in the Speech from the Throne I feel should be there, and sometimes the people with whom I have occasion to discuss are not quite satisfied with the legislation which we have. On several occasions I have had the privilege of speaking to many wage earners in all walks of life from all over the province, and elsewhere. Some-

times some of these wage earners feel they have become a tool, a tool of management or else a tool of the union bosses, and probably sometimes both. Many of these wage earners, Mr. Speaker, feel they have lost their freedoms in every sense of the world. Let us take, for example, the wage earner who is qualified for a certain position, applied to a union shop for a job. He has to sign an agreement as to the conditions of work, his attendance, etc. If it is a closed shop he is given his position on condition that he join the union. All complaints this man may have, all discussion this man may have with management about his problems, his ambitions, his desires to better his way of life, or possibly he may have shortcuts that could help management, he cannot normally go to management and discuss his problems, whether they be working problems or otherwise. He has to go to the steward — the shop steward. He is unable to communicate with management so far as work is concerned. Wages, conditions, etc. He has to join that union within thirty days of taking employment. If he doesn't, the union forces him under the agreement that they have, out of a job.

I have concerned myself with that, Mr. Speaker, and what I am going to say, I think, may get a rise out of some of the Members of the Government. I am concerned with freedom of the individual. When he has freedom to organize, should we not have freedom not to organize.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Yes, and work seventy-two hours a week!

**Mr. Coderre:** — If there is no union in that particular establishment you have someone taking advantage of him. After taking employment in some rather secure position, we find management takes advantage of the wage earner. He doesn't know whether his future is secure; whether after a time he is going to get a fair wage or decent working conditions. Oftentimes employers take advantage of the employee. Sometimes the employee is not in a position to stand up for his right. He is meek because he wants that job security, and it forces him probably through fear of losing his job, to keep quiet. In any event, the thinking in the wage earner's mind is job security — not conditions of work. He wants to be assured of his job so that he can provide a decent living for his family.

In either case, Mr. Speaker, these men's freedoms and rights have been taken away from them. I believe in local union autonomy and this must be preserved at all times, but not union monopoly. Whenever the word

**February 21, 1961**

monopoly appears many socialists get up on their feet and say, 'You can't have a monopoly' but still we have a monopoly in these particular cases.

I believe, as I mentioned before, in the right of the wage earner to associate as a unit or organization to better his working conditions. This is a right that has been granted by a Liberal Government in the past, by the Saskatchewan Trade Union Act, and it was later supplemented in 1944 by the Labour Relations Act. This just shows, Mr. Speaker, that we are not opposed, as Liberals, to any of this legislation. We put it on the statute books. These very laws, Mr. Speaker, are still on the statutes and are still being used as a base or foundation on which our labour legislation is based. The Workmen's Compensation Act was established before these boards were even dreamed up. Workmen's Compensation, 1928; Trade Union Act, 1938; and then you have many others — Coal Miners' Safety Act, Mines Regulation Act, Minimum Wage, Workmen's Compensation Board, Workmen's Wage Act and Apprenticeship Act. All these Acts were put on the statutes by previous administrations. Not necessarily by socialism, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — They're a lot better now.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Naturally they're bound to be better. There is certain progress in this world, and things have been progressing. We didn't have them prior to these days, because the need was not necessarily there. As we progress, legislation must progress, but this Government, as I have shown, Mr. Speaker, is still on the blocks; they're getting the mileage, but they're getting nowhere.

I can show you something that really concerns me so far as freedom is concerned. What has happened to the laws of our country which permit situations, as I quote you, Mr. Speaker, and I will quote it, so that the hon. Members won't get up and make another hassle about the rules and regulations of the House; this appeared January 7, 1961 in 'The Leader-Post': "B.C. Mother Fights Union Fine for Son". I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the duty of a mother or father is to look after the welfare of their children when they are below the age of maturity. It is their right that is handed down, not by government, but by the means of freedom given to all of us. I quote from this clipping:

"A North Vancouver woman has challenged a Trade Union's right to fine her sixteen year-old son for not attending a Union meeting."



Has that young fellow, Mr. Speaker, any right? Is he obligated to attend a Union meeting? Apparently he has because the quote goes on:

“Mrs. Emily Anderson says that out of \$9.60 her son, Grey, a high school student earned in eight hours of week-end work in a food store, he was fined \$5.00 for not going to a meeting, or 52% of his wages.”

Is that freedom? Is that a right? I have more to say, Mr. Speaker, on human rights in a few moments.

“Mrs. Anderson told the Retail Food Clerks Union, C.L.C. that it has no authority to order a minor where or when to attend a meeting. Mrs. Anderson said that the boy had no choice but to pay \$15 union initiation fee in order to work. In five months work this year he has earned \$38.10 as a parcel wrapper; the union has taken \$21 of this.”

This is 55% of his earnings, Mr. Speaker.

I am sympathetic to unions, and I still am, but providing Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, that their freedom does not infringe upon the freedoms of anybody else. That is an infringement upon this person's freedom. A young man, sixteen years old, may not according to the law of the land, be a fully matured person but he has to attend a meeting probably for some brainwashing, in this case, who knows? This mother is concerned — maybe the son did not want to go to these meetings or the mother didn't want him to go, but the union insists on his going.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Member a question? Do you know of any similar case that has ever taken place in the Province of Saskatchewan, and in addition what has this British Columbia case got to do with this Government?

**Mr. Coderre:** — I think that is a very fair question, and I will try to give a fair answer. Mr. Speaker, time and again, labour unions who have put themselves in these situations have wrested the control and the rights from individuals across the country, and being concerned for the people of Saskatchewan I believe that we should guard ourselves. I have to give examples of what may happen. We are affiliating with the proposed New Party or organization and this particular party is proposing to merge with labour. I am concerned for my freedom, Mr. Speaker. I am

**February 21, 1961**

concerned for the freedom of my child who will someday be a man of sixteen and will have a chance to work. I would like to be assured that when he becomes of age he will have that freedom — the freedom of an individual; freedom of association, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that somehow or other that particular union must have been in very bad shape if they had to force a person to come to the meeting. I belong to the Canadian Legion, and I believe in that organization, for the betterment of the people of the country. Any organization that has to force people into it in order to become effective, does not seem to me to be the type of organization that we require in a free society, and a free democracy.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is just when and where do human rights begin or stop? We have another case in point, of course another one from British Columbia. The S.I.U. forced a company to discharge four men because they tried to exercise their rights as citizens to join a trade union of their choice. The S.I.U. tried the men in absentia when they were out working on a ship at sea. They were accused of giving aid and comfort to another union. They wanted to join a union, but they didn't want the one they were with. They had no choice, Mr. Speaker. These men had lost their rights of joining a union of their choice, and according to a clause in the working agreement, the men had to be members of the S.I.U. in good standing in order to hold their job.

They were tried and convicted by the S.I.U. courts. I went to school and I heard we had courts of the land to do that, but the S.I.U. court found them guilty and they were deprived of their membership, and the company was then instructed to lay them off because of the agreement with the company. If you don't agree with that then you're out — you can't get a job. Where are these person's freedoms? He is prepared to join a union, but where is his freedom? He's out of a job because he doesn't belong to that particular union.

Anyway, these four men were not quite satisfied, so they brought the matter to court, and after the judge had looked the situation over, he said he had no choice but to interpret the law in favour of the union, and that was it. I think it is shocking, Mr. Speaker, when actions of unions like this actually cause people to lose their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we probably have situations like this is probably because management in many cases and employers have taken terrific advantage in the past of our wage earner. They have denied their rights in the same manner. It is only unfortunate, though, that at the moment I don't have any information, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that before time is very much gone, I will have more information that shows similar situations and discrimination in respect to the wage earner that has been made by even management and employers.

My main concern is to see that the individual has freedom. My main concern is to assure myself and my fellow man that we have a human right and that it should not be infringed upon by anyone, Mr. Speaker, be they management, be they labour unions, or be they government. I was very pleased, in looking at human rights and freedoms, that in 1948 the United Nations went to work and gave the world a Human Rights Declaration. This was accepted by all countries. Article 23 of the Human Rights Declaration guarantees life, liberty and security to a person. It guarantees security and freedom of opinion and expression. I mention that in there because in many cases, men have no freedom of opinion and expression. All these rights, Mr. Speaker, have been won through the centuries and a struggle and a fight to allow them to continue. But Article 23, as it applies to us, states that every man has the right to work. This has been approved by all nations of the world — even the Communist world; even the socialist world believe that a man has the right to work. That is Article 23 of the Human Rights Declaration of the United Nations. All countries subscribed to it, to a free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protect us against unemployment. I should like to draw the attention of the Government to that section — protection against unemployment.

This has been followed recently by a Canadian Bill of Rights, and of course this brings us on to the question of freedom. But the other day in the mail, Mr. Speaker, I received a little bulletin known as the "L.R. Bulletin." I read it, and I shall quote from it, December, 1960. This "L.R. Bulletin" is the "Labour Review Bulletin," the organ of free Canadian Labour.

I went to the library, because I was a little skeptical of its origin, because I could see where labour is actually concerned. I went to the Legislative Library and I asked the librarian if there was such a thing as a "Labour Review" and he said there was. It is published as a free organ of Canadian labour, and it is published in Hull, authorized by the Post Office Department,

**February 21, 1961**

and so on. It is the official organ of Free Canadian Labour, the C.F. of L., and is published, I believe, by the B.L.E., now what that means I don't know but I think it is Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. This is a union which has been trying to maintain their right: I quote:

“What price freedom — freedom of assembly and association is recognized by the Canadian Bill of Rights as one of the fundamental freedoms to be sustained by all laws enacted by the Parliament of Canada. That existing laws are consistent with this admirable Declaration was apparently assumed by our legislators in passing the Bill.

Yet in its bearing on an important field of association, that of trade union organization the relative law is lost and its agencies are unmindful of freedom. As a result, for many thousands of Canadian workers, freedom of association is a hope rather than a fact.

There can be no freedom of association without freedom not to associate. This has been laid down firmly by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

There is no freedom of association for workers who join a union to hold a job, who would lose his job if he quit the union. The right to quit is a vital test of freedom.”

I just thought I should mention that at this particular time, Mr. Speaker.

I have expressed my personal views in how I believe our freedoms have been infringed upon, Mr. Speaker. But the freedoms of many people are being infringed upon by this Government also. This Government has created situations in this province that are actually disgraceful. I am not going to speak in favour or in defence of Premier Smallwood of Newfoundland, but remember when Premier Smallwood was having some difficulties with the lumbermen in Newfoundland, what a hue and cry came from across the floor. I remember that day, Mr. Speaker. I didn't know much about the problems but Premier Smallwood knew the story — he was accused of being wrong without even looking into the situation. Mr. Speaker, right here in Saskatchewan we have slave labour conditions. There are

men in our Saskatchewan lumber industry who are receiving less than sixty and seventy cents an hour. Please take note, Mr. Minister of Labour.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — I don't believe it.

**Mr. Coderre:** — I will show you, Mr. Speaker. Lumbermen in this province are only getting about that, and are working a ten to twelve hour day. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? They are paid by piece work. They have so much work to do and they have to do it, and by the time they have done their work, it averages out to less than sixty some cents per hour, or near seventy cents an hour. Where is our Minimum Wage Act? Where is our Hours of Work Act?

**Hon. Mr. William:** — I'm just looking for it in my desk!

**Mr. Coderre:** — But do you know the reason, Mr. Speaker? The Timber Board, an Agency of this Government, is paying the producer so little for the lumber — as low as \$35 a thousand and sometimes less, then recently it even dropped another \$3.00. It is making a tremendous profit at the expense of the workmen. These profits are not passed on to the cutter. When they bring it up in front of this House and say, "Oh, we made a little profit on the Timber Board", they made a little profit, all right. Slave labour profit, Mr. Speaker, at the expense of the wage earner. The actions of this Board are certainly not comparable to the actions of the Wheat Board, so that when they have a surplus or profit they pass it on to the producers. Why doesn't the Government do that? Then they wouldn't have this situation of slave labour conditions. You can bring a lot of lumbermen from the northern part of Saskatchewan right in this Chamber any time you wish, and find out what they are getting per hour.

The reason for this abominable slave labour condition lies directly upon the doorstep of this Government. I thought that slave labour camps were strictly behind the iron curtain. A preview, probably, of what we can expect when the present administration gains control of our labour unions. It is not the labour unions that are trying to gain control of them, it's the socialist thinking. . .

**An Hon. Member:** — That's pretty hard to believe.

**Mr. Coderre:** — However, we'll just drop it at the moment Mr. Speaker, and carry on. I'd just like to show what costs of strikes are; some of our freedoms have been lost, in-

**February 21, 1961**

directly or indirectly to some infiltrated elements within our labour unions, Mr. Speaker. From 1945 to 1948 for example Mr. Speaker, there were 25,919,000 man-days lost due to strikes and walkouts in Canada. A little over one million persons were involved, and then other people were directly or indirectly affected, because these stoppages of work Mr. Speaker, had created more bottlenecks and layoffs in various other interconnecting industries. If we convert this into terms of dollars and cents based on probably an average of \$1.25 an hour, it amounts to more than one quarter of a billion dollars, Mr. Speaker. This is a terrific loss to the national economy, a terrific loss to our agriculture economy, because we are suffering by the strikes, and if you would convert that sum into terms of our Saskatchewan budget, we'd have medical health services, or anything else on the house for the next twenty-five years. This is a tremendous loss to the wage earner as well. I have had the occasion when I was in Toronto, in Windsor and Detroit to talk to some of my relatives, who happened to be working in some of the industries, where they had been on strike, and they are firm believers in labour unions. But, in all cases that they have struck, they have mentioned to me time and again, Mr. Speaker, that it will take them ten or fifteen years to recover what they have lost due to the extensive strike.

There is a direct loss to the wage earner, and a direct loss in revenue to the national economy. Right in this province, Mr. Speaker, we have some firms who have no labour organizations within their ranks. The most cordial relations exist between the wage earner and management. You could not even get one person in that group possibly, to join the union, because they are quite content — they do not want any more. There, management is working in close co-operation with wage earners. That is what you would call a local autonomy of these working people. But, we find Mr. Speaker, that somewhere we have this continual nibbling at one another of agitators within our union ranks who are constantly preaching hate for management, hate for people who are trying to produce, then we are dividing ourselves Mr. Speaker, and it's time the Government did something about it. There is division everywhere. There is our problem. Do the problems lie with our labour bosses who are extracting funds from our wage earner, and in many cases investing it across the line in some real estate of some sort? This is costing our Canadian wage earner a terrific amount of money. No wonder they did create that division, for personal gains. I am in full sympathy Mr. Speaker, with the wage earner, but I'm not in full sympathy with many of these labour bosses, who are constantly agitating

and creating hate. If there would be more thought in the world Mr. Speaker, it would be a much greater and better world to live in.

Does the fault lie with the labour bosses, or does the fault lie with management? I've got something to say about management as well Mr. Speaker. Many of the employers are trying to line their pockets with the sweat extracted from the labourer at wages below a fair level, or does it lie with the Government, who permits this kind of division within our boundaries which could cause economic and social chaos that would be felt by all, Mr. Speaker.

As human being who believe in freedom, we must be united, because, Mr. Speaker, there are Communist elements under the International who have infiltrated into all units of our economy. They have infiltrated within the ranks of labour Mr. Speaker; they have infiltrated within the ranks of government; they have even infiltrated within the ranks of management, for one purpose, Mr. Speaker, to divide us all and then to conquer us.

