

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
19th Day

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

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

ANNOUNCEMENT RE SALE OF PURPLE GAS BY SERVICE STATIONS

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to make one very brief comment. It has come to the attention of the government that some dealers throughout Saskatchewan are selling purple gasoline from service station pumps. In most cases this is through lack of knowledge of the new act. However, I must point out that such sales are completely illegal and there are substantial fines involved for infractions of the law.

Some operators may purchase purple gasoline from bulk dealers only, but under no circumstances may tax-free gasoline be sold through pumps at service stations, and I am sure dealers will wish to co-operate with the government in this regard.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Henry Baker (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to extend a welcome, through you, to a group of fine young students in the Speakers Gallery, from the St. Marks separate school, in the Glen Elm Park district. Mr. Yano, their principal is here with them. You know this school is in the finest constituency in Regina, namely Regina East. We want to welcome them most sincerely. Mr. Yano has always taken a great interest in his students to see that they visit and watch the legislative bodies in action. I think he has been here before with another class sometime in the past. We welcome them and hope they will enjoy their stay here this afternoon, and I am sure some day amongst them we will find future members for this legislative assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I, too, want to join with my colleagues in extending a welcome to the twenty-seven grade seven and eight students who are here from St. Marks school with their teacher, Mr. Yano. On behalf of the assembly, may I express the hope that their stay here today will be both informative and pleasant.

STATEMENT BY MR. SMISHEK RE LABOR DONE ON HOME

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Labor (Mr. Coderre) in his address charged that I was a poor example of my principles because he had heard that I was getting work done on my house by a "scab" building contractor who did not possess the qualifications for the job.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the clerk, a Photostat copy of a Journeyman's Licence and Contractor's Licence, both are issued for 1965, under the authority of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre). Further on checking with the Department of Labour, they state they have no information on any housebuilding contractors having union contracts in the city of Regina, or for that matter in the province. The unions concur with this. The imputations of the minister were damaging to me and to my reputation in the light of my employment and my belief in labor organizations. They are also damaging to other citizens of the province . . .

An Hon. Member: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! There is a point of order raised. Take your point of order.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — My point of order is that the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) is out of order. He has made a speech in this debate and this

March 2, 1965

is no time for him to be making a speech as he is doing at this moment. He is completely out of order.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is speaking on a point of privilege and he is quite within his rights.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, he said that he was speaking on a point of order, and that is not a point of order.

Mr. Smishek: — In view of the facts that I have now stated, I ask the minister to make an outright withdrawal of his statement concerning myself and the contractor concerned.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like a ruling from you as to whether the hon. member is in order or not.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I think it is a fairly well known fact that if a person wishes to correct a statement, he can do so before the Orders of the Day, but he should have risen on a question of privilege instead of sort of slipping this thing around the corner when he was introducing the students. It would have been a lot better if it had been done that way. Now, we cannot have a debate on this, you understand. Are you finished stating your point of privilege.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would ask the minister to make an outright withdrawal of his statement concerning both myself and the contractor concerned in matters referred to previously.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on this . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I recognize the lady member for Saskatoon.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mrs. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, I regret that I take the floor from the Leader of the Opposition, but I think I do it for very good purposes. We have a group of school children from Regina, and I cannot say whether the group of children that I would like to draw attention to are superior children but I would point out that they come from a very much superior city. They are from Saskatoon, from King George school, and we all want to greet them here today with their teacher, Mrs. Sutherland. I should add that I am quite pleased that they have witnessed here some of the actual operations of the house, back and forth. Embarrassing though it may be within the house from time to time, I think it is interesting for young people to see that this goes on.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Harry D. Link (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the other four members on this side of the house I would like to add our word of welcome to the students from King George School and to the teacher, Mrs. Sutherland. We hope this visit will be very pleasant and very informative.

QUESTION RE SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON CROWN CORPORATIONS

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask the Premier a question in connection with the motion by the member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) just now, concerning members of the Select Standing Committee on Crown Corporations. It is unlikely for a few weeks that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Lloyd, will be with us. Could we have the consent of the house to strike his name off the Crown Corporations Committee or add somebody? He will not be here for a few weeks yet.

Mr. Thatcher: — The government certainly would be in agreement with that.

QUESTION RE APPOINTMENT OF GENERAL MANAGER FOR THE SASKATCHEWAN FOREST PRODUCTS

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources, (Mr. Cuelenaere). The other day he made an announcement with respect to the appointment of a general manager of the Saskatchewan Forest Products. I wonder if he would advise the house by whom the appointment was made, and advise whether he recalls the date of the Board meeting at which the decision was made.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Health): — Why ask the question now, it should have been given notice.

Hon. J.M. Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources): — Well, I will accept that as notice . . .

Hon. Lionel Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I thought I should lay on the table, for distribution, the classification of industries — that famous question that was not answered.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I want to express my thanks to the Hon. Minister of Labour.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I must rise again and ask for the withdrawal of the statement made by the Hon. Minister of Labour.

Mr. Speaker: — I am sorry, the member can ask for a withdrawal. The member can rise on a point of privilege — what the minister or somebody else does is up to them, and we cannot have a debate on it save by substantive motion. Who was next here?

Mr. Coderre: — On the point of order, I think the matter under question is a debatable question and it is just a question of a matter of opinion. This is his opinion he is expressing, I have the facts.

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife): — A typical answer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

BUDGET DEBATE

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thatcher, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Blakeney, and the proposed sub-amendment thereto by Mr. Michayluk.

Mr. Frank K. Radloff (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker and members of the legislature, I will continue my remarks on the debate on the budget motion, as outlined by the Premier and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) of this province and I will repeat the remarks that I made of the tremendous feeling of pride I have in being associated with a man who is determined to fulfil his promises and the predictions that he made prior to the election.

Tax cuts and the efficient operation of government departments promise an improved standard of government operation, and I can assure the members and the people of Saskatchewan that the Premier of this province, Premier Thatcher, will be recognized as one of the outstanding and truly great Premiers of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Radloff: — Mr. Speaker, I do not blame the opposition members for being concerned about government tax cuts, and the possibility of people of Saskatchewan having more money to spend on the necessities for more abundant living. The members on the opposite side of the house have a sanctimonious feeling that they are their "Brothers Keepers" and they are entitled to take his sometimes meagre funds for shared benefits. It is apparent that

March 2, 1965

members on the opposite side view with dismay recognition by a Liberal government of the need of tax cuts to stimulate the economy.

Mr. Speaker, for the past number of days I have been sitting with the Public Accounts Committee. I can say that it is unfortunate that all the people of Saskatchewan do not have the opportunity to view the somewhat scandalous way public funds are sometimes used and dispersed. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat difficult to obtain the complete picture of the public accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1964. With so many expenditures and so little information, it is easy to see how a government can and did slip into careless and inefficient operations . . .

Mr. Fred Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. That committee has not yet reported to this house.

Mr. Speaker: — Which committee are you referring to?

Mr. Dewhurst: — The Public Accounts Committee, they have not reported to this house and what summation the committee makes, cannot be debated until the report is received.

Mr. Speaker: — The point of order is well taken.

Mr. Radloff: — Mr. Speaker, it is too bad and it is very sad that the time for accounting has arrived for the past government of Saskatchewan. I feel deeply for the members in the opposition and for the friends of the people in the opposition, who are going to have to get by in the future under reduced circumstances. I can see little hope for a changed position for the people of this province with the government that has gone out of office, but the new government promises a new and more efficient type of government. Some day, I suppose we of this province will find out how much this past government has cost us in some of the projects which they have presented, programs such as Saskatchewan in Motion by one of our television members.

It is indeed an honor and certainly a privilege for me to be a member of Her Majesty's Government, which I am sure will make many major contributions to the economy, welfare and the advancement of the people of Saskatchewan. For many years, Saskatchewan has been looked upon by other provinces in Canada as a rather poor relation, or weak sister, requiring assistance or special consideration in many areas. Only too frequently charts or statistics show several fields of national growth that indicate Saskatchewan is trailing other provinces or not far from the bottom.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this trend will be changed under the present government, and I predict over the next four years as we are able to introduce new legislation and carry out our planned program of establishing new industry with full employment and other related benefits, these changes will be greater than this province has ever experienced before. Several of the hon. members have already indicated many specific cases which have occurred in the last few months, which bears this out and these will, of course, continue to accrue in the future.

Mr. Speaker, one area I would like to deal with is the development of the water resources of the Saskatchewan River, in conjunction with the hydro power and development to supply the needs of industrial growth I mentioned a moment ago. Along with this industrial growth, there are other associated benefits that come hand-in-hand with that growth requiring the consumption of water and a supply of energy. Since the early days of history, the development of Saskatchewan and the prairies in general have been profoundly influenced by the existence of the Saskatchewan River. Initially the fur trade in the seventeenth century was carried out on this water highways of the prairies, carrying fur and trade goods and early settlers all the way from Hudson Bay and eastern Canada, through to eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains.

Early Saskatchewan history along the river is most interesting and I would like to refer to the recent archaeological explorations immediately south-west of the town of Nipawin. Most interesting explorations were carried out during the past two years at the Francois-Findlay site adding much to Saskatchewan's history. Wherever the settlement grew, the river carried a new era of traffic in the form of steam driven stern wheelers, operating from the northern end of Lake Winnipeg across northern Manitoba

into the South Saskatchewan River, where they travelled as far as Lethbridge, within the sight of the Rocky mountains and on the North Saskatchewan river as far as the city of Edmonton.

Now the Saskatchewan River has entered its third and probably its greatest era, contributing to the development of the prairie region. Its energy and water are now being brought under the control of man, to provide water for agriculture, homes, industry, recreation and power development. In late 1959 the Saskatchewan Power Corporation announced the start of construction of a hydro electric station at Squaw Rapids on the main branch of the Saskatchewan River some forty miles down stream from Nipawin. The construction of this project meant much to employment and the economy of the area. Unfortunately some of the good work and the benefits were neutralized by the lack of good management and poor foresight. I am referring to the hundreds of logs and the piles of debris left on the shores and in the water of Tobin Lake. These logs and debris are going to prevent this lake from becoming the great resort that this province and the people of this province could have had. This lake could have been a wonderful resort with proper management.

Mr. Speaker, the progress of a nation is often measured in the growth of electrical demands and electrical consumption of its people. Of all the countries in the world, Canada rates second only to Sweden in the electrical consumption per capita. In terms of rate of growth the new industrial development policies of this new Liberal government will move Saskatchewan ahead, ahead of all other Canadian provinces. The Squaw Rapids Hydro Electric Station will be able to supply the electrical needs of the new industrial growth for a limited time only. It is a matter of urgency that immediate steps be taken to plan for new developments that the policies of our government are encouraging.

The value of Squaw Rapids on the provincial electrical system is enhanced by the fact that now orders have been placed by newly elected Liberal government for the expansion of the Squaw Rapids station with the addition of two turbines and generators to be installed and operating by early 1967.

Mr. Speaker, the total possible installations on the Saskatchewan River would indicate a development of about 400,000,000 horsepower which is in excess of the Canadian installation at Niagara Falls.

At the present time, the people of my constituency have been watching with interest the investigations that are continuing on another potential hydro site adjacent to the town of Nipawin. There is every indication that Nipawin will be selected as the next development for a hydro electric station in Saskatchewan. All information substantiates that this development is one of the most economical power developments after due consideration of all aspects in relation to the value received. I should also point out that such a dam at Nipawin could provide the necessary and adequate river crossing facilities for the heavy traffic over highway no. 35. The present railroad bridge in the vicinity of Nipawin is no longer adequate and is restrictive to the development of this constituency.

Mr. Speaker, rapid industrial development of Saskatchewan's resources demands continuous utilization of Saskatchewan's water resources for power. It takes no great amount of imagination to see the consequences of this development. There is no doubt that communities along the Saskatchewan river will develop and grow into larger communities — grow into important cities — growth that will provide employment and stimulate commerce.

I would like to refer to my earlier predictions of a rapidly expanding industrial economy in the Nipawin constituency. We see many developments ahead. Developments that will be encouraged by the budget presented to this legislature by our able Premier and Provincial Treasurer. Solid advancement multiplied through the length and breadth of Saskatchewan will mean a better life for the people of this province. Today, Mr. Premier and his determined cabinet are providing the leadership and guidance to bring Saskatchewan to the forefront as Canada's fastest growing province.

Today, I would like to present to this legislature one of the many major problems of my constituency, one of the problems that I know the people on the opposite side of the house created, and this government should do something about. I have a statement from the Fish and Game League of north-eastern Saskatchewan, a report that they presented to the past government and the past government did nothing about it. So I would like to present this report to the legislature. This report is in reference to the moose season. It seems quite evident that a shorter hunting season is in

March 2, 1965

order due to the shrinking moose population. Figures from the Department of Natural Resources show that in 1961, 9,997 licences were sold and 6,054 moose taken and hunting success, 64 per cent. In 1962, 12,422 licences sold and 5,066 moose taken and the hunting success was 40 per cent. In 1963, 9,726 licences sold, 3,144 moose taken and hunting success 32 per cent. Now we do not have the figures for 1964, the figures that I have presented show that in the years the moose harvest has dropped 50 per cent, indicating a sharp drop in population.

Now whereas we have been opposed in our area to the early moose season, it no doubt has some merit in the northern areas that seem to be inaccessible, but the later season does seem out of order in view of the reduced moose population on the edge of settled areas and in this view our moose population is on the decrease and we would ask the government to take some action to return to the one season only for moose.

Again, I must congratulate our Provincial Treasurer on the most forward budget presented to the Saskatchewan legislature in two decades. Never before have election promises been acted upon so promptly. Opposition members sneer at tax cuts, but I know they will well rue the days they used to hamper the adoption of proposed progressive legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the sub-amendment and the amendment, and I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bryan H. Bjarnason (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, in entering the debate at this date, it gives me my first opportunity to offer you my congratulations on your election to the office of Speaker. Your office in the legislature is one of authority, and I am certain by now every member in this assembly respects the manner in which you carry out this authority. My congratulations most certainly go also to those members in the legislature for their election in their respective constituencies. Special emphasis is intended in this regard for those who have been successful for the first time. I wish to extend my appreciation to the people of the Kelvington constituency for the support I was given by them. I will try and do my level best to serve their needs, I believe it quite significant that, previous to last April 22nd, the Kelvington constituency was represented by the CCF for a period of twenty-six consecutive years. The fact that it is now represented by a Liberal member is now worthy of mention.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bjarnason: — In my opinion this indicates repudiation of a system, repudiation of an experiment and repudiation of a form of government that previous to the election of the CCF in Saskatchewan was untried in Canada.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to direct my remarks to the field of agriculture and rural Saskatchewan in general. I do this because the budget which was so capably presented by the Premier in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer, clearly indicates that this government recognizes the tremendous importance of our rural people and the concern that this government has for improvement of their status. I do this also because the Kelvington constituency is basically agricultural. In so doing, I would like to use illustrations from my own constituency. Nineteen sixty-four proved to be a year of comparatively good crop conditions in the Kelvington constituency, although frost damage was quite extensive, yields were above average compared with many other areas in the province.