Mr. Khrushchev made it quite clear sometime ago, when he expounded some of his theories under the, I don't know whether it's the second, third or fourth International or something of that sort. The objectives were only too well defined by Mr. Khrushchev. What are we doing about it? Creating more division? That word of hate, it doesn't matter who has created that word of hate of capitalists — creating hate of all sorts. The most important word in free enterprise is freedom of the individual, Mr. Speaker, providing that freedom doesn't infringe upon anybody else. The old, extreme socialists are again rearing their heads, Mr. Speaker — their ugly heads, in the throes of an economic recession, and they're trying to divide us as I previously mentioned. It is noted Mr. Speaker, from time to time in bold threats, socialist threats, and independent threats, that our socialist party is slowly and surely attempting to absorb our labour unions. Some of these power-mad socialists Mr. Speaker, as well as power-mad labour union bosses, are attempting this for one purpose only, not to improve the standards of all Mr. Speaker, but to improve their personal position both in power and in wealth. A preview Mr. Speaker, of what we can further expect from this power-mad group.

The proposed platform Mr. Speaker, of this new Marxist group, in attempting to get all, from all walks of life, incorporated into this supposedly new political

**February 21, 1961**

type of thing, is I feel, impossible, because as groups we differ. We have different opinions, different ways of getting there, but as individuals we have the same common ideals. Let us not get groups together as this new Marxist party is proposing to do Mr. Speaker — let us get the people together as individuals.

The Liberal philosophies have been that of freedom of the individuals, to give him his rights, providing his rights do not infringe on somebody else, not of power groups, but of the individual.

The amalgamation of labour and of socialists is a medicine that we will have to swallow, because it is almost a fact. But I'm sure that when we turn around and look at the labour bosses that it will be a very bitter pill — one we'll have to caution ourselves and be wary of what steps they may take. Because, as explained by Khrushchev, in his International, the inner elements of Communism are infiltrated solidly into them. There was circulated Mr. Speaker, just a couple of days ago, in the Town of North Battleford, a little pamphlet by the Communist Party. Ironically enough, just on the eve when there was an organization meeting, a labour boss from the east, who was speaking on organization, and on a sort of get together of the proposed new merger. Still, socialists for years Mr. Speaker, have had this same disgust for mergers, and now they're going all out for it.

Marx and Engels, Mr. Speaker, and many other old socialists have from time to time, told us what is in that bottle of socialist medicine. Knowing what Marx and Engels have told us, we can't swallow this. It's because we know Mr. Speaker, that when this new merger comes into effect the rights of the individual will be infringed upon.

It is the proposal of the top brass of both of these political parties, that is the CCF and some of those power-mad labour bosses, of raising funds and creating a political slush fund, which will be raised through the check-off system. And, this fund Mr. Speaker, will be used by these ambitious, and glory-seeking gangsters on both sides, for the glorification of their socialist friends. This, in my opinion, is unfair, Mr. Speaker, and it is a bad approach for a political party to take.

**Hon. Mr. Brown;** — What are you worried about?



**Mr. Coderre:** — Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what am I worried about? I'm worried about the freedom of the individual, and I'll show you.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the CCF Party, the almighty humanity first party trying to sneak into this little game. Now here's what they're going to do. The poor, unwary wage earner will have deducted from his weekly pay cheque, and both the CCF, Mr. Speaker, and this labour group, have agreed in principle to this — he will have a weekly check-off, a "tithe" that he will pay for the political party. They'll take it from these wage earners, whether they are affiliated with that political party or not. What a dirty thing to do, Mr. Speaker.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — They've left a way out alright, Mr. Speaker. It is said, of course, (they put it very nice) it is said that the wage earner may contract out, and do you know how? If he dares, and that's the point, if he dares. Did you see what happened to those men in the S.I.U. in British Columbia? You see why I brought this up a while ago. These men dared defy that union and join another union; they wanted to join a union alright, because they realized this association was necessary for themselves. They joined a union, but as soon as they defied that particular union, in that particular organization they were out of a job. This same thing will apply here, Mr. Speaker. This unwary wage earner who wants to contract out, because he doesn't believe in this new Marxist party, would be the object of threats that would be brought within their organization. These Communist gangsters. Oh yes, if he dares, he will be able to sign out but when that man signs out Mr. Speaker, what does he do? He would lose the secrecy of his ballot. They call this democracy.

I have to go back to this "Labour Review," and it gives us here the version of the wage earner, hard working people, gives us their version of what socialism is. Well let's look at the fine print.

"The most considerate socialist political organization in the world, the Labour Party of Great Britain, defines socialism in its litany as the common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange.

**February 21, 1961**

Now the dictionary Mr. Speaker, by which way we stand, as being a standard dictionary in Canada, and many parts of the world, the English dictionary, the Oxford Dictionary, varies the wording, but not the meaning.

“A theory or policy which advocates the ownership and control of the means of production, capital, land, property etc. by a community as a whole, in the interests of all.”

Now this is quite a catalogue, Mr. Speaker. The means of production, capital, land, property, etc, and this is what it says at the end, it takes just about everything. There Mr. Speaker, if the full socialist program were carried out, all industry and trade would be taken over by the government. Do you see what this socialist organization is trying to do? They have not dared to implement their socialist plan Mr. Speaker, but they are trying to, and once they have control of the work force they'll be able to expand and put into effect their complete socialist plan.

Where is going to be our freedom? Have they got freedom behind the iron curtain? I fear, Mr. Speaker, I greatly fear, that history is repeating itself — from freedom to slavery, and now we're getting into a worse kind of slavery.

It is a generally accepted opinion Mr. Speaker, that many union organizations say that the Labour Relations Board should be reviewed. They have not handled with fairness, actually justice for both parties, all the cases that have been before them. It has not been handled in fairness, Mr. Speaker. I say that because in many cases and I give you an example where a person has had to appear in front of a Labour Relations Board in regard to some decisions, a man from Regina had to appear at a Labour Relations Board, and had to go to Saskatoon, or a man from Saskatoon, several men from Saskatoon, have had to come to Regina, and this very often has been a disadvantage. Of course, this is according to socialist thinking because Mr. Donald MacDonald, Leader of the Ontario Socialist Party said, and I quote from 'The Leader-Post' March 6, 1959. I will quote this whole clipping, Mr. Speaker:

“Mr. Donald MacDonald, Ontario socialist party leader is to be commended for his candor. A legislative committee suggestion that companies be allowed to tell their side of the story when their workers are being organized would be a

bad thing in his opinion. In fact, according to the paper such permission would make it extremely difficult for unions to expand. Unionism that cannot survive and prosper under attack from employers or anyone else must be bad for the worker and bad for the community.”

It is just a question, that the Labour Relations Board, the way they have been acting seems to be pro-something and anti-something else. My suggestion, Mr. Speaker, to the Government would be that, in effect the Labour Relations Board would have a representative, say for example, a member of the Ministerial Association which could concern itself with the moral aspects of the decisions handed down by the Labour Relations Board. Then from there would have a representative from the labour union, and then a representative from the employers’ association, a representative of the Government and a representative on the Board from other organizations which are directly related with the case and not by the Government, and you would have a true Labour Relations Board which would look at all aspects from a point of view of fairness and justice to all.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, which has been somewhat of a concern, and I have noted that many employees in the city of Regina particularly some of the boys who are out of work, and some of them are very capable, and their main concern is how to obtain employment. I have also had the occasion to talk to an employer who was prepared to keep his staff on permanently. On four occasions I have had to speak to employees, they requested that they would like the opportunity to make an agreement personally with management or employer for job security rather than certain wage restrictions. There is a firm that I know that has employed first class journeymen and paid \$2.00 and some cents an hour, and the employer kept them on for about eight months and then laid them off. When the management came to those men and told them, “We have to lay you off; the job is done.” These wage earners said: “Give us less wages, we would like to stay on the rest of the year.” The management said, “I cannot do it because (is it the Minimum Wage Board or Regulation) I cannot make an agreement because it is a question that certain trades have got to have a certain wage.”

I do know that this particular chap was rather concerned about losing his job. He would rather have had job security and would have been prepared for the eight

**February 21, 1961**

months of the year to take a little less per hour. It is a union agreement, as far as the union is concerned the employer had to pay agreed wages.

That was the concern of this man anyway, and he doesn't have a job today, and he is very concerned about it. I think it is something that should be looked into to assure such men get permanent employment, rather than the question of the probably higher wages. I would like to see the wage earner get \$25.00 a day, if possible, but I would also like to see the wage earner employed the year around.

Here is another point I would like to bring out, Mr. Speaker, and that is the question of application for certification or decertification. I heard from management, in this particular case. When a group of workers within an organization apply for certification, the Board discusses the matter, looks it over, and within a very short time the certification is granted by the Board. But if after a time the employees feel that the union is not doing a job they may ask for decertification. What has happened is this: the collectors collect through the payroll, I suppose they don't want to lose revenue but anyway when they start having this money coming in, they seem to leave these wage earners in many of our industries just by themselves, and they just don't seem to come around. So finally the wage earners get to the point where they are not too satisfied with the union and they figure they can possibly do a better job, more job security in this respect, so they ask for decertification which is a right which is granted them in this province.

But then when it comes to that, the Labour Relations Board seems to postpone the demand for labour relations. I understand if you apply for decertification you have to apply within the thirty or sixty or ninety days of the contract year. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if you can apply for certification and it is granted within a reasonable time, application for decertification should be granted in equal time, providing both parties are in agreement. But why this long delay? It seems to be to the point where giving the opportunity to those who are willing to come around and exert a little more pressure on them. I don't know, but I think that is the part of the legislation that should be looked into.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the lack of good relations, or good legislation to promote employment which would promote a greater extent of purchasing power, more for the prime producers of this province, and in view of the fact that the Speech from the Throne did not grant or give a right to the municipal people

to have a vote, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I will support the amendment, but I cannot support the motion.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. In accordance with your ruling I am rising on a question of privilege. I want to deny categorically that I have ever, at any time, refused to meet any unemployed group. As a matter of fact to this date the unemployed have never asked me for a meeting directly. I was phoned by the Secretary of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, and told that the labour unemployed group would like to meet the Cabinet and myself at some time. I said we would accommodate them any time they suggested, and the date finally set was February 28th. At no time was I asked for a meeting; at no time have we refused.

**Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon):** — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Member answer a question?

**Mr. Coderre:** — I'm not the Government, but I will answer any question I can.

**Mr. Stone:** — Are you in favour of right-to-work legislation?

**Mr. Coderre:** — The Government is not in a position to do it, but I believe that a person should have some freedoms; I believe in the freedom of the individual and freedom of association. Whether you call that right to work, or not, I don't know. I haven't legislated and I don't know anything about it but I feel that the individual should have a right of association.

**Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour):** — I enjoyed the hon. Member's speech very much, and am sorry it wasn't all on the air. I would just like to take a moment to refer to his claim that we had slave labour in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. Member is entitled to make an explanation, but he must contain himself to the explanation . . .

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — That is exactly what I am going to do — explain that there is no slave labour insofar as the Minimum Wage regulations are concerned.

**February 21, 1961**

**Mr. Coderre:** — Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Minister speaking . . . ?

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — No, that is an explanation in regard to your . . .

**Mr. Coderre:** — I have not asked for an explanation from the Minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is his privilege to make an explanation at the close of your speech, if he has the consent of the House to do so.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — I'm just going to quote from the Minimum Wage Court Order No. 9. This is the application . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I merely want to ask a question. I don't want to interfere with the hon. Minister who is on his feet, but on a point of order, is it your ruling that this is going to be allowed for all Members of the House, or will the hon. Minister later on be permitted to indulge in the debate, in spite of the fact that he stands up and speaks to a question?

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — I tried to ask a question half way through . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I will have to make a ruling. You cannot make a denial half way through a speech. I have no desire to try to hamper the privilege in regard to a point of privilege, but my argument is that denial is not a point of privilege. That is the point I am trying to make. A point of privilege can be raised at any time, but I am trying to clear up the point that a denial is not a speech; you must wait until the Member has taken his seat and then may ask leave to make a statement. I believe that is quite clear. If leave of the House is given, I believe the Minister can make a statement, but he must contain himself strictly to the point that he wants to bring up, and not make a speech in regard to it.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, does not the statement which he requests have to be on a point of privilege? Does he not first of all have to make a point of privilege to the satisfaction of the Speaker, and then ask for permission to make a statement on this? I don't know. I'm asking.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think you have a point there which I would like to look into.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — The reference of course, was to slave labour which I am going to disprove, and if I may proceed now, I consider that my point of privilege.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Mr. Speaker, I made the statement that I know there are some people in the province — I didn't say that he . . . I am quite aware that there is a Minimum Wage . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! If the Minister has a point that is directly concerned with his Department that he wishes to clear up that has not been corrected with regard to what has been said by the former speaker, he may do so, but he must do it shortly and briefly and come to the point quickly.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Is he going to participate in this debate?

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — It is just a matter of an explanation with regard to what was said.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Rule on it!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Excuse me, Sir, how do you want this to be treated? Are you asking me a question or are you making an explanation, or are you . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — No, I am attempting to seek information in order to clarify my thinking on the apparent confusion that has developed here this afternoon. My interpretation was that the only time you could rise on a point of privilege was that if a Member was directly misquoting a statement which you had made in the current debate — not outside of the House, or a press clipping, as I thought the speaker was correct in everything that he said in regard to it, but now to give the laxity to everyone of us to stand up after a Member sits down and on the pretext of there being some explanation which another Member wishes to make, that the speaker had make a statement which is not, in another Member's opinion, correct, is not my understanding of the rules. The Member made

**February 21, 1961**

a statement that there were some conditions in the province which he thought were comparable to slave labour. I don't think the Minister has any privilege to stand up and say, "I'm going to quote the Minimum Wage Act". He is getting into the debate and once he does that he loses his privilege of speaking again.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think possibly the hon. Member has a point here, and if the Assembly will permit I would like to give the matter further consideration, and if you don't mind, Sir, we will go on with this debate at this time.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I agree with the Member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). I don't think anybody can rise unless it is a matter of personal privilege, but there is nothing to prevent the Minister from replying to the previous Member, providing of course it is understood that he is taking part in the debate. There is no objection to that, but he certainly cannot make a statement and not be considered taking part in the debate. If the Minister wants to use his time in this debate in replying to the Member he is quite within the rules of the House.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder now are we going to get off the track again, because after all by a gentlemen's agreement and by agreement of the Legislature this afternoon, the roster of speakers was drawn up; they were told what to expect and when something like this happens it is going to throw the whole House into confusion again in the future.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I have endeavoured to straighten out the House on a problem which I feel has been in this House for some time, and that is in regard to raising points of privilege which were not actual points of privilege, but rather matters of denial or because someone has felt that he had been misrepresented, and he considers it a point of privilege. It is quite possible that, in regard to this matter of explanation, I have possibly gone a little too far and I would like the matter to be dropped at this time, and I will give it study so if the debate at this time will continue, and the hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Williams) will consent to forego his point at this time, I would like to have the debate continued and we will look into this matter further.



**Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly):** — Mr. Speaker, before I take part in this debate, I would like to associate myself along with all the other previous speakers in the congratulations they extended to you on your appointment to the high office in this House. I see that this office is a rather difficult one at times, but I am quite certain from my personal acquaintance with yourself that you will conduct this office, and conduct the proceedings of this House, in a very fair, impartial, and capable manner. I hope that I and the other Members of this Legislature will co-operate with you in the fullest extent.

I also want to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the previous speakers in this debate, and in particular to those new Members of the Legislature who made their maiden speeches. I think that each one of them did a very good job, and will make considerable and substantial contributions to the proceedings in the House.

I would be remiss if I didn't at this time make some reference to the fact that the people of the Pelly Constituency, saw fit to return me for another term to the Legislature; it's something I appreciate very much. I will endeavour to carry out my duties here, in their interests, during the next four years to the best of my ability, if I am spared to attend these Sessions. One thing I might mention is that about five years ago in this Assembly there was a certain prophecy made that I wouldn't be back after the next election. Well, that prophecy didn't turn out to be very true, because my good friends in the Pelly Constituency not only saw fit to return me once again, but with an increased majority.