One of the many points in the budget which will prove of great interest to my constituents is the commencement of the fodder shelter program. We have experienced in the past fluctuating supplies of fodder due to varying climatic conditions. We have years when hay supplies are short. This results in either unwarranted reductions in our livestock or increased costs in purchase of hay which has to be brought from other areas. These purchases are usually at prices far beyond normal prices and beyond the capabilities of what our farmers can afford. The government has indicated that a start will be made on this program this year and it will be improved and expanded in the years ahead. Farmers with surplus fodder supplies will be able to obtain grants to aid in constructing these shelters. This will prevent spoilage of fodder supplies and permit storage for use in years when hay crops are not abundant.

Of rather greater concern to me in our constituency is the plight

of our small farmers. We have many farmers living on small holdings in the low assessed areas, who are trying to exist on incomes as low as \$800 a year. These people need assistance and need it soon. Since the Second World War, Saskatchewan rural areas have undergone a tremendous change. Before the war, the average farmer fed ten or twelve people, now he feeds thirty. With one-third fewer workers, his production has doubled due to the great change in farm mechanization. Prices for farm products have remained low and farms have been forced to become larger and larger, to remain in business. ARDA indicates that many of our farms are uneconomic. We in Saskatchewan have been losing farmers at a rate of 2,500 to 3,000 per year. These are only the symptoms of the problem. Much of the land of this province should never have been broken in the first place, as it is more often suitable for grazing purposes than cultivation. Accompanying this unfortunate set of circumstances has been a steady increase in technology. Farms have become more mechanized and machinery costs have risen, yet the price of the farm products has not. These conditions have resulted in a steadily declining net income because most of the farms have been unable to change with the times.

The children of farmers often leave the farm, and many farmers have to look for off-farm work to supplement their declining incomes. Since these people are, more often than not, unskilled, work is difficult to find and as the prosperity of the farmer turns to hardship, so does that of the rest of the rural community whose economy is largely centred around servicing the farmers. Thus many rural areas gradually slip into severe economic depression, with the people who are left there, having neither the knowledge or the means to free themselves from the conditions in which they are caught up. As a result they slip further into poverty and despair. Some who try to start a new life in the city find that permanent jobs are hard to find for an unskilled man and, more often than not, rural poor sometimes become the urban poor.

This, Mr. Speaker, is why I see so much hope in the budget. Besides its aid to agriculture, it encourages once again investment into our province. This investment, coupled with private enterprise, will mean new jobs and these jobs will help to combat the problems of poverty which I mentioned. This is where the Socialists fell behind, they failed to attract investment capital and they failed to create the necessary jobs to assist low-income farmers who were trying to find alternative sources of employment. The Socialists professed to call themselves "The friend of the laborer", yet in this regard they did nothing. One need, to any rural development program, is education. Education is one way in which new alternatives will be brought to the attention of those less fortunate. For it is basically the failure to adjust to change that causes poverty.

Mr. Speaker, this government has recognized the tremendous way in which education can be used in combating poverty. As a result it has made plans to increase aid in all levels of education. Statistics show that most of our unemployed have less than a grade eight education. This government expects to spend \$4,800,000 more this year for educational purposes — in other words an increase to an all time high of \$61,652,000. These are the ways I think some of our small farmers who are having difficulty can be helped, by creating alternative sources of employment, by encouraging investment money to come into Saskatchewan, and by increasing the expenditures in education. This budget is only the beginning of an attempt to help out the rural areas of our province.

I would like to deal now, Mr. Speaker, with another aspect of life in the riding of the Kelvington constituency, that I believe has application in many parts of this province. I refer, of course, to the situation that prevails there with respect to our Indian population. It is not too different from that which prevails on many reserves in Saskatchewan. At the present time, the hon. members opposite say that we are endangering the plight of our Indian population by establishing a special agency to deal with the problems that beset them. We have all been saying for more than half a century that we must avoid isolating the Indians from the rest of our society. Mr. Speaker, we have used that argument as an excuse for doing nothing and in so doing we have permitted the current legislation which would appear to further segregate them from the society in which the rest of us live. However, the intent of the government is quite the opposite. It is meant to extend to our Indian and Metis population those programs that are now available to the white population of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bjarnason: — In particular, I would mention two aspects which I believe

March 2, 1965

merit special attention. One is the question of the opportunity of our Indian population to make a living through agriculture. The other has to do with providing such utilities as electricity, and telephones to reserves, most of which now lack these modern day conveniences which are available to virtually every white citizen in Saskatchewan in 1965.

First on the question of agricultural policies with respect to Indians. It is a matter of history that under the various treaties signed with the federal government up to and including the treaties of 1906, the boundaries of reserves land are fixed by law. In other words, all land was originally allocated to bands on a per capita basis, that basis was as the population stood at the time of the signing of the respective treaty. Since then, no additional lands have been allocated to most bands in Saskatchewan, and when you further consider the rapidly increasing population on reserves, it will be evident to any one familiar with agriculture in 1965, that those farm units of necessity must be quite un-economic today.

It also becomes clear for many of our Indians, even those working good land, the resources are quite inadequate. Unfortunately, however, not all the land now being farmed by Indians in Saskatchewan is good crop land. In some areas, this soil is of marginal value. In other areas, although the soil is basically good, many of the native population lack training in the agricultural skills necessary to good farm management. This is an area, Mr. Speaker, in which the provincial government can be of real help to our Indian population. If we recognize that most of our Indians want to be given guidance in the matter of good farm management, then we must see our way clear to train them in those skills that will increase the productivity of their lands, and greatly improve the standard of living of our Indian people. Hand-outs, social aid, or special guarantees are not what our Indian s need from the provincial government. All they require is a better working knowledge of agriculture, as it applies in 1965.

The same principle applies to the matter of electrification of Indian reserves in Saskatchewan. I believe we all realize that it is not feasible at the present time to supply power to a small number of very remote reserves. It is possible, however, to commence a program of electrification on most of our reserves that would show in a very real manner that we do indeed want our Indian population to enjoy the same services and utilities that we are prepared to make available to white citizens in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, to encourage the Indian people to raise their standard of living, we have to be prepared to show them some evidence of these higher living standards. Surely a start on a program of electrification would, for example, permit the construction of more modern housing units on the reserves. It would insure a higher level of social life on the reserves. It would permit more and more of our Indian population to raise their educational standards by having available to them the advantages of radio and television. Finally, it would permit the building on the reserves of a certain number of small domestic industries and it would be a beginning at least of a source of income for some percentage of our Indian people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have indicated most certainly my enthusiasm for the budget which I know will be of great benefit to the citizens of my constituency, therefore, I would like to make it quite clear that I intend to vote for the motion and against the amendment and the sub-amendment.

Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would first like to add my congratulations to the others, on your election to Speaker of this house. I feel sure you will do honor to the position. I feel very humble in this house and yet very proud that the electors of Meadow Lake constituency saw fit to elect me to represent them. I can assure them that I will do my utmost to warrant that trust.

The Meadow Lake constituency is a very large one and has a wide variety of interests as well as problems. Mr. Speaker, since I was first nominated five years ago as a Liberal candidate and again in 1963 to contest the Meadow Lake riding, in which I have lived for some thirty years, I have spent much of my time before, during, and after the election to make myself even better acquainted with the needs, hopes and aspirations of the people

of this constituency. It has been a most enlightening experience in the present thinking of the pioneer people who have been dominated for some twenty years by a government whose political philosophy had been "the government knows best — just leave everything to us and we will take care of you". That government for twenty years marched under a banner that proclaimed "I am my brothers' keeper" and they were.

There are men, women and children in Saskatchewan who through age, sickness, and other disabilities need to be kept, and the people of Saskatchewan have long proved their sincere wish to see that they are given every possible care. That wish goes far beyond party lines. No party and no government has the monopoly on decent human instincts. On the other hand, I find able and fit people in my constituency, who through no fault of their own, could find no means of supporting themselves or their families, though they desired to do so. To these people, the CCF-NDP government said "Don't give it a thought. If we cannot find a job for you on the government payrolls we will keep you anyway — there are plenty of well-to-do farmers, business men, wage and salary earners who can well afford to pay for your upkeep and we will see that they do". And they did. Here is where the Liberal and CCF-NDP differ widely. I think the Liberal party has a banner too, not for how, rabble rousing or sectionalism, but for action. The Liberal banner does not say "I am my brothers' keeper" it says "I am my brothers' brother. I shall do everything in my power".

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — "We will do everything we can to provide opportunities to develop his own initiative, preserve his own pride, and strengthen his own sense of responsibility towards his fellow man, his province and his government." The banner has been presented to this legislature when the Provincial Treasurer brought down the budget, and for the first time, in twenty years, it says to the people of Saskatchewan "This government believes that the people of this province ask only for the opportunities to earn their own keep rather than to be kept by the government." This was the predominant thought I found among the people in the Meadow Lake constituency when they supported my candidature in no uncertain way in the last provincial election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — The economy of the northern part of the Meadow Lake constituency depends largely on commercial fishing. There are over 5,500,000 pounds of commercial fish shipped out of that area every year, in addition to the amount of fish that is taken out by the tourists.

The policies under the previous administration have almost ruined our lakes for commercial fishing — due to the use of small mesh nets, and opening the seasons when the fish are spawning. I feel that a whole new policy must be established so that the quantity and the quality of commercial fish will be maintained and expanded in the years to come. With this in mind, I would recommend we look into the feasibility of opening a fish hatchery in the Meadow Lake constituency. I would also like to see the government look into the feasibility of control gates on the Churchill River, up at Patchinak to control the levels of all those lakes in the north in high water, as well as in low water years.

In the north, we have a large mink ranch industry. I think we should take a long look at the fees and licences that these ranchers have had to pay over the years to take raw fish from the lakes to feed their mink. This is a valuable industry in the north and the high fees charged in the past have forced some of our ranchers to leave there and go to B.C. and other provinces to carry on their mink ranching operations. They are even charged commercial rates for power which I feel is unjust. I feel they should be classified as farmers or ranchers, and pay a farm rate for their power.

We have to create far more opportunities for the people in the north, and I feel some of this can be done by expanding education and the development of the north. These people want freedom to earn their own livelihood and not have to seek social welfare as they have in the past.

I would like to say a bit about the town of Meadow Lake. It is situated, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the Canadian Pacific Railway and it is the jumping off point for goods and services for a large area to the north. It is also a collection depot for exports to the south. Total export trade from the area totals to millions of dollars annually and consists of fish,

March 2, 1965

fur, pulp wood, railroad ties, grain, grass feed, livestock, dairy and poultry products and last but not least, lumber. Meadow Lake is one of the largest grain storage centres in western Canada. The storage capacity is over a million bushels, and there is over 3,000,000 bushels handled annually. We also have a large ranching area. There are over 50,000 head of cattle in the area. Some 6,000 go through the agricultural stockyards per year besides what are trucked out to Alberta from the west side. In our area, we have a lot of farmers who would be excellent farmers if they were able to obtain credit for clearing and breaking new land. As it is, they have not the required assets to qualify for long term loans and, therefore, they are gradually being squeezed off the land for this reason, and I do not feel we can afford to lose them. Mr. Speaker, these people play a vital part in any community, and every consideration should be given to making credit available so that they can improve their standard of living and stay on the farm.

Mr. Nollet: — What credit have you?

Mr. Coupland: — Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to hear the member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) talking on credit for the small farmers, and I just wonder after twenty years in operation why they haven't done something about it . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a question . . .

Mr. Coupland: — . . . with the ARDA program . . .

Mr. Nollet: — On a question of privilege, the hon. member stated that we had done nothing about it. May I reassure him that we passed the legislation last session to provide this credit, but it was never used by the new government. Well, use it now, don't wait another twenty years . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! That is not a question of privilege.

Mr. Coupland: — I think the small farmers in my area will know what I mean. I am wholly in agreement with the ARDA program and I understand they are aware of this credit or lack of credit situation too and are looking for a solution.

There is one thing I would like to say in regard to setting up of projects in any area, whether they be fodder projects, community projects, or any other projects, and that is that we give the people concerned in these areas a voice in the matter. I feel that we are responsible to the people of this province and for too long they have been dictated to by a government who felt they knew best what was good for the people. It is time the people had some voice in their own affairs and I am sure they are going to get this under the new Liberal government. Another thing that would help many of the small farmers in the Meadow Lake constituency would be the cancellation of the debts incurred by these farmers in the early thirties. These people went into that area and opened up land under severe conditions and I am talking from experience. I homesteaded in that country in 1932, and I know what conditions they had to work under. This development by the pioneers in those days has given this province a great asset for today.

Turning to the lumber industry, in the Meadow Lake constituency, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention some of the operations we have. We have the Erickson Box Factory in Meadow Lake, which employs a large number of people the year around and utilizes a considerable amount of forest products in the manufacture of boxes, snow fencings, survey stakes and lathes, as well as lumber. Our timber planning mill burned last year, with the result that a lot of people have been out of work for considerable time during the winter. However, a modern planning mill should be in operation this month and I am sure we will be able to handle the timber that is taken out in the area. Over \$5,000,000 worth of forest products comes out of that area per year. Mr. Eikel has a mill going up at Isle La Crosse right now and he tells me that by the end of this week he will have over a hundred workers on the payroll. The one thing that is interesting to note, is that over fifty per cent of his workers will be of native or local residents from that area, and I can assure this house, it means a lot to the people of the north to have these job opportunities.

Some of the parts of the budget, Mr. Speaker, that I feel will

help the people in my area in particular, are of course, the use of tax-free gas in farm trucks and the removal of items such as barb wire, cattle oiler, welding machinery, etc., from the list of taxable items. These items of the budget I am sure are welcomed by the farmers regardless of what the members opposite say. We also hope our area will benefit from some of the incentive programs outlined in the budget in regard to oil and mineral development.