I've been rather surprised listening to the debate, particularly in regard to the attitude of the people opposite. I came here to attend this Session with the expectation that our friends, after their victory at the polls in June last, would be very buoyant and optimistic. Well I don't know what's wrong, but it seems to me that there is a lack of lustre, and certainly no indication of enthusiasm thus far in the Session. This was brought to my attention particularly with the restrained and apologetic speeches made by the hon. Minister of Travel and Information, (I believe I haven't got his right title — Industry and Information I guess it is)

**February 21, 1961**

and the Hon. Premier. Neither one of them is up to his usual standard as I had experienced it in previous Sessions in this House. I am wondering the reason for this apparent change of attitude across the way. There must be some cause. I have been wondering whether certain developments that have taken place since last June are partly or wholly responsible. I am wondering if this suggested merger about to take place, which will result in the death and burial of the CCF Party is having this particular affect at this time. I suppose there is a certain amount of controversy, and a certain amount of strain within the socialist party, because I understand there is going to be a leadership race in a few months time for the national leadership of the New Party. Some of these particular things may be the reason. I myself am not only wondering, what is the reason for this particular attitude, I have heard other Members, Mr. Speaker, exhibit the same interest during this Session.

Now, I want to commend the hon. Provincial Treasurer, for certain statements he made yesterday in his speech with regard to the debt of the province, and I want to congratulate him for making public in his speech certain figures, particularly in connection with the gross debt. For some time, yes for some years, from my observation and opinion, it has been more or less put to one side. There has been great emphasis put on the net debt. I believe the gross debt is something that I think emphasis should be put on and I believe I have mentioned this before in this House. Not that I am complaining about the amount of debt, but I think the public of this province, or any province, or any country, should know, and should be constantly reminded of the amount of debt, and the consequent interest and carrying charges on that debt, so they will know and realize what it costs to provide them with services. The various services that their government, whether it is senior, local government, or a Federal Government provide, cost money. They should know what these services of government cost. This is something I think is important. This is my own personal opinion, and to repeat myself, I want to compliment and commend, the Provincial Treasurer for being forthright and frank in his speech yesterday afternoon in this regard.

He also mentioned the progress made, and in the substantial retirement of the gross debt of the province since this socialist Government came into office. Well, I think in all fairness, and I think he will agree with me, that part of the accomplishment which has been made by the present Government in connection with the

retirement of debt, part of that credit must go to agencies outside of the Government. The Government came into power in 1944, and since then they have substantially reduced, as I have mentioned, the public debt, but \$70 odd million of the debt was retired by other than agencies of the Government. I am only going to mention a few such as the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool which received assistance from the Provincial Government prior to 1944 when they were in difficulty. They retired or paid off a \$13 million loan. It was considered as part of the public debt. The Saskatchewan Co-operative Creamery is another organization which was having difficulties, and was assisted by the Government prior to 1944. They in turn were able to pay off their particular amount of debt. So, in all fairness, I think these other agents should be given some credit along with the Government for the reduction in the total debt of the province.

One matter the Provincial Treasurer made mention of was that during the term of office of this Government, they have increased, very substantially, the grants to education. If my memory serves me correctly, I think he mentioned from \$6 million to \$25 million. That's a very substantial increase in contributions by the Government to the cost of education, but I think it should have been more, because during that particular period, or I take it for granted during the period that he referred to yesterday, the revenues of this province increased by five times. I don't think it would be out of the question or unreasonable to expect that the burden of education, the cause of so much trouble, particularly in our urban and rural areas, should have kept pace with the increase in revenues, so I don't think it's too great a credit to say that the costs of education have been increased about four times, whereas the revenues of the province, in that period have increased five times.

One other reference the hon. Provincial Treasurer made yesterday which I thought was a little bit foolish, if I can use that word, was in his defence of this new Saskatchewan Power head office building. He made mention that this was going to employ Saskatchewan labour; this was going to use Saskatchewan steel; there would be Saskatchewan brick used in the building; there would be Saskatchewan cement used; and it would provide work for other building trades. I quite agree with this, but where I take exception to his statement is that there are probably more essential buildings necessary in this province at this particular time than this SPC building. Had other buildings been built, wouldn't they have used Saskatchewan steel, Saskatchewan cement, Saskatchewan brick, and employed Saskatchewan labour in the building

**February 21, 1961**

trade? This is a rather ridiculous statement. I will have more to say about that particular building later on.

I don't intend, Mr. Speaker, to deal at any length with the New Party, or so-called New Party. During this debate we have heard references made on many occasions to a victory which took place in the federal field in the Constituency of Peterborough. This has been referred to many times. I didn't hear anything mentioned about what happened, or the results of the particular by-election in our neighboring province, Alberta, at Medicine Hat. I just want to bring to the attention of my friends across the way the statement made by one of their supporters in the federal field, Mr. Douglas Fisher, the Member of Parliament for Port Arthur. When he was talking some time ago about the New Party he said that he gave the life of that New Party, if it once got off the ground, ten years. Some reference was made in this House, on occasion as to the Liberal Party being down and out. I am quite sure in my mind, Mr. Speaker than when all of us here are dead and gone, there will still be a Liberal Party.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — How will they get along without you?

**Mr. Barrie:** — If I am to believe one of their supporters, one of the CCF socialist Members of Parliament, he doesn't agree they are going to last very long. I believe I am inclined to concur with him.

In connection with the Speech from the Throne, I believe the term 'barren', was used by former speakers, Mr. Speaker, and I think possibly from what most people would have expected, we could call it barren. I noted a great part of the Speech from the Throne deals with the self-appraised accomplishments of my friends across the way. There was mention made of declining revenues, and there was mention made of certain economies. I want, also, in addition to the reference made in the Speech from the Throne regarding economy, once again to compliment and commend my friend, the hon. Provincial Treasurer for certain reports he made, or were made shortly after he took office, to the effect that he was going to carry out certain very necessary economies. I think in many respects, in connection with the spending of this Government, this is long past due. While this pleased me very much as an individual, the next thing I noticed was the very opposite, a contradiction and an inconsistency: I note they are going to spend a million

dollars or the liquor board is going to spend a million dollars, in the City of Regina to construct a new liquor warehouse and head office.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Self-liquidating!

**Mr. Barrie:** — It's quite liquid alright. I think possibly there are places, if the Government is having difficulties in getting the necessary finances, where that million dollars could be put to better use, and would benefit many more people.

Then, of course, along came the announcement of the thirteen storey sky-scraper, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation building, which according to press reports is to cost in the neighborhood of \$6 million and possibly more. Now, as far as I am concerned and I think I have mentioned this in this House before that, in my opinion, any building such as an office building to be constructed for Government use, and I think it is only practical good business, should be a building of very sound construction, but there is no necessity for luxuries, frills and extravagances such as have taken place in the past, and are apparently going to take place in connection with this particular building.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote from an article in the "Leader-Post" with a picture of the proposed Saskatchewan Power Corporation building attached. Certain statements that were made in this article by Mr. Brown, the hon. Minister in charge of the Power Corporation surprised me, and I quote:

"Mr. Brown said no decision has been reached in financing the building. Two methods are being considered. The corporation could raise the money and erect the building, or it could have a private company do the building and lease it on an arrangement, which would give the S.P.C. eventual ownership."

Well, we hear all about socialism and government enterprises, and then he is considering having a private company, some of these capitalists I suppose, come along and build the building and make an arrangement so they can occupy it and pay it off. Probably his plan is a good one, but I am surprised at it coming from a devout socialist. I want to go on and quote further from this particular article, and what I'm going to quote now, Mr. Speaker, is in connection with certain statements

**February 21, 1961**

made by the General Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, David Cass-Beggs, I quote:

“The Saskatchewan Power Corporation will have the highest office building in Saskatchewan. It will be faced on the street side with white Saskatchewan brick, and dazzling gold-colored Japanese mosaic. The basic structure of the Y shaped building will be steel.”

This is going to be another show place. I want further to quote, and this is quoting Mr. Cass-Beggs, or quoting from the article in which he is supposed to have said:

“The building will be a spectacular architectural show place. Mr. Cass-Beggs said it is possible that the lights will be burning all night because they will double as heaters for the offices.”

I wonder what they will do in the summer time? I want you to pay particular attention to this quote, Mr. Speaker:

“He said that 1% of the cost of the building, will be spent on definite works of art.”

(\$60,000.00 if the cost is \$6 million)

“These might include murals and sculptures, and will be secured by the competition of artists.”

I certainly am opposed to luxury and extravagance of this kind for an office building, particularly when there are people in this province, if you don't know it in the City of Regina, then you want to get out into the country where the money can be spent and spent time and time again, to far greater advantage than to provide some luxurious office for certain individuals and employees of the Power Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, according to this article, Mr. Cass-Beggs went on further to say:

“I doubt if you would find, short of the new City Hall in Toronto, another building in Canada which is an functional and attractive.”

Well, now, we are trying to compete with the City of Toronto, with more people in the one city, than we have in the whole province of Saskatchewan. If we are going to try and compete with buildings such as the Toronto City Hall which I had the privilege not long ago of seeing, then I wonder what the people who are receiving \$2.50 supplementary allowances, the people who are going through mud axle deep on municipal roads, and paying the tax loads there are here now, I wonder what they think of this kind of extravagance and luxury.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to deal with industrial matters, and I want first to state that I am very happy to see any development in this province along industrial lines. I want also to say, I would welcome any new industry which would come into this province and help the economy of the people of Saskatchewan. Yesterday the Provincial Treasurer talked a great deal about misrepresentation, errors, contradictions, and insults. In this particular regard, I don't like to use the word misrepresentation, but there has been a lot of misrepresentation in connection with the industrial development in the province. These particular statistics and figures which have been used, particularly by the Premier of this province, are certainly distorted, or misleading, or maybe the Premier is in error. I have here a publication by the Department of Trade and Commerce, more commonly known as the White Paper, but I believe this is where the Premier or his advisers, or speech writers, or whatever you might call them, probably get their information. It has been pointed out time and time again by people in the Opposition, that they are using the wrong figures. There has been some industrial development in the Province of Saskatchewan, and no one can spend more time than the Premier of this province going up and down the province, in season and out of season, speaking to service clubs, in this Legislature and outside of the province, trying to make people believe we have had a spectacular industrial development in Saskatchewan. It's too bad it wasn't true.

Mr. Speaker, we must face the facts. In order to back up this mission he has, apparently, in connection with industrial development, he used certain figures. Now this has been pointed out as an error, and it was pointed out in this House a few days ago by a previous speaker. He uses the figure of \$600 million as the increase. Well, now on pages 9, 10 and 11 of this White Paper, issued by the Federal Department of Trade and Commerce, these particular items are all set out. I

**February 21, 1961**

think I can still read. Instead of the sum of \$600 million which the Premier has quoted as often in connection with the increase in manufacturing in Saskatchewan, I find that the best that I can make out of these particular figures, for the year 1960, was \$23 million. I see a figure here, certainly, of over \$600 million, but this particular figure includes many things I don't think any of us with the widest stretch of imagination would consider manufactured articles, or in relation to the manufacturing business of the province.

This is some of the propaganda which emanates from the Department of my friend the hon. Minister of Industry and Information. I think he should check some of these errors, and the man in charge of the Industrial Development office. They should double check some of these things. It's too bad we didn't have industrial development such as this, but quoting a figure which includes all these various things which are not manufactured does not help. I don't know, I suppose this is probably something we should expect from a socialist Government.

Insofar as they are concerned, and despite all their alibis to the contrary, they have to accept the responsibility. As socialists preaching a doctrine, by which they want to eliminate capitalism, the basic principle of their philosophy is to do away with the capitalistic or free enterprise system. They have to accept the responsibility of certain great losses we have had in the Province of Saskatchewan. I don't think any reasonable person would consider for one minute, in view of the speeches by Cabinet Ministers, members of the socialist party, in the province and outside of the province, claiming so much for socialism, and forever and ever criticizing and condemning the profit system, I don't think that is the kind of climate which is going to induce any reasonable business man who has money to invest to come here and invest it. I am going to say that one of the things we have possibly lost which has gone elsewhere, is an industry in this province which would provide plenty of employment in a large part of the province where employment is needed, for some of our Metis friends and native people. This is in connection with the recent announcement of three new pulp mills going into the Province of Alberta.

Once these mills are established in the Province of Alberta, then in spite of the fact we have the materials



and labour force, our chances of ever obtaining a pulp mill are remote, to say the least.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must inform the hon. Member that it is now 5:30.

(The House recessed at 5:30 o'clock p.m.)

The House resumed at 7:30 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Barrie:** — When the House recessed I was discussing the loss to the province of a pulp mill with the announcement of three additional mills to be constructed and put into operation in Alberta.

Our forest industry has been declining for the past three years. Revenue from this source dropped considerably during the past year. Our revenues dropped \$73,000.00. We are producing less than 10% of our potential cut based on a sustained yield program. Now we will have to, where it is possible, have free enterprise, or somebody, go into production of our forest industries, and if we could increase production to say only 50% of the potential, it would mean instead of \$8 million, \$40 million of production in a year.

When you look at the Province of Manitoba, you find they are fortunate in having a pulp and paper mill. In the October issue of "Western Business and Industry" there is an outline of the Saskatchewan forest production for 1959 which I just mentioned amounted to a little over \$8 million. In the Province of Manitoba, production during the same period was in excess of \$20 million. This is a serious loss to the province, and when we have an abundance of raw materials, and we have the labour force here that could make use of this particular raw material. We know we have certain difficulties in freight rates, but that isn't all the trouble.

I am quite sure the value of our production, is as low as it is, because of some other underlying reasons. One of these reasons is one of the monopolies we have in this province, and have had for some years, with respect to the forest industry — the Timber Board. This Timber Board has the complete monopoly on the production of all spruce lumber off Crown Lands in the Province. They also insist that all pulp wood taken

**February 21, 1961**

off Crown Lands has to be disposed of through the Timber Board. The Timber Board hasn't been able, in the northeastern part of the province in particular, to do a job in disposing of that timber. The private operators in that area, in my Constituency in fact, have had no difficulty, no difficulty whatever, in disposing to Canadian Forest Products and other United States firms anything they can produce.

We heard this afternoon, in this House, about certain low wages, prevailing in the forest industry in the northern part of the province. I believe it possibly has some foundation, and probably the reason for that is the price the producers have to take, when they are producing lumber or pulp for the Saskatchewan Timber Board. Just as recently as yesterday, I contacted gentlemen who are in this business, and I've got the up-to-date prices which were prevailing yesterday on contracts where deliveries are being made at the present time. I am going to read to the House, the variations of prices in pulp. For instance for fire-killed pulp, where there has been a forest fire and they have taken pulp out of that area, the Timber Board pays \$11.50 a cord stock-piled in the Town of Swan River, Manitoba. The private companies who are purchasing the same product, the same pulp wood under the same conditions, stock-piled in the Town of Swan River, are paying \$16.00 a cord. That's a big difference, Mr. Speaker, in the price. It makes a terrific difference to the producers.

Now we will go onto peeled pulp wood. The Timber Board is paying \$17.25 a cord, stock-piled in the Village of Arran in my Constituency, just inside the Manitoba-Saskatchewan boundary. The private companies buying this same peeled pulp wood are paying \$22.50 for it. There is quite a difference here too. The people who are producing and selling to the private companies certainly could afford to pay much more to the people who are cutting the timber and hauling the timber.

When we get down to green, rough pulp wood, for some reason or other the Timber Board has no market, or I assume that that is the reason the Timber Board are not purchasing green rough pulp from my area at least. The private concerns are in the market, and they are buying green pulp, delivered to the Village of Benito in the Province of Manitoba, and are paying \$15.50 a cord for it. Now, the only reason I see we are not producing more pulp and providing employment, and the Government receiving more in the way of revenue, and many other advantages from it, is because we have this

monopolistic Timber Board. I am sorry to say, and I don't know the reason for it, but insofar as these companies who are buying from private individuals are concerned, they apparently are not interested in dealing with the Saskatchewan Timber Board.