I am very happy to hear about the development throughout the province in potash and mining and so on. It is easy to see why we could have more job opportunities than we will be able to fill in the future. All I can say is, what a difference from the past when our people had to leave the province in order to obtain work!

When the member from Cumberland, (Mr. Berezowsky) was speaking the other day, he mentioned that Alberta does not have to offer incentives to attract industry. Mr. Speaker, they did not have to. We had a Socialist government here in Saskatchewan that drove all the industry into Alberta including all the saw mills from the Meadow Lake constituency . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — . . . and the ones that stayed . . .

Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — The hon. member is saying something I did not say. I never said the government should not give incentives, I said — if he wants to know what I said, I will tell him . . .

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member wishes to make a statement in regard to something he thinks he may be misquoted on, the time to do that is when the other member is finished speaking. That is the proper place for asking questions. If the member does not indicate that he wishes to give way by taking his seat, then he has the right to continue with his speech uninterrupted.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — . . . including the saw mills from the Meadow Lake constituency, and the ones that stayed gradually went broke due to the policies of the Timber Board at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is no wonder Alberta does not have to offer incentives. One thing I found significant, Mr. Speaker, is that almost without exception, the speakers from the opposition in this Budget Debate have been unable to criticize the budget, so have used their time to try to ridicule our Premier and the Liberal government.

Mr. Speaker, it has taken a long time, since the people in Saskatchewan have had such a forward looking budget brought down in this house and I am sure they are as happy as I am about it. Mr. Speaker, I feel very proud and will take great pleasure in standing up in this house beside the Premier of this province to vote in support of this far-reaching budget. Needless to say, I will not support the amendment or the sub-amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member from Saskatoon would give me one minute to make an announcement in the house that I am sure all members will be anxious to hear.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FINAL WHEAT PAYMENT

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — The Canadian Wheat Board have just announced the final payment on last year's crop. The final payment for hard spring wheat will average 48.725 cents . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . on durum 43.217 cents average, this will mean a total payment to the wheat producers of \$271,964,000. About half this amount will come to our Saskatchewan farmers and cheques will commence to come from the Board on March 8th next.

March 2, 1965

Mr. W. Robbins (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) made this statement but I wish he had made it on Liberal time.

An Hon. Member: — Don't you like it?

Mr. Robbins: — I like it very much, Mr. Speaker. This is my first opportunity to rise in debate in this house and I wish along with other hon. members to express to you my congratulations on your appointment to the vital post as Speaker of this assembly, Mr. Speaker. I feel that it is a signal honor and I feel that you will have singular success in the discharge of your duties. I would like to add my congratulations to other members of this house with respect to all members elected, both old and new.

The new Saskatchewan Liberal government which took office on May 22nd, 1964, recently introduced its first budget. The Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) the hon. member for Prince Albert, described it as a courageous budget. I am certain that it took a good deal of courage to introduce this budget . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — . . . which is potentially a deficit-type budget. It definitely takes the route down the road to deficit financing.

The Provincial Treasurer described the province as having a buoyant economy and we on this side would certainly agree with this. This then, seems a very inopportune time to engage in deficit financing when we are in very buoyant times. Apparently, the new budget is something that we in Saskatchewan will have to bear, along with bad winter weather, toleration of senators, wheat price declines, and the Saskatchewan Liberal party.

Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest the other day, that the member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) referred, I think rather sneeringly, to people on this side as NDPers. Mr. Speaker, I would like you to take notice of the fact that the people on your right are SLPers, and if they think that means "slow long play" it certainly might apply to their program, but it means Saskatchewan Liberal Party. The Saskatchewan Liberal Party is essentially a Conservative party and with all due deference to the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) I would describe a Conservative as an individual who will fight to the death to prevent from passing out what his father fought to the death to prevent from coming in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — The Premier assumed his secondary role as Provincial Treasurer and presented his budget on Friday last. He divulged in the 1965-66 estimates, that he anticipates a surplus of \$249,960. This is indeed a modest surplus, if realized. I am certain that it must have been the Provincial Treasurer speaking and not the Premier, for anything modest could have no connection whatsoever with the hon. gentleman who currently occupies that position.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to look for a few moments at the statistics in the budget. Hon. members recall that the former Provincial Treasurer stated that the government had been successful in saving \$6,500,000. If this is true, and this figure is deleted from the \$225,565,000 expenditures, then we should have a surplus of \$7,835,000 taking into account the \$12,000,000 he anticipates in additional revenues over and above those budgeted for in the 1964-65 estimates. On this basis, and I quote directly from his report, he states that:

the government anticipates a surplus as of March 31st, next, of \$5,500,000.

Where, Mr. Speaker, did the \$2,335,000 disappear? It clearly indicates that the \$6,500,000 is a rather fictitious figure.

The Provincial Treasurer in introducing the budget and commenting on the general trends with respect to the economy in this province, made some comments with respect to capital financing in the last fiscal year, that is the year ending March 31st next. He made a point of the fact that the government, and in this case it would be the previous CCF government,

borrowed \$15,000,000 January 15, 1964, with two maturities, one in 1984, one in 1994, 5 1/2 per cent coupon, with an average yield of 5.59 per cent. He pointed out that, in addition, the government secured \$13,861,200 from the Saskatchewan Savings Bond program. Then on July 15th, they floated an additional bond or debenture. This also was \$15,000,000 worth. A 5 1/2 per cent debenture, priced to yield 5.56 per cent.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer, at that time, mentioned that this money was borrowed for self-liquidating debt. I recall in years gone by, when he was the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), he could not make a differentiation between self-liquidating and dead-weight debt.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — This is typical of the Provincial Treasurer. Give him the party line and he will expound it with vigor and reasonable clarity. Change the party line and he will expound it with equal vigor and clarity, not only proving that the first line was right but that the second line was right also and that the party was right in changing from the first to the second. He attempted to imply that the 5.59 per cent at the beginning of the year, which declined to 5 1/2 per cent on the last flotation in the year, December 1st, when a 5 1/2 per cent yield cost to the government was encountered, indicated perhaps, that the new government had improved the credit rating in the province. This is ridiculous. Surely the Provincial Treasurer of this province knows that every province in Canada borrowed money more cheaply at the end of 1964 than they did at the beginning of 1964. Surely the Provincial Treasurer of this province knows that the rate of interest in this country is largely dependent, and is pretty well set, by the Bank of Canada, the fiscal agent for the federal government of this country, and influenced to some extent by the international money markets in New York, London and Zurich.

Mr. Speaker, surely the Provincial Treasurer of this province knows that there is a severe gold drain in the United States at the present time and if necessary, American authorities will raise interest rates to improve the balance of payments problem in that country, and if this does happen, interest rates in this country will rise. Surely he knows this, Mr. Speaker. If he does not, he should not be Provincial Treasurer in this province today.

I am convinced a lot of people are concerned about the fact that this kind of implication is made. I am convinced that a lot of people are convinced he should not be Provincial Treasurer in this province today. I am also convinced that a lot of people do not think he should occupy the Premier's chair. All around the constituency that I represent, people have clearly indicated that they do not believe he should occupy either the Premier's chair or the Provincial Treasurer's chair, and the Hanley by-election results clearly indicate this to be true.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency I have the honor to represent, along with four other persons in this legislature, will be faced with extremely severe financial problems in the next six to seven years. Mayor Cole and City Commissioner McAskill have recently stated that there is every probability that the city will be facing a real financial crisis. This is due to the fact that we have, in the periphery surrounding the city of Saskatoon, a development of potash mines, one at Delisle, one at Allan, one at Elstow, one at Viscount, one at Patience Lake. The obvious facts stare us in the face. These industrial plants will not pay taxes to the city of Saskatoon. Yet the city of Saskatoon will, of necessity, have to service in large measure, a large number of the employees who work in these plants. They will commute daily from the city of Saskatoon to their jobs in these industrial plants.

We have clear evidence that this situation will recur, as it has already occurred with respect to the city of Edmonton. The city of Edmonton is afflicted with, not only a high municipal tax rate, it is afflicted with a mayor who is a prominent ALPer and that, of course, is a member of the Alberta Liberal party. I urge on the government, to take action with respect to the problems that are arising with respect to the city of Saskatoon. In the last sitting of the legislature, the Industrial Towns Act of 1964 was passed and this act provided some assistance to the town of Lanigan because of the Alwinal people coming in there with a large potash development. This in itself, proves conclusively that Liberal claims that they were responsible for bringing in the Alwinal people are patently false.

I agree, Mr. Speaker, that a good measure of the total economy of our province and our country will, of necessity, be in the hands of private

March 2, 1965

enterprise. I would contend that this was certainly true while the previous government occupied the treasury benches and held the reins of government in this province. This is essentially true now, and was true then, and will be true in the future. However, on balance, is this any reason to belittle or bedevil public and co-operative enterprises? Prior to the provincial election I wrote a letter which was printed in the Star Phoenix letter box. I might say, Mr. Speaker, I am not too successful in getting letters into the letter box of the Star Phoenix. I would like, with your permission, to quote from it. It was entitled "Private and Public Enterprise".

Notwithstanding political assertions to the contrary, Saskatoon is, in general, a prosperous community. How prosperous would it be if the public enterprise of this city were suddenly removed? We would lose the university, the university hospital, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and its generating stations, the Cole plant and the Queen Elizabeth plant, Saskatchewan Government telephones, the Canadian National railway, the Bessborough hotel, the city hall, and all municipal services, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance branch office, T.C.A. and the airport, all our public schools, and all our public separate schools and collegiates, the National Employment Office, the Unemployment Insurance Commission, the post office and probably others which do not currently come to mind.

In addition, we would lose the co-operative organizations, the credit unions, the Wheat Pool flour mill. I readily admit, these do not fall in the same category as the first group, but they are social organizations, serving large groups of consumers who are also owners as well as the consumers of the goods and services.

To hear some people talk, you would think the prosperity of the Saskatoon community was dependent upon the corner drug store. This is not to disparage private business but simply to ask a question, where would they be without the economic base provided by public enterprise?

All too many people parrot ambitious politicians who religiously attempt to disparage public enterprises, asserting by some strange alchemy that they limit the freedom of the individual. This has little basis in economic fact.

What have been the actions of the present liberal government? Its purchasing agency and six crown corporations were members of Federated Co-operatives, the wholesale distributing organization for co-operatives across the prairie regions. It withdrew these memberships from this organization.

Now, I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker, and I would not suggest for one minute that this government would, of its own accord, take out membership in an organization like Federated Co-operatives, but I am a little surprised to withdraw membership. For after all, these six crown corporations they withdrew their original seventy dollars plus \$206,692 in cash, representing patronage refunds on the business transacted by government agencies with Federated Co-operatives.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — That is not a bad investment, Mr. Speaker. Yet perusal of the public accounts clearly indicates only a small percentage of the total government business found its way into co-operative channels. The government did not force government employees to purchase co-operatively. They encouraged them to do so and, as I said before, if you check the public accounts you will find quite clearly that the vast majority of the petroleum and other business required by government agencies, did not go to this organization.

The Provincial Treasurer has a fair bit to say in his budget

report about crown corporations established by the previous administration. I did not argue, nor have I ever argued, that all crown corporations will automatically achieve success. I am not one who argues that every action of a crown corporation is necessarily a correct one. However, I would like to comment briefly on some of these.

The first I would like to make a comment on is the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. In his remarks, with regard to this crown corporation, the Provincial Treasurer made a very significant statement and I quote directly:

It appears evident, at this time, that the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, because of the nature of services provided will be continued.

Well, let us look at this office for a minute or two. He also pointed out that monopoly features would be removed and I will have something to say about that as well. This publicly owned corporation was begun in the year 1945 by the previous government, with a loan of \$12,000 from the provincial treasury. That money was repaid before the end of that year. Yet this organization has returned to the treasury of this province, as indicated in the reports signed by the minister and tabled in this house, of the sum of \$4,986,002 since it was incorporated, and it had an earning of \$376,925 last year.

In addition, this organization has \$20,100,000 in assets and has \$14,800,000 invested in hospital, school, sewer and water debentures. Now it is significant, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we take cognisance of the fact that this is important to the economy of this province. If, for example, the previous government had not required schools and hospitals, which received grants from the government, to place its insurance with SGIO, a goodly portion of the assets built up would not be there and, in addition, a goodly portion of the money now invested in hospitals and schools and sewer and water and municipal debentures would not be there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — The report, which was under the signature of the Minister of Agriculture says \$660,000 was so invested last year. I contend that the action of the previous government with respect to this particular item, made eminent sense. If grants are to be made to hospitals and schools, it is important that the government know that those buildings are insured. Now, I know members opposite, when they sat in the opposition, often used to deride the government and say, for example, that the University Hospital did not need to be insured. This is errant nonsense. Any building must be insured because it can be gutted from within by fire.

Obviously, if the government had to make capital grants in the form of construction grants, if fire did destroy these buildings, then it made a lot of sense to make certain that they were insured. In addition, as I previously pointed out, we had assets being built up and money staying within the province. I would like to say a word or two about the bus company. Notice that the Provincial Treasurer says it will be retained. This is good news. This is a good bus company. We should never forget that we would never have had this bus company had we not had a CCF government in this province. It has returned \$1,274,178 to the treasury of this province, \$167,475 of it last year. It is also significant to note, Mr. Speaker, that of that \$167,475, \$30,907 represents a decrease in depreciation despite the fact that the bus company had the same number of vehicles in 1964 as it had in 1963 and the same basic equipment. Now, I know that people opposite often tell us we do not know anything about business. But here it appears that these people are willing to juggle the figures a bit in order to bring out a better showing than was recorded in the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about Saskair. Saskair is needed in terms of transportation in the north. I readily realize the it has not been as successful financially but the record shows, as tabled in this house, that Saskair has brought \$110,590 in earnings into the provincial treasury, \$28,771 of it last year. The real problem with regard to Saskair, is related to the fact that it should, in all probability, have the route from Prince Albert south to Saskatoon and into Regina. They made a presentation to the Air Transport Board when Transair, a private company, got this route. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, Transair is in trouble. this is true and is well known, I think, in terms of financial resources and with

March 2, 1965

respect to this particular route. Saskair suggested that they would put smaller planes on with ten to fifteen passenger capacity. They suggested that they would do away with ten to fifteen passenger capacity. They suggested that they would do away with meals and coffee breaks and this sort of thing. This made eminent sense. The assumption that competition would make for a good economic airline operation, and that the so-called benefits of airline competition should be applied to airline economics in all places, at all times, Mr. Speaker, is an exceedingly puerile argument. This corporation, as I previously stated, has made \$110,590 for the provincial treasury, and we would not have had that revenue, nor that service, had we not had a CCF government in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — The Provincial Treasurer lumps together the remaining five crown corporations — the Saskatchewan Timber Board, Guarantee and Fidelity, Saskatchewan Sodium Sulphate, Estevan Clay, and Saskatchewan Government Printing, as areas which might be better served by private enterprise.