We have thousands upon thousands of cords of this wood, and I am satisfied that if this Government would change its policy in connection with pulp, it would provide employment for thousands of people in the northern part of this province, such as our Metis people, our native Indian population, as well as other bush workers and truck drivers. It is by virtue of this policy that the Government has apparently insisted upon year after year, that this is lost to the people of Saskatchewan. It is also a loss to the Government itself in the way of revenue.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, the Government take a good look at the conditions that have prevailed, and are prevailing at the present time. We hear a great deal about unemployment, and it is a problem, a real problem. The tendency is, of course, to blame certain industries, and to blame the Federal Government. We've heard plenty of that. Insofar as I am concerned at the present time, I think this Government should take a good look at their policy. It is a shame and disgrace to think there are thousands upon thousands of cords of timber in the northern part of this province that could provide employment, could be sold to provide revenue to the Government, and provide people with a good basic living. But just because they insist upon this monopolistic department of government in handling these products, they can't get a market. It's a crying shame.

I'm going to repeat myself, Mr. Speaker, I hope this Government will see fit to examine and examine carefully, the policy that is in effect, and make some changes, and thereby act and not talk. This unemployment situation we hear a lot about is a very serious problem for many of our people. This is one means by which the Provincial Government, by a change of policy can provide many, many jobs, for a great number of people who need work very badly at the present time. So I say to the Government don't talk any more, but act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just before I leave this particular subject, I would like to mention the actual lumber production. It's alarming when you go into retail lumber yards in the province, and right in my own district which is only a matter of a few yards from the forest where lumber is being taken out by certain producers for the Timber Board, and you find they are able to sell

**February 21, 1961**

you fir lumber which is produced in the Province of British Columbia for practically the same price, or an equal price in some cases, as native Saskatchewan spruce.

Mr. Speaker, there is something very seriously wrong when a condition of this kind exists. There is another suggestion I am going to make to the Government, and that is that they undertake to effect a change of policy, insofar as lumber for residents is concerned, particularly those close to the forest reserve. A change should be made to the farm people in particular to go into the forest reserves as they did years ago. I am quite aware of the fact there must be conservation methods adopted, and the cuts that are taken out have to be curtailed to a degree, but allow the farm people to go in, and with the expenditure of very little in the way of cash, practically all they would have to invest, outside of their own labour, would be the cost of the permit, and the saw bill, in order to obtain their lumber. There are many people in the northern part of the province in particular, and I think this would apply all over the northern part of Saskatchewan, who years ago, at very little cash outlay, were able to obtain lumber, and to build the buildings they presently have on their farms. Many of these buildings are getting in a state of disrepair. Many farmers need new buildings, many need to expand their building, but at the current cost of lumber at a lumber yard or at the Timber Board piling yard dealers, the cost makes it prohibitive for these people, under present conditions, to proceed with repairs, let alone any expansion or new construction. This is another way the Government, by reviewing their policies and making some changes, can assist many of our people in the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss a matter that's in the forefront today, and has been for some little time. That is the matter of the change suggested, and being promoted, of our local government administrations. One place where I have to differ with my hon. friend the Provincial Treasurer is that in 1956, after urging the calling of a Municipal-Provincial conference, particularly by my friend the hon. Member for Moosomin, this conference was convened. I had the privilege of attending that conference, and when this conference was convened, I thought it would be a very good thing. I had just been elected in the general election of 1956. I had never sat in this House. I came down to that conference, which was held in this Chamber, and I thought it was being organized on the basis of where the municipal people would sit down, and have a far greater degree of participation in the conference. I found the time was pretty well taken up by Members of the

Government, and the theme of most of their addresses, and the conclusion of most of their remarks, were to the effect that there had to be a change, a reorganization, in local government administration. I am not going to argue about that, but even at that time, five years ago, it was very apparent to me as an onlooker, that the Government felt, and possibly for reason, felt there had to be this change to a larger unit for municipal administration. Of course, I think they were largely influenced by the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, headed by Professor Baker, and I have here a copy of part of the Commission's report. This is a synopsis of a certain portion of the report. I notice in this particular report, Mr. Speaker, insofar as that commission was concerned, they were very definite. On page 35 of this summary of rural roads and local government, it states that only two of the three alternative systems considered, the county, and the modified county, substantially fulfil the minimum requirements for a satisfactory municipal system, and local government as a whole.

The Baker Commission, of course, were very much in favor of this. It goes on to say on the same page that of the two acceptable systems, the full county system is the most desirable. So, it is very evident even prior to 1956, or at least in the year 1956, certain emphasis was being placed from the top and from this Commission, on a reorganization of municipal boundaries.

The reason I have mentioned this, Mr. Speaker, is that despite anything which might be said to the contrary, it is my opinion this whole matter of suggested reorganization has come from the wrong source. If local government, the school units, the school boards, the rural municipal councils and the village councils and their representatives had come to the Government, and requested a larger unit, then I would have considered it in a very different light.

At the conference I just spoke about, in 1956, the Continuing Committee was set up. They continued until the present time, and they are still continuing as far as I know. This particular Committee has not brought down its report yet. The hon. Provincial Treasurer made some mention in this Chamber yesterday about some of us people who wished to take a certain line on this particular matter, and suggested that we are insulting the committee members. Well, I don't consider anything I have said or am going to say an insult to the committee members. I suppose the contention is that as the report hasn't been brought down yet, we shouldn't talk about it.

**February 21, 1961**

I want to remind the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that for weeks and months past we have had these meetings held all over the province where not only written reports, but radio has been used, television has been used, moving pictures have been used, by the various representatives of this Committee, pretty well outlining what they will no doubt conclude in a written report. I don't think it's any secret what these people are likely to recommend.

I had the privilege of attending one of those meetings. The gentlemen who were there, and I have every respect for the gentlemen who are appearing as representatives of the Committee, very frankly stated what they thought. I imagine the expressions they made at that time will be what will be in the report. So I don't think there is any reason to say we are insulting these particular gentlemen. They have probably done a very good job, but again I want to repeat that these particular meetings, I assume that all of them were such along the line as the one held in the Town of Kamsack, were designed as a very definite promotion of this particular system.

I don't like to use the word, but I am going to, and it is brain-washing. Insofar as the people who probably had some objection to this particular system were concerned, they had a very limited opportunity to express their opinions. I was very disappointed in the type of meeting, and the apparent regulations which were set down by the people representing the Committee at that particular meeting. The lack of opportunity to express themselves given to the people who they had called into that meeting from all the surrounding district concerned me, and some of these people had some real suggestions to offer; some of them had some real good reasons as to why they didn't think a certain thing should be done or should not be done. As a result of all this, in talking about insults, I have found amongst friends of mine, that there has been a certain amount of insult heaped upon those people who down through the years have served as public servants on local government bodies. These are the men and women in Saskatchewan who have given of their efforts, their abilities, and their time, in order to carry on our school administration, our municipal administration and such like. As far as any suggestion that there are insults by talking about this, if there is any basis in fact for it, then as far as I am personally concerned, I would rather insult the few people on the Committee, than insult the people who have served for so many years as our municipal officials.

This, in my opinion, is an effort further to centralize power in this province. To take away from the

small man in the small school district, and in the village, and in the rural municipality, a certain amount of power that he now has, and in my opinion is rightfully his. I can't despite anything I've read or heard, see where they are going to have the same say, in their own local affairs they have today if they are going to be put into a county system, and have fewer members than they have on the municipal councils and school boards today, in a much larger area.

It's a centralization of power. Now, that centralization of power is coming from the top, rather than from 'the grass roots' to the well know expression, is something I think this Government, and the Committee should take into fuller consideration. Possibly they have, because it is very evident to everyone of us in this House that in the last few months what has happened must impress you without a shadow of a doubt — a large majority of the people in the province, are incensed over the action which has been taken, and the promotion in this particular regard.

If my memory serves me correctly, I believe there have been 179 rural municipalities who have held a vote, and around 30 villages. Members of local government, reeves and councillors arranged these votes, and I suppose in many cases pressure was put on them by people who were very confused in the whole matter. One of the main reasons for their confusion and their doubt is what this change is going to cost. The people in the province, in the rural areas today, believe taxation on land has reached and exceeded that saturation point, and they are afraid, and I should think they have good reason to be afraid, this plan is going to cost a lot more money. It doesn't matter how much they are going to get in additional service. I know that is one of the excuses offered, but if they can't pay for what they have now, how on earth are they going to pay more?

I want to commend the speakers who appeared in the Kamsack meeting. I believe it was Mr. Trout, or Mr. Fahlman, if my memory serves me correctly. When they were asked as to the possible cost or economy of this larger county system, they honestly and frankly told the people assembled there it would cost them more money, but they said they expected they would probably get more service. Well there is nothing to stop the people in the present municipal set-up, to get more services today, if they want them, and if they are able and willing to pay for them. This is one of the reasons the people in rural Saskatchewan are so incensed today over this promotion

**February 21, 1961**

that has gone on for the last few months. Surely, the overwhelming votes in opposition, recorded in each and every one of the areas where a vote was taken should certainly impress any Government, any group, or any committee that there is something seriously wrong with this particular proposal.

Now, I want to say something that probably we will hear a lot about from the other side. The Liberal Opposition has taken a stand in this matter. Some of us as individuals may have said other things, but I think the official stand of the Liberal Opposition has been consistent, and it's consistent today. All we have said, and all we have urged, is very simple. We have insisted upon, and we will continue to insist that before any change is made in local government boundaries or reorganization the people in every area where change is proposed should have the opportunity to express, by a ballot, whether they want it or not. That is the stand we have taken, and it is hoped this will be carried out, in the days that lie ahead. I am sorry there was no assurance given either by any Member of the Government or in the Speech from the Throne. Probably that's expecting too much, but I think, it could have been included in the Speech from the Throne. Some assurance could have been given, to many thousands of people in Saskatchewan, that what we have proposed, would be granted them.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne includes no assurance of such nature, and for the various other reasons I have mentioned, I am glad we have an amendment whereby the Members in this House will stand up and vote, either for or against the amendment. I am very certain that vote will be very interesting to the rural people in Saskatchewan.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very evident to everyone present, and yourself, that I will support the amendment, and I cannot support the motion.

**Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney-General):** — I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to take part in this Throne Speech Debate, for several reasons. First of all, because it gives me a lot of pleasure and satisfaction to be able to congratulate you, on your election to the high office of Speaker, and to express on my own behalf, the confidence that you will discharge your duties in a manner which will be a credit to yourself, a credit to the Constituency from which you came, and a credit to this legislature.



I want to pay a word of tribute to the mover and seconder, for the very eloquent testimonials they have given, and for the very eloquent way in which they expressed their support for the policies of this Government. They, (and it is easy to see,) were wisely chosen by their constituents, to represent them in this Assembly. Their constituents will be, I am sure proud of the performance which they will turn in. I am sorry that the whole tenor of the debate, since their addresses, has not been kept up to the same uniformly high standard which they set.

I want, also, while I am in this congratulatory mood, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate all of the new Members who have been elected to this Assembly, and to congratulate those who have spoken, on the high quality of the addresses which they gave, and I make that comment without any distinction as to one side of the House or the other.

I am pleased to welcome the evidence of merit, which is shown, on both sides of the House, by new Members, and I am sure that this House will derive a lot of benefit in the next four years from the contribution which these new Members bring with them.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I should say at the outset, in case I forget at the end, to say that I will support the motion, and will vote against the amendment. I will support this motion, Mr. Speaker because I think it is an eminently good statement of policy for the Province of Saskatchewan. We have been somewhat surprised to hear, that there are those who think that it is perhaps too modest a statement, or that it does not set out an ambitious enough program for the future. To them I can only say that their taste has become dulled and satiated by the splendid performance of this Government over a period of seventeen years, and that if they had been comparing this document, with any Speech from the Throne that has been read in this House, prior to 1944, there isn't any doubt in my mind but that they would say that this is a very progressive and forwarding looking document indeed.

I am not going to deal with all of the things that were referred to in the Speech from the Throne, nor all the things that were referred to in the debate. I would like to say, however, there are a number of different achievements recorded in the Speech from the Throne, and a number of separate proposals and promises for the future, anyone of which would have been taken by any previous Government in this province, as being justification for a whole term of office. I look, for example,

**February 21, 1961**

at the unprecedented highway expansion of the current fiscal year. This is the largest highway program in the history of the province. Yet, everyone can remember that during the late twenties, a Government was elected to this province that undertook a large highway program for two years. They virtually bankrupted the province in the process, but for two years of the five years that they were in office, they undertook a large highway program, and even three years later that Government went back to the people on the cry that they were the good-roads Government. It's true, of course, that they didn't elect a single Member, but even their program has been exceeded by this Government in its first year after a general election. We saw Liberal Governments in this province who generally could contrive to have a big highway program, or at least they called it a big highway program, in the year just before a general election, but here is something new: the largest highway program in the history of the province, in the year immediately after a general election. I suggest, that significant fact ought not to be lost sight of by the people of this province.

The Speech from the Throne refers to the expansion of power facilities. In one year, this province spent \$60 million on expanding its power utilities, more than the province had spent in the entire previous history before the election of a CCF Government. This \$60 million was largely for the production of increased volumes of power, but also for the extension of power services to more customers. It is not only a testimonial to the activity of this Government, but is proof, if proof were needed, of the economic development, the industrial development of the province.

Natural gas — I find it almost unbelievable myself, — when I see the figures: twenty-four new communities added during one year, a total now of ninety-three communities in Saskatchewan served with natural gas. Well, I know that there are approximately ninety-five or one hundred communities in Saskatchewan that have R.C.M. Police detachments, and that's how I get the impression of how many one hundred is, spread out over the province of Saskatchewan. There are just as many communities with natural gas as there are with the R.C.M. Police detachments. It is a very wide-spread service indeed, Mr. Speaker. Numbers don't mean very much in the abstract, but numbers when you relate them to something, a physical fact, do become significant. I know that numbers don't mean very much to the erstwhile financial critic over there, because he has never been

trained to any capacity to understand. When I say that this number is about equal to the number of the R.C.M.P. detachments in the province, we can then form some impressions of how side-spread the use of natural gas is in Saskatchewan. I am sorry if I have to speak so “figuratively,” Mr. Speaker.

Then of course, not enough has been said about the unique and novel program of farm sewer and water. This is a first for Saskatchewan. I know of no other jurisdiction in North America, or anywhere else, that has made it the business of government, to go out and see to it that rural people enjoy these modern amenities of life. This was something that was only possible because of the farsighted rural power program that was launched back in the early fifties. This program will increase the attractiveness of rural life, will help to keep farmers on the land, and at least if they can't make any money, they will be happier there with an indoor bathroom to use.

This Government, has been able in the past year, to see the crowning reward of several years of planning, preparation and promotion of a steel industry. Last spring the first steel was poured in Saskatchewan. This is a first which the Opposition, if it had the chance would boast to the heavens about. This is an achievement which any Provincial Government ought to be proud of having realized.

The South Saskatchewan River project is going on — a project which will cost this province roughly some \$25 million for the dam alone, in addition to a much larger sum for power development and a substantial sum amounting to millions of dollars for recreational and other developments for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan. This is an ambitious project — one which dwarfs any physical achievement by any previous Provincial Government in the history of this province. Then, of course, we have the welfare and education benefits which have been extended. I do not propose to deal with them, except to refer to the Student Aid Fund which I believe is a very important program. Until now over 8,000 people have benefitted in this province by direct Student Scholarship Loans in addition to about 500 who already have, in the first year, received direct scholarship grants to enable them to attend the first-year university.