I do not question the right of members opposite to be critical of the approach in this respect. It is simply a matter of judgment, I think, in relation to the economy of the province, but these crown corporations have accumulated \$11,465,998 in earnings for the people of the province. If you add them on to the previous earnings that I have recorded, in terms of the Government Insurance Office, the bus corporation and Saskair, you would find these total \$17,833,768 — and not one dollar of that amount of money would have been available to the people of this province had we not had a CCF government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — The Provincial Treasurer said that the Saskatchewan government telephones was a well operated organization. This is evidently one crown corporation that he is willing to leave alone. It, of course, comes under the classification of a utility. He did not speak as well with respect to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. He was not satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with the earnings of that corporation last year, which incidentally, were \$5,494,199.

The point we must keep in mind here, I think, is that there was a real vendetta carried out by the government against officials in the Power Corporation. The Provincial Treasurer said, in his remarks in the Budget Debate, that we have a new Board. Well, this is true. Mr. Bowman, who sells spark plugs, replaced Dean Booth of the electrical engineering department of the University of Saskatchewan, Mr. Buckwold, who sells overalls, replaced Mr. A.P. Gleave who represented 65,000 rural customers on the rural electrification program and Mr. T. Myer, who sold out the Conservative party received his political reward. The government of Saskatchewan loaded the Saskatchewan Power Corporation Board, in order to unload the corporation's general manager, Mr. Cass-Beggs. Government ministers, in Public pronouncements, contend that Mr. Cass-Beggs did not have any more qualifications than thousands of other engineers, except that he was a defeated CCF candidate. Mr. Cass-Beggs was president of both the Canadian Electrical Association and the Canadian Gas Association. Mr. Speaker, he gave papers on power and generation of energy in Melbourne, Australia in 1958, and Belgrade, Yugoslavia in 1962. He must have had some ability.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — I would like to quote, if I may, from two articles and I am sure the minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) will not mind this as he was quoting yesterday from the Western Miner and the Northern Miner. I am quoting from Oil Well, a journal of the petroleum industry and also from the Canadian Gas Journal. Let us see what they had to say about this matter.

There was little surprise over the firing of David Cass-Beggs from his position as general manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

He had been fired in effigy many times in the past two years or more when the new Saskatchewan Premier, Ross Thatcher, as Leader of the Opposition, carried on a one man campaign against the S.P.C.

Now, note this, Mr. Speaker.

Grave injustice has been done to the S.P.C. general manager. The practice of firing top government servants after change of government is archaic and disreputable. It sounds like the experience of so many Canadian football coaches, get your team in the Grey Cup playoff and then get fired after the game.

Mr. Jim Armstrong, the western editor of the Canadian Gas Journal, had this to say with respect to it:

I am beginning to question the sanity being exhibited by the new government that has taken over in Canada's wheat province. Ever since Ross Thatcher and company wrestled away government control in Saskatchewan from the twenty year enthroned CCF government, he has been wielding the big axe. Mr. Cass-Beggs ran a good organization and undoubtedly the most complex dual utility distribution system in Canada.

Now, this man says that he does not know too much about electrical generation because he is a natural gas expert, but he does make this comment:

I do know that S.P.C.'s natural gas transmission and distribution system is tops. I have heard of some waste being carried out in S.P.C. but tell me, what crown corporation does not, or for that matter, tell me what free enterprise operation does. not? Mr. Cass-Beggs was respected in the industry. He is leaving big shoes to fill.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the new general manager, Mr. David Furlong, every success in his position as general manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. He may prove a better administrator than his predecessor. I do not know. But this should not, in any way, detract from the fine accomplishments achieved by Saskatchewan Power under Cass-Beggs in building the provincial power grid, a natural gas grid, and establishing a 400 per cent increase in power and energy generation in his ten years as S.P.C. general manager. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the potash and oil development that the Provincial Treasurer now points to with such pride would not be there had we not had a good electrical power grid and a good gas grid in this province. We have to thank the previous administration for them being there. In fact, Mr. Speaker, a Liberal member in this assembly once rose in his place and said:

There will not be an oil well found in this province as long as we have a CCF government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, only a Liberal could be wrong 5,337 times on the one statement.

I say Mr. Pinder, who was a candidate in the Hanley by-election on T.V. hold up a picture of the Kalium Chemical Plant, and he made this statement:

We are bringing new industry into this province. Here is an area that never had industry before.

Well, I drove past that plant at least a half dozen times on the TransCanada highway, long before the election of April 22nd was even announced. I readily admit that it was not in production but it was built and obviously was built to go into production. The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) said in this house yesterday that, and I quote him:

We have the first potash mine in the world using the solution process.

This is true, but he implies that the Liberal government should achieve some

March 2, 1965

merit for this and this is obviously false.

I would like to say a word or two, Mr. Speaker, about some of the other potash developments in the area around my city, for example, the Noranda Development in the Viscount area. People who are knowledgeable with respect to the investment field know that the Noranda people had a lease option on the Consolidated Morrison holdings in the Viscount Colonsay area, and also in the Tom Bill holdings south of Esterhazy for the last eighteen months or more. Surely, Mr. Speaker, these people were not holding off just because they expected a change of government. This is obviously a ridiculous approach in terms of saying whether or not we would get potash development in this province. The potash development would have come, irrespective of what government was in power in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two about tax cuts. The Provincial Treasurer contends that Liberals are against regressive taxes and that they are harmful at current rates. He mentioned the five per cent sales tax and he said it was working a hardship on parents with large families, and also, in the last election campaign, the Liberal party promised to remove the sales tax from children's clothing and shoes. There is nothing in the budget in this respect. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that if it is working a hardship on large families, it is still working a hardship on large families simply because the reduction of the rate from five to four will not save these families sufficient money to cover the cost they have already had to bear in terms of the increased medical and hospitalization tax.

I did note and quite frankly I was surprised that the government introduced a motion providing for a \$1,000 exemption for newly-weds after February 19th for a twelve month period for major household furniture and appliances. Can the members of this assembly not see what will happen next year? We will be asking the government and the Provincial Treasurer how many rebates they have made on bed springs a year from now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — I hold in my hand an advertisement from the Star Phoenix. It says "Vote Liberal, Reduce the Five Per Cent Sales Tax to Four Per Cent Immediately". I am quoting directly from the advertisement.

Saskatchewan people pay more in taxes than people in all other provinces.

That statement is definitely not true. Seventy-two per cent of the people in Canada, in British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec, pay a higher per capita tax rate than do the people in this province.

Mr. Pinder, who recently spoke to the Young Liberal Association in the city of Saskatoon just prior to the budget coming down, made this remark:

Tax cuts are coming in the budget. Major tax reductions will be contained in the provincial budget to be brought down on Friday.