I am pleased to see in the Speech from the Throne reference to the fact that this may be extended in the coming year. This Government will always, as long as any Member of this Government lives, I am sure, the people

**February 21, 1961**

who form this Government will always be proud of the fact that we have witnessed the greatest expansion in our university facilities in the history of the province. A five-fold increase in the total value of buildings on the university campus, and in addition, the proposed launching of a second institution at Regina to serve the needs of the young people of Saskatchewan. This Government realizes as no previous Government in this province has realized, the importance for the future welfare of Saskatchewan of an education at university level for these young people.

Then of course there is the expansion of the provincial grants. One of the Members who spoke this afternoon remarked that there had been a five-fold increase in provincial grants, and he attributed this statement to the Provincial Treasurer who spoke yesterday. The fact is the Provincial Treasurer referred only to the last ten-year period. The Opposition Member, however, in quoting this, referred to a period in which the CCF Government had been in office, sixteen years. The fact of the matter is that if you take the whole seventeen year period, school grants amounted in the first year to \$2¾ million dollars — that was the last year of the Liberal Government. This year \$30 million — not a five-fold increase but more than a ten-fold increase in fifteen years. Then my hon. friends say, “Well, of course, there has been an increase in the provincial revenue”. Well there has been an increase of about five-fold in provincial revenues, but at the same time a ten-fold increase in provincial grants.

We talk about our highways programs; we talk about increased in provincial grants to municipalities; assistance to the universities’ expansion of facilities for hospitalization, care of mentally ill and so on; Opposition Members are inclined to come back with the answer that this, of course, is easy. Times are different than they were in 1944, and of course I can agree that times are different than they were in 1944, but in 1944 Saskatchewan was one of the poorest provinces in Canada. Under a Liberal Government this province occupied almost the very bottom of the economic totem pole, Mr. Speaker. Now things are different. This province is able to provide more amenities and more services for its people.

The Opposition then changed their tune and started saying that Saskatchewan has stagnated since 1944; that the CCF Government has prevented developments; that there have been actual reductions in industrial activity. Well, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends might be

able to kid themselves but to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, they are exhibiting a split personality. This is schizophrenia and it has not recommended them to the electors in Saskatchewan in five separate elections.

**Opposition Members:** — Who has schizophrenia?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take up my time or the time of the House dealing with the arguments which have been put forward by my hon. friends opposite. I think what I would like to do is take some time to review the operations of the Department of Attorney General and some of the information I may give may be prosaic; it may not be very sparkling but nevertheless there are some facts which I would like to place upon the record because the Attorney General's Department does not issue an annual departmental report. Some of these facts, highlights, and figures I have placed on the record for the last four years and are a permanent record of some of the statistics which may be useful to the House.

First of all, I know, Mr. Speaker, that when I do this it will be said by my hon. friends opposite that I am being very tiresome. Well, I can't always be sparkling and if I want to put these facts on the record, I hope that my friends will bear with me.

First of all I wish to refer to the Provincial Magistrate's Civil Court. Hon. Members will recall a few years ago legislation was provided giving to the provincial magistrates a civil jurisdiction up to \$200 and you will remember that I said that the reason why the Government was proposing this legislation was that very often in isolated rural areas, disputes arose between citizens as to small claims of less than \$200, often arising out of an automobile accident where the amount deductible was at issue. I remember in my own Constituency, people approaching me with this question — "Why should I have to pay the \$200 to repair my own vehicle, and \$200 to repair my neighbour's vehicle?" The only answer I could give was that you were at fault, and therefore you had to compensate your neighbour for his damages as well as to pay your own. But often I found that answer wasn't satisfactory, because the person with whom I was talking would say, "Well, this is how it happened" and proceed to explain to me how it happened. Of course, it always looked as though he was almost right, that he wasn't 100% at fault, and it looked as though he suffered somewhat of an injustice.

**February 21, 1961**

So I would suggest that perhaps he should have taken it to his lawyer, or to court if he wasn't satisfied with the adjustment. His answer was, "If I did that I would have paid more money to get justice done than the benefits I would have got by going to Court, even if I had won". I have to confess that perhaps there is some truth in that. So the Government gave some thought to some way of allowing such people . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — Will the hon. Member allow a question?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Yes, I have no objection.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Why would the man have to pay \$200 to repair his own vehicle and \$200 to repair the other person's vehicle if there had been no case and no judgment?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Usually, Mr. Speaker, what happens is that the two insurance companies come to an agreement about the matter, and if the other driver has collision insurance he is paid by his insurance company, and the insurance company then subrogates his rights against the person who is at fault. So the insurance company is claiming \$200 if the motorist was at fault, and the motorist who is at fault also pays the \$200 for his own garage bill. This is usually the case. The insurance companies try to recover the \$200.

I have suggested to these people that there ought to be a very simple and easy way for them to determine whether or not they are at fault without having either to be taken into court by the other motorist, or without having to go to a Superior or District Court themselves. As my hon. friend knows, to dispute the liability of the other person's damages is running the risk of having to go to court to defend oneself, and usually insurance companies have been in the habit of taking people to the District Court which meant substantial additional costs. This, of course, my constituent is anxious to avoid.

I discussed this with my colleagues and so we came to a policy of providing for a civil jurisdiction before the magistrate for an amount of \$200. It was said by hon. friends opposite that this wouldn't be used, that it was a waste of time, that this service was already provided by the small debt procedure of the District Court. Well, it is provided by the small debt procedure of the District Court, but unfortunately the

District Court only sits in twenty or twenty-three different places in the province, and this isn't close enough to the farmer-citizens of Saskatchewan. So therefore, by giving this jurisdiction to the magistrate, some eighty-five or ninety communities of Saskatchewan have the services of the Magistrate's Court for the purpose of adjudicating on these small claims.

The services are coming to be more popular. I have returns for the first of January to September 30th, 1960 showing that during that period there were 1,350 summonses issued in the magistrate's small claims court; that 124 contested cases were heard by Magistrates; that there were 439 uncontested cases and judgments were rendered in 449 instances. Now, this represents a service to the people of Saskatchewan which they had to pay a lawyer to render, and which would probably cost \$10,000 to \$20,000. It is still a small thing, but it is growing. I am told by one of the magistrates that there are many instances where he is able to render service to the public that doesn't show on the statistics and figures. That is where two motorists come arm in arm to him; they each relate their stories; he advises them what he thinks is the law, and if they are satisfied they go away and settle up, and that is the end of it. It doesn't cost them a penny and they have the opportunity of having legal services without having to pay for them, and without having to go to court to find out who is in the right.

I'm sure that my hon. friend from Humboldt isn't altogether happy about the success of this Court, because she was one of those counsellors of doom and gloom who were critical of the idea when it was first presented to this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — I'm very happy.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — . . . about the Land Titles Act, and this is a matter about which I have spoken before during past Sessions, when I have referred to recent reforms made under the Land Titles system. I believe now that it is appropriate for us to review the results of these reforms. By 1956 it was becoming more and more apparent that the system of land titles in this province — the system of filing documents and recording land transactions was becoming outmoded. The large accumulation and the tremendous volume of records and documents in our various offices, covering a period of more than seventy-five years since the land titles system was first introduced, was causing

**February 21, 1961**

our offices to bulge at the seams. The method which was introduced under the original land titles system made it impossible to separate documents which were discharged and dead from those which were live and current, thereby making it difficult to segregate and to destroy documents which were ancient and useless. This quickly growing volume of paper was also interfering with the working of the system of interfering with the staff in the handling of the records. It was a particularly acute problem so far as Saskatoon and Regina were concerned, these being the two largest offices.

As a result, over a period of some ten or twelve years each of these offices were running with a delay of anywhere from ten to thirty days from the time documents were filed until they were dealt with. A survey was made of the situation in the other torrens jurisdictions in North America, both Canada and the United States. All of them were using virtually the same system as we were using in Saskatchewan. It appeared to us that the only method which they had found of dealing with this cumbersome situation was to increase the work space and to increase the size of the working staffs.

So at that time a study of our system and possible methods of improving it was launched. In consultation with the Land Titles office staffs, a new system was finally worked out. This new program called for four major changes. First it called for the establishment of the position of administrative director, and a separate and distinct office for the Master of Titles. The latter position is a legal position, and it is traditional that the Master of Titles concern himself with the judicial functions which the Legislature vests in him under the Act, and concerns himself with seeing to it that the land titles system functions according to law.

The job of planning for the administrative efficiency of the system, in our view, calls for a different kind of qualification, a different professional skill. The new administrative director appointed under the Act is Mr. V.T. Dean, a long-time official of the staff of the Provincial Auditor's Department, and previous to that a man who had practical experience as an employee of the Land Titles Branch. The value of this step has been demonstrated to the public who use the system, through the increased efficiency resulting from better administrative control, and the virtual elimination of the delays which used to attend upon the processing of documents. In 1960, for example, there was only one



occasion when one office fell more than forty-eight hours behind in the objective of processing of all documents on a current basis.

Secondly, the program called for the introduction of a new system of registration. This meant the replacement of virtually all the equipment and the introduction of new forms and recording systems. This was probably the most costly aspect of the new system, and accounted for about half of the cost of converting the system. This phase or branch of the conversion has been completed.

Thirdly, the plan called for the microfilming of all the original grants of title from the Crown as well as microfilming all subsequent certificates of title. By this means, it will be possible to reconstruct the Land Titles system in the event of the destruction of one office, or indeed of all ten offices. This permanent microfilm recording is also, or would also be of great assistance in the event that a certificate of title was lost, misplaced, mislaid in one of the offices. So far it has not been necessary to replace a single title lost or mislaid under the new system of filing, although I must say that the separation of the books or titles, or the putting of the titles into separate fileholders did cause some apprehension, lest some of them might get misplaced, placed in the wrong folder, and thus lost. So far, although some have been missing briefly, we have never actually lost one yet. If such an eventuality should occur, then this record would enable us to restore the lost title.

The microfilming has now been 65% completed with respect to the existing titles. We hope that this microfilming will be completed by September 1st of this year. The microfilming has also been done on a current basis on all new work coming into the office during the past two years. The microfilm program, however will not be complete until the Original Grants from the Crown are microfilmed, and it had been the intention of the Department that this should be done this year.

Fourthly, the new system made it possible to embark upon a program for the orderly destruction of documents. Under the new system of filing dead and live documents are separately filed. It is now possible to specify an age beyond which dead documents shall be destroyed. Plans are to destroy liens, mortgages, and caveats and such things, six years after they have been discharged or withdrawn, provided that at least ten years has elapsed since they were registered. There is no intention to destroy certificates of title.

**February 21, 1961**

The new streamlined system of filing, Mr. Speaker, already referred to, has made it possible to effect striking economies in space. The destruction of documents will eventually make even more spectacular space savings possible. The Land Titles Office in Prince Albert, for example, built only a little more than six years ago, has been reduced by 40% in the amount of floor space which was required. Fortunately, this extra space is being used by another Government Agency. Five years ago plans were under way for an extension or addition to the Regina Land Titles Office involving a cost of a quarter of a million dollars or more. The conversion of the land titles system to the new procedure has made it possible to dispense with those plans, and indeed we now have surplus space in the Regina Office.

The cost of the conversion was originally estimated at \$374,000, part of which was incurred over each of the past three years. It was estimated in 1957 that the conversion to the new system would make possible a staff reduction of about thirty persons, and that this would effect an annual savings of about \$100,000. It is interesting now to examine the extent to which these estimates proved to be accurate. As it turned out, the cost of the conversion will be less than was estimated, Mr. Speaker. To date the cost of conversion has amounted to \$348,000 or \$26,000 less than the amount originally estimated. It was originally hoped that the staff would be reduced from one hundred and sixty-two as it was in 1956-57 to one hundred and thirty-two after the conversion process was completed. As it turned out, our expectations in this regard were too modest, for notwithstanding a more than 10% increase in the number of documents registered during the past year, as compared with 1956, we have nevertheless achieved our objective in regard to the reduction of staff. We now propose to continue our program of streamlining our establishment and improving the level of service to the public, by transferring the offices at Arcola and Moosomin to Regina. This move will result in a savings of \$17,813 per year from now on. Of course, during the first year we will have to offset against this the sum of about \$5,000 to cover moving expenses.

In addition there will be substantial savings accrue to the Department of Public Works if they are able to use this space for some alternative Government Agency.

As I have already suggested, this move has not been dictated altogether by consideration of economy. However, although consideration of economy must not be

lost sight of, I am always amused by my hon. friends opposite who wail against the Government for not economizing, and then when you do economize somewhere they carp against you for putting a dollar and cents value on service. It just goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that you can't please some of the people any of the time.

As I have already suggested, this move wasn't dictated solely by consideration of economy. A survey made in the offices at Moosomin and Arcola revealed that only a very tiny proportion of the work in those two offices had originated in Arcola or Moosomin. In Arcola, for example, only 8% of the work done in that office originated in Arcola. The largest single source of work in the Arcola office having come from Regina.

With regard to Moosomin, only 9% of the work of that office came from Moosomin and vicinity, and again Regina was the largest single source of work for that office. So it is therefore clear, if we are to recognize our duty of rendering the most efficient services possible to our customers, the people of Saskatchewan, it is our duty to provide these offices as nearly as possible to where the customers reside, so that the citizens of Saskatchewan will be put to as little trouble as possible in using these offices.

I regret that the Member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) or the Member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) are not in their seats, but I want to say that I believe it is no part of the function of Government to fragment and break up efficient and economic services merely to subsidize or stabilize the economy of a larger number of communities.

The purpose of the land titles system is, as efficiently as possible, and as economically as possible, to provide the people with an effective system of land registration. If that can be more efficiently and economically done in Regina than it can in Arcola or Moosomin, then it is the function of the Government to see that that is brought about.

Under the old system it would have been impossible to have made this improvement, firstly because it would have been extremely difficult to integrate documents from two or three offices into a single office. Secondly, because space in the Regina office would not have been sufficient to accommodate the work of these three offices. It is therefore expected that the Moosomin office will close on March 31, 1961 and the Arcola office will close about six weeks later.

**February 21, 1961**

I would like to say something now about the Courts. The judicial system has also been adapted to meet current conditions. Take first the number of judges in the District Court. For many years, Saskatchewan had eighteen District Court judges. In spite of the fact that the District Court in Manitoba and Alberta had practically the same jurisdiction, and despite the fact that Alberta has a much larger population than we have, those two provinces were provided with only twelve judges and ten judges respectively, compared to eighteen in Saskatchewan. Previous Governments in this province must have been more successful in creating political plums for their friends than were the Governments of either Alberta or Manitoba.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Shame! Shame!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — The Culliton Committee on Judicial Reform pointed out in 1957 that more than half of the judicial work in the District Court was being done in two judicial districts, that is the judicial districts of Regina and Saskatoon, and at that time there were only two judges in Saskatoon and one in Regina, so that three District Court judges were doing more than half the judicial work of the District Courts in this province. The pressure on the judge in Regina, however, was shortly thereafter relieved by the moving of another District Court judge from another city to Regina. This gave Regina and Saskatoon each two District Court judges.

The centres have now been grouped into circuits of three, four, or five judicial centres. Circuit A, Regina; Circuit B, Saskatoon, and the other circuits are comprised as follows: Circuit C, Weyburn, Arcola, Estevan and Moosomin; Circuit D, Wynyard, Yorkton, and Melville; Circuit E, Prince Albert, Melfort, Humboldt; Circuit F, Battleford, Kerrobert, Wilkie and Kindersley; Circuit G, Assiniboia, Shaunavon, Moose Jaw, Gravelbourg and Swift Current.

At the end of my remarks I would like to give a summary showing the number of writs issued in each of these judicial centres for the years 1958, 1959, and 1960. The summary also shows the number of trials conducted by the District Court in each of those three years. It also shows the number of miscellaneous applications made to the District Court in each of those three years, and the number of Surrogate Court applications for probate or administration, during each of the same three years. That Table is marked Table A.

Before turning it in, however, I would like to make some comments on it. Table B, which I would also like to hand in at the conclusion of my remarks for annexation to the record, is merely a conversion of the number in Table A to percentage points, so that it is possible to get a picture of the change in the level of each activity in 1960 as compared with the previous year.

Some significant facts appear, Mr. Speaker, from these tables. First of all, Regina and Saskatoon each account for between twenty and twenty-five per cent of each category of the judicial work that is done in the province. Since there are two District Court judges at each place, one might assume then, that each District Court judge is able to do from ten to twelve per cent of the work of the District Court in the Province of Saskatchewan. In fairness, however, we should recognize that those judges who have rural circuits have the extra burden of travelling and the moving from one Judicial Centre to another. Therefore, one should expect that the judges in these rural circuits should be expected to handle ten per cent or less of the total judicial work of the province. Circuits A and B, as I have already said, each comprise nearly twenty-five per cent of the work of the province, giving to each of these judges approximately twelve and one-half per cent of the judicial work of the province. Circuit C, which comprises Weyburn, Arcola, Estevan, and Moosomin accounts for only about six per cent of the judicial work of the province in all categories. It is, therefore, reasonable to expect that one judge can quite easily service Circuit C, although Circuit C, now has two judges, one of whom expects to retire during the coming summer. Circuit D, comprising Wynyard, Yorkton, and Melville, and the three points together handle about six or seven per cent of the various categories of judicial work in the province. It, therefore, can be said that one judge could conveniently handle the work of that circuit. At present that Circuit has three judges. Circuit E, comprised of Prince Albert, Melfort and Humboldt accounts for about fourteen per cent of the judicial work in the province, and should, therefore, reasonably be expected to have two judges. That is the number which it presently has, and due to the regrettable illness of one of the judges, it has become necessary to authorize the Federal Government to appoint a third judge for that Circuit. The Government at Ottawa, however, has unfortunately not made that appointment to date and the work of that Circuit is suffering.

**Mrs. Batten:** — . . . whether you're teetering up or down.

**February 21, 1961**

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — After the next retirement from that circuit, it will be unnecessary to make a replacement. That Circuit can then be worked with two, providing that the two remaining judges enjoy good health.

Circuit F, consisting of Battleford, Kerrobert, Wilkie and Kindersley accounts for a total of approximately six per cent of the judicial work of the province in all categories. Those four centres account for approximately six per cent of the total. One judge can therefore, reasonably be expected to do the work of that Circuit. There has unfortunately, however, been no judge on that Circuit for the past several months. The urgings of the Saskatchewan Government over the past three months, that an appointment should be made there, have so far gone unrewarded. This failure of the Federal Government to make an appointment has resulted in serious disadvantages to the people of that area.

The travelling required on this Circuit, that is Circuit F, which as I said comprises Battleford, Kerrobert, Wilkie and Kindersley, will be somewhat less after the beginning of the new fiscal year, as it is the intention of the Government to discontinue Wilkie and Kindersley as Judicial Centres. A glance at Table B will show that Wilkie accounted for 1.06 of all the actions launched in the province, and Kindersley accounted for one-twentieth of one per cent. Wilkie accounted for 58/100ths of one per cent of the trials of the District Court in the province, and Kindersley accounted for 23/100ths of one per cent. Since neither of these places has adequate facilities and since each centre is only thirty-five or forty miles from the neighboring Judicial Centre, both of which neighboring Judicial Centres enjoy first-rate judicial facilities, it is fruitless, we believe, to try to maintain the appearance of active Judicial Centres at either Kindersley or Wilkie. The loss of the service will hardly be notice in either place because of a change made in the rules of court permitting the filing of material of the court by mail. This will leave only Battleford and Kerrobert on Circuit F.

Circuit G has the largest number of Judicial Centres of any Circuit in the province, comprising Assiniboia, Gravelbourg, Moose Jaw, Shaunavon, and Swift Current. About fifteen per cent of the judicial work is done in this Circuit, and this volume of work justifies having two judges working on the Circuit, and that is exactly the number we have.

It will be seen, Mr. Speaker, from the foregoing estimates, that eleven District Court judges would be the optimum number for Saskatchewan. One more than Manitoba and one less than Alberta. Only where prolonged illness or incapacity impairs the ability or health of a judge are we justified in authorizing any number beyond eleven. It may be argued that a judge should retire and allow for a new appointment when he is incapacitated by illness. The Government does not share this view, Mr. Speaker, where there is reasonable expectation that the judge may be returning to his duties. In the Government's view judges ought not to be hastily retired, because of even lengthy physical illnesses. Where there is reasonable hope for a return to active duty on the bench before the statutory time of retirement, then we believe that the Government is justified in making other arrangements to tide the court over until he can return to his duties. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that we asked the Legislature three years ago, to provide some flexibility in the number of judges. If we are to keep the number of the judges at the very minimum necessary for the proper administration of justice, then there must be provision for the appointment of one or more additional judges when illness or disability strikes.

At the present we have thirteen judges — two more than the minimum number needed. We also have two vacant positions, one of which as I have already said, has been vacant since November 15th, and the other which has been vacant since February 3rd. Under the Judges Act of Canada, we are entitled to have, as I have already indicated a maximum of eighteen District Court judges. By regulating the number in accordance with the judicial work load, we are presently saving the Government of Canada, something like \$50,000 a year. The success of this business-like method of operating our courts will require, however, a willingness on the part of the Ottawa Government to make appointments promptly when necessary.

But the new conception of Judicial Centres, as opposed to Judicial Districts, was not designed solely to provide more flexibility in the use of judges, but to permit general reorganization of the duties of court officials. In the last full year before the new system went into operation, we required a staff of seventy-seven persons in our Judicial Districts. In the current year, because of this more flexible system the work is being done by sixty-two persons, or a saving of fifteen people. This reduction was effected simply by allowing retirements to go unreplaced, and by making transfers of the remaining

**February 21, 1961**

staff to bring about the most economic distribution of personnel. Next year we hope to reduce the permanent staff to fifty-seven, representing an overall reduction in five years of twenty positions or 26%, without any significant deterioration in services, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, the staff required to operate the new Central Registry Service for chattel mortgages, which was launched in 1957, is included in this number of fifty-seven.

As a result of the abolition of Judicial District boundaries, and by reason of the introduction of some flexibility into the establishment of sheriffs, it has been possible to operate this year, with eleven sheriffs and two extra assistants doing the same work which was done by twenty-one sheriffs under the old system of Judicial Districts.

It is interesting to note that during this same period, Mr. Speaker, there has been an increase in the amount of judicial work. Let us compare the work done in 1960, as shown in Table A, with the average volume done during the period 1952 to 1956, as reported by the Culliton Committee. The average number of actions of all kinds started by the issue of a written summons during the five year period reported by the Culliton Committee was 11,366. In 1960 it was 13,157 or an increase of 15.7%. The total number of Queen's Bench and District Court trials in the five years period was 725; in 1960 it was 858 or an increase of 14%. The number of Surrogate Court applications for administration and probate averaged 3,762 during the five year period under review by the Culliton Committee and 3,932 or an increase of 4.7% in 1960.

When this legislation was before the House two or three years ago, the Opposition did not see any merit in the reorganization of our court systems. I think it is fair to say that there is not a single lawyer in Saskatchewan who would honestly and conscientiously advocate a return to the 1917 system, which we had prior to that time. In fact, the only criticism which I have heard of the new system, has been directed at the lack of judges in some Judicial Centres, and this is a problem, as I have indicated, which the Government has been anxiously trying to have remedied.

It was said by the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that the reform in the judicial system would result in the centralization of litigation in Regina and in Saskatoon. This was one of the major grounds for attack by the Opposition, on this legislation. Again the facts do not bear out this contention. Look at the percentage of all



writs and summonses issued in Regina. The figures are as follows: Before the introduction of the new system in 1958 — 22.7%, in 1959 after the new system — 23.5%; in 1960 — 21.9% or an overall reduction for Regina of 8/10ths of one per cent of the provincial total in 1960. Look at the percentage of all trials held in the Judicial Centre of Regina: For the year prior to the introduction of the new system 1958 — 24.9% of all trials were held in the City of Regina; for the two years after the new system was introduced 1959 — 25.2%; 1960 — 20.5%. An overall reduction of 4.5% since the new system went into operation.

Now there has been some small increase in the percentage of Letters Probate, and Letters of Administration issued out of the Regina Judicial Centre since 1958. It may be said that this confirms the forecast made at that time by the Opposition. It should be pointed out, however, that it was inevitable that there would be some increase in this work done in the City of Regina because lawyers in small towns, where there is no Judicial Centre are naturally going to mail their application for probate and administration to a centre where there are two judges on duty, rather than to a centre where there is one judge on duty, only part time. This does not mean that the Regina lawyers have benefitted at the expense of the rural lawyers, because the rural lawyers are able to mail these applications in directly to the Clerk of the Court, and the Regina lawyers don't make a five cent piece for that, and it doesn't cost the rural lawyers any more than if they filed them at their own Judician Centres.

I would like to take time to analyse the situation in Saskatoon and compare it to the rural areas, but time will not permit. I will just say, however, that there was a decline in the percentage of the provincial total of writs issued in 1960, in Saskatoon, as compared to 1958 of 1.15%.

The overall effect, Mr. Speaker, of these statistics, is that all of the weeping and wailing of the party opposite, when this legislation was proposed, has been proven to be without justification. The Government's decision has been completely vindicated.

It seems to me, and this is always the best time to take part in an argument, after the facts prove that your position was right. It isn't always the most satisfactory time. I had to suffer the stings and scorn of the hon. lady from Humboldt for three years, but, I am sure now . . .

**February 21, 1961**

**Mrs. Batten:** — . . . didn't waste that much time.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — . . . that the hon. lady will acknowledge that her objections to this legislation, at the time, were not based upon substantial facts, but were based upon fears which were not justified by the events.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Wait another three years.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — This experience, I suggest Mr. Speaker, has demonstrated, that the CCF Government although in office now for seventeen years, is still capable of adapting Government institutions to meet the changing needs of the time. It demonstrates also, that the Liberal Party, even though freed of the responsibility of office for almost a generation now, is still afraid and timid — that the Liberal Party is still willing to live according to 1917 concepts, rather than to face realistically present day problems.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — In addition, we've tabled, in the year which I refer to, one other table which I would like to have included in the records, Mr. Speaker, and that is a table of criminal statistics. Now this table continues the table which I have put in for the previous four years. I thought that the House might be interested in following up the distribution of criminal cases, as between the various courts, and as between the various sections of the various acts, so that you see the trends as they appear from time to time of the offences.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Member permit a question? Is the hon. Minister suggesting that there is still crime in Saskatchewan after sixteen years of socialist power.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I thought fifteen years ago that with the dawning of a new era, all kinds of backward and ugly and squalid things would have disappeared from Saskatchewan. My hopes have not been fully justified, however. There is still crime; there are still some people who commit crimes; there are still criminals; there probably always will be. We feel it is our duty to see that justice is done, wherever possible, and if crime persists, if crime survives, then we'll have to turn to some higher authority and recognize that human institutions are not capable of making man perfect.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just put these figures on the record, and I will just draw your attention to that last table, to one set of factors — I'm not going to deal with each Act or section, the number of offences under each, but I would just refer briefly to the totals. The total number of cases tried by Justices of the Peace declined by 1,000 during the year from 10,532 to 9,537; the number tried by Provincial Magistrates increased from 44,875 to 50,463; the number tried by District Court Judges increased from 106 to 109; the number tried by Queen's Bench Judges decreased from 61 to 47.

Now Mr. Speaker, before I leave the question of courts, I thought that some other changes in staff and facilities in various judicial centres ought to be brought to the attention of the House, since the House was now sitting, rather than being made merely by notifying the people directly involved. I would draw attention Mr. Speaker, to the following transfers of personnel, which will go into effect on the 1st of April, 1961. In the Judicial Centre of Gravelbourg, the Deputy Sheriff, the Deputy Local Registrar, will be transferred from there to the Judicial Centre of Estevan in view of the fact that the Deputy at Estevan is due to be retired on superannuation. The Gravelbourg office, it is felt, can be operated just as efficiently, and with just as much use to the public, if it is operated for two hours a day instead of the present six hours a day, and it will be open, therefore, after the 1st of April, from 2 P.M. to 4 P.M. and it is proposed to appoint a part-time employee for the purpose of operating that office, similar to the arrangements which we now have in Shaunavon and Arcola, for instance. Gravelbourg will continue to be under the direct supervision of the Sheriff for the Assiniboia Judicial Centre.

With respect to Moosomin, the Sheriff who is also Sheriff and Local Registrar for that Judicial Centre, will be transferred to the Judicial Centre of Melfort on April 1st, as the Sheriff there is retiring on that date. The Moosomin Judicial Centre is presently being operated on a part-time basis by a Deputy Sheriff and Deputy Local Registrar, and it is expected that the Moosomin office will continue to operate in the same way. The Sheriff of the Judicial District of Weyburn who is past the age of retirement will be retiring on April 1st on superannuation, and the Sheriff for the Judicial Centre of Estevan will be taking care of both Judicial Centres, in addition to Arcola, which he is now looking after.

**February 21, 1961**

The Deputy Sheriff for the Judicial Centre of Wynyard will be transferred to Weyburn to fill the position vacated there by a retirement which will occur on April 1st. It is hoped that the Wynyard Judicial Centre will continue to serve the public for a two hour period each day, and it will be operated by a part-time employee. As I have already indicated the Judicial Centres at Kindersley and Wilkie will be closed April 1st next, and my litigation which arises in those areas will be handled in the nearest Judicial Centre as provided in the Act and in the Rules of Court.

I have already spoken of the closing of the centre at Kindersley and Wilkie. This will be a withdrawal from those two communities of a service which was not very much used while there. As for the other Judicial Centres, changes are being made at Moosomin, Wynyard and Gravelbourg — the services being restricted to two hours a day. This will actually take care of the needs I believe, of the people of those communities. Otherwise there will be no actual curtailment or restriction of service beyond that which I have spoken.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about the Securities Act and securities enforcement. There again, there is no report tabled in the Legislature so I would like to put on record some facts and figures for future reference, taken from the report of the Chairman of the Securities Commission, to myself as Minister. As hon. Members know the securities business in Canada has not been thriving in any province in Canada. There has been a sharp recession in the volume of securities work. Saskatchewan, however, has borne up very well in this atmosphere, this climate of recession, and we had this year seventy-three lease brokers and broker-dealers as compared to seventy-two in the previous year. The number of securities issuers has increased from twenty-one to twenty-five. I described to the House last year, a new policy of the Government requiring securities issuers in this province who propose selling their stocks in the United States, to be registered with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission at that time. Of these twenty-five, five are registered with the S.E.C. at Washington.

The number of salesmen has declined slightly from 488 to 439. The number of securities advisors has declined from two to one. The number of investment dealers has increased from nine to ten. The number of prospectuses (I presume that's not the correct plural of

prospectus) has increased from ninety-seven filed during the year 1959, to one hundred this year. The number of salesmen's licenses suspended during the year was five last year, six this year. The number of salesmen's licenses or applications to withdraw increased from seven to thirteen. The total amount of fees collected by the Securities Commission this year was \$43,470 compared with \$41,701 the previous year. The number of cancellations of broker dealers licenses; one this year and one last year. The number of suspensions; one this year and one last year — that is broker dealers. The number of suspension of salesmen: two this year as compared with eleven last year.

Last year I believe I gave a report on the enforcement the number of persons charged and convicted in 1960: five; the number of persons charged and before the courts: three; the number of persons charged and not yet brought to trial, as at the end of the year; one, making a total of nine.

I think it is unnecessary to give you the other information, information of detail, which probably wouldn't interest the House. However, I do feel that I ought to say something about the administration itself. The Securities Commission consists of a Chairman, a part-time chairman, who is also a part-time Provincial Magistrate. Then it has a Director of Enforcements, who is also Registrar of the Commission, and it has one field investigator.

While I'm discussing this matter I would like to say just a word or two concerning the resignation of the present chairman. During 1956 and 1957, because of changes in the enforcement policies of some of the neighboring provinces, we had an influx of stockateers in this province at that time, fleeing from law enforcement in other provinces. This is something which will always happen until we achieve a national securities law, a national securities administration in Canada. When changes occur in one province or another, these "stockateers" float from one province to another and try to find a place where they can operate with impunity. So during those years 1956 and 1957 and 1958 we had in Saskatchewan a temporary enforcement problem. The situation was aggravated by the fact that for the first seven months of the year 1958, we were without the services of a chairman of our Securities Commission. The province was fortunate, however, in securing the services of Mr. W.W. Cameron, who we got from the Ontario Securities Commission, where he was their Chief Counsel for many years. After his arrival in Saskatchewan we also recruited

**February 21, 1961**

(also from the Ontario Securities Commission,) an experienced Director of Enforcement. Together, these two gentlemen made an extremely effective team. Mr. Mathews, the Director of Prosecutions, did and is still doing an effective job of prosecuting under the direction of the Department of the Attorney General. Mr. Cameron, by the exercise of his powers as chairman, succeeded in filtering out the criminal elements from the securities industry. While the Director of Prosecutions was mainly concerned with prosecuting offenders, the job of the Chairman was primarily concerned with the prevention of securities frauds, and the exclusion of fraudulent securities promoters, so far as that is possible to do in advance.

At the present time, it can be safely said, I don't think anyone will contradict this statement, that the standards of the speculative securities industry in Saskatchewan is one of the highest of any place in Canada. That is because we have the highest standard of security law enforcement, because we have the highest standard of inspection and inquisition into the applications of people seeking to enter that field in this province. The major share of the credit for this situation, I believe and acknowledge, should be given to Mr. Cameron. His energy, skill, and integrity have stood Saskatchewan in good stead during his service in this province. I want to express on behalf of the Government, our best wishes to him, as he takes up his new career in the sunnier climate of the west coast.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want just before I conclude, to comment on one or two things which were said by one of the Members who spoke just before supper. We hear from the Opposition, those who spoke this afternoon, about the opposition of the Liberal Party to any change in the system of local government. I do not pose as having any specialized knowledge of local government, but I at least claim to have enough common sense to know that I should not make judgments or decisions about important matters involving the future welfare of the people of Saskatchewan without providing myself with facts on which to base such a judgment. Members of the Opposition apparently are so all-wise and all-knowing that they are able to decide in advance that changes in the method of administering local government ought not to be made without even knowing what those changes may be. Well if it is a matter of sitting here, Mr. Speaker, and listening to these Solons of the other side, express their opposition to changes in municipal local government administration, or if it is a choice of reading the report of the committee and hearing the views of local government officials after they have seen the report, then I prefer to follow the latter course.

I certainly do not believe that this important matter ought to be decided on the basis of prejudices and biases of Members of the Opposition, who, I believe, are attaching themselves to this question for the purpose of gaining some transitory political advantage.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Oh shame.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — The farmers don't think so.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Opposition thought that the compulsory automobile insurance was going to be unpopular, so they latched on to that and attacked it. After all, they don't want to agree with the Government, so what else can they do but to try and pick up some temporary little bubble of protest, and blow it up into a balloon which they hope will elevate them to office in this province.

Well Mr. Speaker, we have seen them decry and disparage the school unit legislation that was introduced by this Government. We have seen them condemn and criticize things which I have referred to earlier this evening, other progressive measures introduced by this Government, only to find that they were wrong — looking at their record after the event.

But they are not content Mr. Speaker, to stand on that record after they have been proven wrong. The hon. Member from Arm River, got up in the House and tried to deny the Opposition had opposed compulsory automobile insurance in 1946. And I predict, in the years to come, when we have made improvements in the methods of local government, as we will inevitably do, Opposition Members will then try to pretend that they were never really opposed to these things at the time."Prove it," they'll say, "You can't prove it." I recall in this House, in 1949, hearing the then Leader of the Opposition saying that they weren't opposed to a hospital scheme — they weren't opposed to a hospital scheme but it should have been left to the municipalities.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hospital scheme of this province had been turned over to the municipalities, you'd have just about what you had in those sad Liberal days of the 1930's. You'd have virtually nothing of a hospital scheme. Now they'll try to tell you that they were in favour of hospitalization at the time, when every single criticism they made was aimed at destroying the effectiveness of that scheme. It will be the same

**February 21, 1961**

again. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would be much better for this House, for the Liberal Party and for the country, if Liberals for once would come to realize that they ought to get a good idea once in a while, and push it and see it get established, instead of constantly needling and harassing the Government over proposals which the Government puts forward.

With regard to municipal reorganization, I am certainly not going to vote on the recommendation of one or two Members opposite, that we ought to decide this question on the basis of their prejudices or their biases. I am going to vote to have this question decided in an orderly way, after I have the benefit of the report of fourteen able and conscientious municipal officials, after I've had a chance to read and to study that report. Even more, I'm not going to make my decision on this question purely on the basis of that report. I believe that when that report has been thoroughly discussed with local government officials, that after the fullest possible consultation, and we have had the benefit of the advice and suggestions of local officials, then I am prepared to make up my mind. And when I make up my mind on this matter, I venture to say, that history will prove that I am right and that my hon. friends opposite are wrong.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Like the time question.

**Mrs. Batten:** — You and Hitler.

**An Hon. Member:** — That was your idea.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Well Mr. Speaker, in the course of my remarks this afternoon, I have had not only to review the past, but to forecast somewhat of the future, and I have had to advise the House of certain curtailments and restrictions in a Government program, which I am sure will cause some aggravation to some persons affected. But I want to say that I am proud to belong to a Government that is honest enough to do things which may cause some temporary pain, or some suffering in order to achieve bigger goals and bigger objectives.

**Mrs. Batten:** — After an election.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, that those who criticize this Government by saying that it doesn't know how to economize,



that it doesn't know how to cut down expenses, and then turn around and criticize the Government in the next breath because it has done that, show a lack of loyal honesty, which disqualifies them from occupying a seat in Government.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — It seems to me that, I don't mind criticism, I enjoy it as a matter of fact, — it seems to me that criticism ought to be consistent and it ought to be constructive, and when a political party devotes itself to criticizing the Government for economizing, and then criticizes the Government for not economizing that they had better get together. When a political party criticizes the Government because we are taking credit for progress in the last seventeen years, they say that everybody has progressed in the last seventeen years. What do they say when we say we've had industrial development in Saskatchewan? They say we've had stagnation. You can't fit those two arguments together. If we have had stagnation in the last seventeen years then this Government deserves special credit for having brought into being some of the grand programs that the people of Saskatchewan have benefitted from over the past seventeen years. The Opposition had better start showing some consistency and some moral honesty about these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I think that while some of my remarks may have been a little bit scattered about on various subjects, and the subjects may have been selected at random, nevertheless, I think it is perfectly clear to you Mr. Speaker, that I intend to support the motion and that I intend to vote against this iniquitous amendment.

**TABLE "A"**

Summary of Judicial Activity for Each Judicial Centre  
for the Years 1958, 1959 and 1960

	Writs			All Trials			Miscellaneous Applications			S.C. Applications For Probate or Admin.		
	1958	1959	1960	1958	1959	1960	1958	1959	1960	1958	1959	1960
Arcola	41	141	208	2	8	9	49	49	52	120	78	75
Assiniboia	26	122	105	1	3	3	59	52	54	76	87	67
Battleford	555	442	453	23	25	36	121	138	359	271	273	215
Estevan	231	277	276	28	19	23	177	409	476	212	104	105
Gravelbourg	152	88	77	4	21	10	123	99	88	68	63	75
Humboldt	274	140	190	32	33	28	92	157	153	129	149	131
Kerrobert	91	175	155	10	6	5	128	65	54	87	51	42
Kindersley	56	18	7	2	3	2	144	34	34	103	81	75
Melfort	477	405	283	42	35	30	211	217	271	193	213	199
Melville	91	301	326	21	9	19	109	100	78	122	72	85
Moose Jaw	623	657	540	53	70	54	782	840	1152	242	309	274
Moosomin	162	88	53	7	3	6	60	53	47	180	128	139
Prince Albert	969	1125	1279	91	85	85	467	670	678	213	201	206
Regina	2357	2744	2876	205	210	172	287	288	353	485	732	707
Saskatoon	2861	3065	3280	181	190	254	612	1192	1281	530	617	727
Shaunavon	63	68	35	10	13	7	113	160	103	71	88	70
Swift Current	765	1089	2113	38	33	51	126	169	164	260	289	301
Weyburn	79	193	154	20	11	11	120	101	121	158	88	89
Wilkie	181	85	140	6	1	5	126	138	117	82	79	54
Wynyard	109	35	63	3	1	1	150	111	96	105	85	77
Yorkton	214	375	534	42	52	47	72	67	116	214	229	219
<b>Totals</b>	<b>10377</b>	<b>11633</b>	<b>13147</b>	<b>821</b>	<b>831</b>	<b>858</b>	<b>4128</b>	<b>5109</b>	<b>5847</b>	<b>3921</b>	<b>4016</b>	<b>3932</b>

TABLE "B"

Relative Volume of Judicial Work  
in Principal Judicial Centres as  
a Percentage of the Total for  
the Province

	Writs Issued		Trials Held		S.C. Applications For Probate or Admin.	
	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960
Saskatoon	26.3	24.95	22.9	29.60	15.3	18.49
Regina	23.5	21.88	25.2	20.05	18.3	17.98
Prince Albert	9.7	9.73	10.3	9.91	5.0	5.24
Swift Current	9.4	16.07	4.0	5.94	7.2	7.66
Moose Jaw	5.9	4.11	8.4	6.29	7.7	6.97
Battleford	3.8	3.45	3.0	4.20	6.8	5.47
Yorkton	3.2	4.05	6.2	5.48	5.7	5.57
Melfort	3.6	2.15	4.2	3.50	5.3	5.06
Weyburn	1.6	1.17	1.3	1.28	2.2	2.26
Melville	2.6	2.48	1.1	2.21	1.8	2.16
Estevan	2.3	2.10	2.3	2.68	2.6	2.67
Humboldt	1.2	1.45	4.0	3.26	3.7	3.32
Gravelbourg	.8	.59	2.5	1.17	1.5	1.91
Wilkie	.7	1.06	.1	.58	1.9	1.37
Moosomin	.8	.40	.4	.70	3.2	3.54
Arcola	1.2	1.58	1.0	1.05	1.9	1.91
Kerrobert	1.5	1.18	.7	.58	1.3	1.07
Wynyard	.3	.48	.1	.12	2.1	1.96
Assiniboia	1.0	.80	.4	.35	2.2	1.70
Shaunavon	.5	.27	1.5	.82	2.2	1.78
Kindersley	.1	.05	.4	.23	2.1	1.91
	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

TABLE "C"

## CRIMINAL STATISTICS

for the period April 1, 1959 to March 31, 1960

Offences Under	J.P.'s		Magistrates		D.C. Judges		Q.B. Judges	
	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.
Sec. 221 CCC	12	12	270	243	0	0	0	0
Sec. 222 CCC	4	3	157	150	2	1	1	1
Sec. 223 CCC	42	41	1,236	1,176	6	3	0	0
All other CCC cases	417	414	6,904	6,526	64	43	46	28
Other Federal offences	335	335	1,830	1,793	9	4	0	0
Total Federal offences	810	805	10,397	9,888	81	51	47	29
Liquor Act	861	859	5,372	5,260	7	7	0	0
Liquor Licensing Act	13	13	109	107	2	0	0	0
Vehicles Act (speeding)	1,901	1,900	5,990	5,943	7	3	0	0
Vehicles Act (all other)	2,786	2,781	15,928	15,518	5	1	0	0
Highways & Trans. Act	483	482	806	789	0	0	0	0
Education and Hospitalization Tax Act	0	0	122	119	0	0	0	0
Saskatchewan Hospitalization Tax Act	12	12	234	233	0	0	0	0
Fuel Petroleum Products Act	182	182	508	503	0	0	0	0
Stray Animals Act	5	5	4	3	0	0	0	0
Recovery of Wages Act	2	2	50	47	0	0	0	0
Game Act	83	83	327	311	2	2	0	0
Securities Act	0	0	144	113	1	1	0	0
All other Prov. Statutes	88	88	822	747	4	4	0	0

TABLE "C" (continued)

Offences Under	J.P.'s		Magistrates		D.C. Judges		Q.B. Judges	
	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.	Cases	Conv.
Total Prov. offences	6,416	6,407	30,416	29,693	28	18	0	0
Municipal Bylaws	2,311	2,308	9,650	9,462	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	9,537	9,520	50,463	49,043	109	69	47	29

**Mr. Gordon T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising in this House on this first occasion, I would like to take this opportunity to express, as others have before me, the feeling that we have that you in your new position will exercise the authority that is vested in you and will perform your duties to the satisfaction of all the Members of this Legislature.

I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne and I would like to take this opportunity of also congratulating all newly elected Members to this Legislature as well as congratulating those who have sat in this Legislature in previous years.

I want to take this Opportunity also, Mr. Speaker, of congratulating the various Cabinet Minister who have assumed a Cabinet post since this Legislature met last. On behalf of the people of Moose Jaw, I would particularly like to convey my congratulations to the Hon. W.G. Davies, on his appointment as Minister of Public Works.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would also, in spite of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition is absent tonight, I would like to offer my congratulations on his election. I would like to add also that it is my wish that his health will allow him to continue in that capacity for some little time to come.

I would like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition not only on his very slim victory in Morse, but also on his wisdom in choosing to be a Member in Morse Constituency rather than in his own hometown. By this one stroke of diplomatic genius, Mr. Speaker, he has spared the persons sitting opposite the embarrassment and the necessity of choosing a new leader in this Session of the Legislature.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — I would also at this time, Mr. Speaker, like to pay tribute to my predecessor, Mr. Dempster Hemming, who ably and conscientiously represented the Constituency of Moose Jaw in this Legislature for some several years. On each occasion his re-election was an indication of an overwhelming vote of confidence.

Now, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that those persons who are conscious and familiar with the history of Saskatchewan recognize the fact that a matter of some number of years ago, the City of Moose Jaw rivalled Regina, or . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I must inform the House, that under standing order 30, sub-section 2, it is my duty at this time to interrupt the hon. Member and to put the question on the amendment.

It has been moved by Mr. W. Ross Thatcher, seconded by Mr. A.H. McDonald, that the following words be added to the Address:

“But this Assembly regrets that Your Honour’s advisers have failed to provide assurance to the electors concerned that they will be given a vote on the question of whether or not there should be any basic change in the organization of local government.”

The question being put on the amendment, it was negived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 13**

Messieurs

Batten (Mrs.)	Gardiner	Horsman
McCarthy	Guy	MacDougall
Barrie	Boldt	Snedker
Cameron	Klein	Gallagher
McFarlane		

**NAYS — 35**

Messieurs

Douglas	Brown	Meakes
Dewhurst	Thurston	Thiessen
Williams	Blakeney	Snyder
McIntosh	Erb	Stevens
Brockelbank	Nicholson	Kluzak
Lloyd	Turnbull	Dahlman
Walker	Stone	Michayluk
Nollet	Whelan	Semchuk
Kuziak	Thibault	Perkins
Cooper (Mrs.)	Berezowsky	Peterson
Davies	Kramer	Broten
Willis	Johnson	

**February 21, 1961**

**Mr. Snyder (con'd):** — Mr. Speaker, I believe I was remarking that a matter of some years ago the City of Moose Jaw rivalled the City of Regina in growth and population. In addition to being located in an excellent farming district, Moose Jaw also has the distinction of being the divisional point for the Canadian Pacific Railway and at the same time the general offices of Canadian Pacific Railways were located in the City of Moose Jaw.

Now the creation of the province in 1905 and the developments thereafter, and the creating of the seat of Government in the City of Regina, undoubtedly turned the tide indefinitely in Regina's favour. It is possible that the decisions that were made at that time are perhaps open to question: I have no doubt that Moose Jaw would have made an excellent capital for the Province of Saskatchewan, but, however, subsequent results are perhaps only reasonable under the circumstances.

I would like to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Moose Jaw are pleased with the highway development that has been carried on in the City of Moose Jaw over the past number of months on the highway between Moose Jaw and the resort area on Buffalo Pound Lake. It is my hope that other programs which have been considered in the past will be put on the priority list in the near future and be given ample consideration by the Department of Highways.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I would be ungrateful if I did not at this time make mention of the public works projects which we in the City of Moose Jaw have received over the past number of years.

I refer in particular, Mr. Speaker, to the Saskatchewan Training School and in addition to the recently completed Provincial Technical Institute. This Provincial Technical Institute, the opening of which we had the pleasure of attending a short while ago, will make available opportunities for young people to take advantage of technical training. In addition to this it has provided employment for a staff of some seventy people, I am given to understand, and in addition to this, Mr. Speaker, much of the work that was done on this Provincial Technical Institute was done at a time when it served a very useful purpose in alleviating an unemployment situation. This was done during the winter months for this purpose.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention that the Saskatchewan Training School, which Moose Jaw has been blessed with, also provides employment for some five hundred and five persons, I am given to understand, as



well as filling a very definite link and a need in our mental health program. I would also mention, Mr. Speaker, in this respect, that we in Moose Jaw, are very pleased with the announcement that was made in the Speech from the Throne to the effect that the Prince Albert Sanatorium will be converted and be put to good use as a home for mentally retarded children. This in effect will relieve some of the stresses and the strains on our training school in Moose Jaw and will make available more room for children who are considered to be in the category of the untrainable. For this we are extremely thankful, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to mention at this time, Mr. Speaker, the mutually favourable agreement that was reached between the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the City of Moose Jaw. This agreement provides the City of Moose Jaw with an annual payment of some \$250,000 for ten years, and I have been given the assurance of His Worship Mayor Fysh and he has given the permission to quote him at this time, that this was a most satisfactory agreement for our city.

Now before continuing, Mr. Speaker, I intend to make reference, perhaps very briefly to some of the remarks that were made earlier this afternoon by the Minister of Labour in the Liberal shadow cabinet. I have some misgivings about mentioning any of the things which have been mentioned previously, due to the fact that I fear that giving any recognition at all perhaps may justify his existence. But in view of the fact that some of these remarks which have been made indicate a complete lack of knowledge of the subject which he is talking on, or has been talking on, and perhaps the person who wrote his script knows very little more, I would like merely to make reference to very few of the speeches that have been mentioned.

The Member for Gravelbourg began by denouncing the closed shop. He indicated that there should always be a free choice regarding membership in a labour union, or whether he would not join a labour union. I think perhaps the best test in any question is perhaps the test of exaggeration, and I think perhaps this same theory that the Member for Gravelbourg has advanced here could be applied to hospitalization, to insurance, to taxes for education.

I question very much, Mr. Speaker, whether it is within the bounds of reason for anyone to assume that we may accept the benefits of hospitalization, that we may accept the benefits of insurance, that we may accept the benefits provided by education without paying some premium for these benefits which are provided.

**February 21, 1961**

Now we heard this afternoon the hon. Member from Gravelbourg making references to slave-labour in Northern Saskatchewan. I would like to say particularly that this is one industry which lends itself perhaps to agreements and arrangements with which we are not in accord. In addition to this, I think the same failings, the same shortcomings have a tendency to apply in other industries, such as textile industries, where piece-work is the order of the day. In various of these industries this piece-work is set out for a person. There is so much work to be done in the course of an hour. Now this puts management in a definite position of advantage in view of the fact that he raises his standard so high, that of course, instead of doing one hour's work in one hour, it may take a person involved, considerably longer. In view of this, it is conceivable, it may take eight hours or it may take ten hours for a person to do eight hours work.

Now, this Mr. Speaker, in my estimation, is an excellent argument for these people who fall in that particular category, to belong to an organization which has the strength and the authority to negotiate their problems for them. But while the Member was speaking on this subject, he did a direct about turn, and he advocated that management and labour should enter into some kind of a contract, in some figment of the gentleman's imagination, whereby labour and management may join together and that labour will accept a lesser wage for the purpose of working twelve months out of the year rather than working for a lesser portion of the year. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is the situation, which in effect is the same as saying to management: "Now, here we are, we will sell jobs, who is the lowest bidder?" That is precisely the arrangement that they're asking for, Mr. Speaker.

Now, recently, Mr. Speaker, (I am going to leave the Minister of Labour for a moment), and I would refer briefly to other Opposition Members who have been using a large portion of their air time, proclaiming that labour will dominate the New Party. They have also insisted that the party will not get off the ground and a short while ago, when the hon. Member from Yorkton was speaking, I believe we saw a rebirth of McCarthyism for a moment.

Now, each Member was rising in turn and declaring before this Assembly that "We Liberals are not anti-labour." The hon. Member from Wilkie devoted some little time in his declaration of the fact that the farmer and the labourer have no common interests.

To review these facts that have been stated, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if our friends in the Opposition are thoroughly convinced that the New Party is

doomed to fail and will not get off the ground, they are spending a good deal of their valuable radio time on a matter which should concern them very little.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that they recognize that this New Party is a dominant force and is being readily accepted across the country. I believe, that indications in the two recent by-elections, in Peterborough and Niagara will bear me out on that particular point, and that the New Party is being readily accepted at the New Party conferences which are being held throughout this province.

In relation to remarks which were made earlier by the hon. Member from Yorkton, I can merely say that intelligent people are no longer subscribing to the tactics that were used by the hon. gentleman on the brief occasion when he was on his feet.

I would like to suggest to the hon. Member from Wilkie, in regard to his remarks on the grainhandlers' strike and what have you, I would like to point out to him that adequate labour laws are in effect the best deterrent to labour difficulties. Direct reference was made to the grainhandlers' strike and I would like to devote only a few moments on this particular topic this time, Mr. Speaker.

I want to indicate that management openly invited this strike by refusing to negotiate the terms of the new contract in the exact language of the old contract with the small increase in wages which was recommended by the Federal Government mediator. This increase supplied on the 1959-60 crop, Mr. Speaker, would have meant an increase of seven ten thousandths of a cent per bushel for the 1961 year.

The main reason for the strike, Mr. Speaker, was to hold on to contract provisions that these workers had enjoyed over the past number of years. They were provisions, which management was endeavouring to take away from the workers and I would like to mention some of these particular features that they were endeavouring to delete from their contract. It was a matter of hours at work, overtime pay, lay-off notices, vacations and seniority benefits. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the strike was precipitated only after a full year of patient negotiations, at which time management refused to talk terms and contracts were settled. Only at that time did the grainhandlers take their last course of action.

I suggest in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that those of us who are in the trade union organizations

**February 21, 1961**

with the trend as it has been over the past number of years from the country to urban centres, that those of us within the trade unions who sprang predominately from the farm, have a definite, fundamental knowledge of the farm movement and I might say that by and large I think perhaps we understand farm problems probably to a greater degree than many people in the agricultural movement understand the problems of labour. Be this as it may, I believe there is, perhaps, good reason behind this in view of the fact that many people in agriculture have had no direct contact with people in labour organizations.

However, may I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that we in labour organizations are conscious of the fact that when conditions are unsatisfactory on the farm, it immediately creates a chain reaction and it is not long before conditions in labour circles suffer to a relative degree. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the only solution is for both segments of our economy, to join together for the common good of both and to wage war on a common enemy.

Mr. Speaker, there are several items, which I wish to deal with this evening that were mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. First of all, I would mention the general slowing down in business activity across Canada, accompanied with a rise in unemployment. Although this unemployment picture is partly disguised by an armament program, there are at present well in excess of half a million people who are unemployed at the present time. Estimates place this figure at an excess of one million when it reaches its seasonal peak sometime later on in the year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no part of Canada that is insulated from this general condition. Just as a healthy limb is not likely to be found growing from a diseased body, by the same token it is not likely that you will find Provincial Governments escaping for very long unsound policies in the Federal field.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under the existing circumstances and conditions, I would imagine that it is not too surprising to find the Leader of the Federal Liberal Party now proclaiming that the Conservatives have no cure for unemployment. At the same time we find the Prime Minister of Canada declaring that these are conditions which he inherited from the Liberals. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as these accusations are concerned, both these gentlemen should be given high marks. They are both right; they have both hit the nail right on the thumb. I would like to remind our friends in the Opposition that these unsatisfactory conditions were in evidence, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the present Conservative Government

took office. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that was the main reason for their success at the polls.

While the pipe line companies and various other large industries were still doing fairly well under the Federal Liberal regime, the Canadian people, Mr. Speaker, were haunted by the spectre of growing unemployment, unsatisfactory conditions in agriculture, the loss of wheat markets, and a general feeling of insecurity under a growing burden of inflation and debt.

In the field of social security, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government had begun to retrench and retreat and they failed to provide much-needed relief for agriculture. They were apparently indifferent to the needs of our senior citizens also. Although the Conservative Government did supply some much needed relief for our senior citizens, the basic trouble, the basic ailments of our economy still remained with us, because of the fact that the Conservatives supplied no basic alternative. The main problems inherited from the Liberal Government remained unsolved.

I would like to mention the fact, Mr. Speaker, that in my estimation the installation of the Conservative Government in Ottawa, resembles very closely the installation of a second-hand incubator, filled with all the stale and musty eggs that the Liberals had been sitting on for twenty years. One of these eggs, Mr. Speaker, the health insurance egg, is over forty years old and is being handled with extreme care by both these political parties.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the solutions, that are being offered by these old line parties will prove sterile, because they fail to deal with the basic problems, the basic troubles with which we are faced today. These are problems which will not be solved by giving our home-owners another ten years to mortgage their future or by giving tax cuts to industries which have already had too many tax cuts. We are not suffering, Mr. Speaker, from any shortage of goods. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics, December 30th issue, showed that steel mills were operating at 47.2% of their rated capacity, compared to 58.3% for the same period a year earlier. This same issue of D.B.S. showed wholesale sales in October at \$689,751,000, as compared to \$721,015,000 in the same month last year, or a decrease of 4.3%. Apart from agricultural surpluses, Mr. Speaker, a glimpse into Canadian warehouses and new car show rooms and used car lots will provide evidence that Canadian people are not suffering from their inability to produce goods or to produce services. They are suffering from a lack of purchasing power. The extent to which our so-called

**February 21, 1961**

prosperity has been based on credit, or credit buying, I believe should serve as a guide to those who are sincerely looking for a cause and a solution to our actual problems.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, and in all sincerity, that all Members on both sides of the House are interested in and are sincerely looking for a solution to these problems. Therefore, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a former Member of Parliament, and reveal some views which he has expressed on this matter. I quote:

“I believe that the price decontrol policy of the Government in post war years will go down in history as the greatest blunder made by Prime Minister MacKenzie King in his long years in office. During the war years, the Government made a fairly good job of maintaining price controls. However, with the end of the war, large commercial and industrial interests brought terrific pressure to bear on the Government to remove controls. They found that they were not making as large profits with controls as they could make without them. You have seen the results. In five months the cost of living has increased drastically. Today the working man is caught in a squeeze. Prices are going up much faster than pay envelopes. That is the chief reason for the current meat packing strike.”

This, Mr. Speaker, is a portion of an address given before the Windsor Club, in October 1947 by the present Leader of the Opposition and Member for Morse Constituency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend this a little further and indicate to you just how right the Leader of the Opposition was on that one specific point. In view of the fact that 95% of Canada's automobile industry is American owned and controlled, I believe the operation of one of these large companies should serve as a point of interest to all Canadians. I refer now to an article in “U.S. News and World Report,” November 14, 1960, which is entitled “Millions into Billions — The Dupont General Motor Story.” This is an account of an anti-trust suit, which was filed against Dupont who, in addition to owning a large chemical concern and various other interests, also controls 23% of General Motors stocks. For our review today, Mr. Speaker, the pertinent point is the fact that Dupont's total investment in General Motors was some \$130 million. Now, the article goes on to say, that the automobile company split

its stock repeatedly and each of the growing number of shares grew in market value and at the present time the original holding has gone up from an original \$130 million to \$3.5 billion and dividends have come to about \$1.8 billion. This, Mr. Speaker, is the record of only 23% of the stock of one of the larger companies.

Several years ago, Mr. Speaker, during a labour dispute it was shown before an arbitration board that this company, a manufacturer of farm trucks and automobiles, had taken out more the previous year in net profits than they had paid in wages.

Another article to which I would call your attention, Mr. Speaker, appeared in "MacLean's Magazine" on March 12, 1960 and describes the operations of Sir Eric Bowater. He is the owner of the Bowater Paper Corporation in Newfoundland, and it states:

"In 1959 Bowater made \$50 million profit, an increase of \$3 million over the preceding years profit."

The article also states that during Newfoundland's logging strike last year, Bowater's general manager, Albert Martin, sided openly with Premier Joseph Smallwood in his successful attempt to crush the International Woodworkers of America who were at that time asking for a 52 hour week.

I wish at this time, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention also to an article, which appeared in "The Star Weekly" a short while ago entitled "Why are Drugs so Costly?" This article states, and I quote:

"Canadians have learned that the high cost of being ill is a public scandal. Credit is due to U.S. Senator Kefauver, whose congressional subcommittee has revealed that some big-name companies are charging Americans and Canadians outlandish prices for new wonder drugs. In one case a mark up of 10,000% was discovered on tranquilizers and cortisone derivatives.

It is now known that Europeans are getting the same drugs for comparatively minor cost. A tranquilizer by the brand name of Largactil, which sells in France for 77¢ per 100 tablets, in the United States costs \$5.50 and in Toronto \$6.75.

**February 21, 1961**

The U.S. senate subcommittee heard testimony that some mental patients released from institutions as a result of tranquilizer therapy could not afford to go on paying for this medication, so they are confined again in mental hospitals.

From the evidence in Washington, and initial studies in Canada, it appears that some brand name drugs are being vigorously promoted among physicians and patients, while the opportunity to buy the drugs by their chemical name is being ignored. A drug, named by the brand name of Pen-Vee retails in Toronto for \$50.62 per 100 tablets. The identical drug, under its chemical name phenoxymethyl penicillin, sells for \$18 for 100 tablets. Similarly, hydrocortisone acetate tablets, in the 20 milligram size are sold in Toronto at \$40.00 a 1000, but under their brand name of Hydrocortisone, they retail at \$295 per thousand. In some cases the mark-up reaches 3,000%.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are not isolated cases, but I believe, that they will serve to indicate what is happening under our so-called free enterprise system which the Opposition speaks of in such glowing terms.

I believe, this also indicated, Mr. Speaker, why the Commission which is studying the causes of the problems of unemployment may not get within shooting distance of the real problem.

As some Members may know, I am a member of a trade union organization and I am pleased to point this fact out to Members opposite and Members on this side of the House. I am also Secretary of Moose Jaw Lodge 521 Brotherhood Local Firemen and Enginemen, I have also spent ten years as a tenant farmer.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I must point out to the hon. Member that it is now 10 o'clock.

**Mr. Dahlman:** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

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

The House adjourned at 10 o'clock p.m.