Now get this:

A reduction of \$20,000,000 in taxes promised by the Liberals in the April, 1964, election campaign should be reached.

Now there is a direct quotation from the Star Phoenix, February 16th, \$20,000,000. Now the Provincial Treasurer in his budget report that there is \$14,300,000 less, roughly \$2,300,000 in terms of the new tobacco levy which gives him a net figure of \$12,000,000, if you deduct from that the \$5,000,000 in the increase in the hospital and medicare tax, you have a net figure of \$7,000,000.

The Provincial Treasurer says \$12,000,000. It turns out to be about \$7,000,000. Hanley Herb says \$20,000,000. These people should bet together. What is \$13,000,000 between friends? I think at one time a very prominent Liberal made the remark, "What's a million?". If the people opposite do not know who he was, I am not going to say anything further about it now, but some how they should be able to find out somewhere along the way.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about the debt position of this province. Personally, I am sick and tired of the utter nonsense we have heard from people on the opposite side with respect to the debt position in this province. I am quoting directly from the financial and economic position of the province of Saskatchewan printed under the signature of the present Provincial Treasurer of this province, a man named Hon. W.R. Thatcher. On the second last page and if members have these booklets with them, they can check these figures. There are items with respect to the financial position of the province.

The funded debt of this province as of March 31st, 1964 was \$559,120,000, to this we have to add treasury bills of \$36,153,000, this gives us a total of \$595,273,000, and from this we must deduct \$7,402,000 in sinking funds, giving us a net figure of \$587,871,000. Offsetting these items in terms of financial position, the province at that time had \$52,286,000 cash and investments on hand. It had \$9,192,000 in loans and advances in terms of working capital. It had \$556,198,000 in revenue producing enterprises. It had \$3,198,000 in other loans and advances for a total of \$620,874,000, a difference of \$33,003,000, Mr. Speaker. This province was in good financial shape when the present government took power.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — If you want to break down that gross debt, you will find that \$99,697,000 was loaned to Saskatchewan Government Telephones, this happens to be a utility that the Provincial Treasurer likes. There was also \$440,782,000 invested in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, what did that represent? It represented 60,000 miles of rural electrification lines. It represented the Squaw Rapids electrical station. It represented the Queen Elizabeth Plant in Saskatoon, and the Boundary Dam Plant at Estevan, plus all the other equipment required in operating an organization like Saskatchewan Power. When these people try to tell us that this is a debt which is a burden on this province, they must realize that Calgary Power, Canadian Utilities and another firm you want to name has exactly the same set-up and when people pay their light bills, they not only pay for the operation of that utility, but they pay for the amortization of the debt plus the interest accumulation over the period of that debt.

So this province had \$540,479,000 in self-liquidating debt. In addition it had dead-weight debt, with \$1,190,000 owing on public buildings and \$33,983,000 owing on highways. It had \$18,021,000 owing on seed and feed relief. Now, I do not blame the government opposite for this or the previous government. Obviously this was an extremely difficult time in this province, but it is a dead-weight debt that they will have to carry and they should be honest about it in terms of letting people know what is there. Other capital expenditures total \$1,600,000, a total dead weight debt of \$54,794,000, and if you add these figures together, the \$540,479,000 in self-liquidating debt and \$54,794,000 in dead-weight debt, you will have the total of \$595,273,000 which we started out with.

I think it is time that people in this province realized that the debt position of this province is good. I hope it will be better when this government leaves office. I doubt very much that it will be. Quite frankly a \$7,000,000 loan to the university and some member on the other side suggested that this would mean it would be a self-liquidating debt, is simply an exercise in credulity. It simply cannot be. The province will pay that debt and the interest accumulation on it. It is a dead-weight debt and it will be added to the \$54,794,000, Mr. Speaker.

Sometimes I think people find it difficult to assimilate these things but perhaps a bit of clarification would help. Possibly the Minister of Labour and Co-operatives, (Mr. Coderre) whose association with credit unions is fairly recent, could benefit from some clarification in this respect. If I, as an individual, joined a credit union and put \$2,000 in that credit union and borrowed \$3,000 from it, we would have a gross debt of \$3,000 and we would have a net debt of \$1,000, but if we put \$2,000 in that credit union and borrowed \$1,000 we would still have a gross debt of \$1,000 but we would have a net asset of \$1,000. Now if he uses these examples, perhaps he can begin to understand something of what is involved with respect to the financial position of the province and we will not hear the absolute balderdash we have heard with respect to the debt position of this province in the past.

Mr. Speaker, are there any things that we can commend in the

March 2, 1965

budget? Certainly there are. I, for one, would certainly support the teachers and public service pension increases. I know something about the problems of teachers. I want to let members opposite know that I taught school in this province. I walked thirteen miles a day, taught ten grades, did the janitor work and did not get any money for six years afterwards, but it taught me a good deal. It gave me a good deal of discipline and I think this is necessary in life.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the government on their position with regard to up-grading courses, but I would like to also make a comment, if I may with respect to the education budget. I notice that the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) the other day mentioned that 49.3 per cent of the total cost of education would be covered by government grants. Now actually you should do a little bit of calculation on these figures, because if \$46,188,000 is the correct figure as shown in the estimates, you must deduct \$1,140,000 from it. Why? Because \$1,000,000 is for a technical school program and \$140,000 is for private school grants which were not there before. This leaves you with a total of \$45,048,000. This is 48.1 per cent of the \$93,644,960 which the hon. member from Touchwood, (Mr. Trapp) mentioned as the total cost of the school system in relation to a question asked in this house the other day.

My only comment with regard to technical education and I sympathize with the minister, this is a difficult portfolio, and a very heavy one, but I contend the government of this province suffered a technical knockout in its first year in the first round.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer has set his feet firmly on the road to deficit financing. It is sound Keynesian theory in economics to build substantial surpluses in buoyant times, as the previous government did. In twenty years of government in this province, the previous CCF administration had eighteen surpluses totalling \$108,000,000 and two years of deficits totalling \$5,800,000. The difference of \$102,200,000 represents the actual total surplus attained in twenty years of government.

Mr. Speaker, any government, if it is logical in terms of economics, will build surpluses in buoyant times and will spend more than it takes in in difficult times in order to off-set declines in private spending when recessionary tendencies appear in the economy. The Provincial Treasurer chooses to ignore this eminently sound and satisfactory economic advice. He does so at the peril of sound provincial financing and at the peril of the economy of this province I cannot, therefore, support the motion, but shall support the amendment and the sub-amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to express my appreciation to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) on behalf of myself and the people of Turtleford constituency for proposed programs in that area. I hope there will be a continuation of construction on our roads and highways that need it, I hope, too, that we will get a bridge across the North Saskatchewan River which I am sure the hon. minister realizes is important to the area. I was very interested yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and somewhat amused listening to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) talking about a car he has found. Now, I do not know anything about the car, Mr. Speaker, but my memory ran back to the time when the CCF took over in 1944. It was not a car. It was a large building full of dismantled aeroplanes that we found, all boarded up. The Conservatives took them to pieces in the early thirties, Mr. Speaker, and the liberals tried for ten years to put them together, by that time they were obsolete along with the Liberal party.

In addressing this house some years ago, I made some remarks that I want to repeat again this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, —

In a democracy, a government is not measured entirely by the success of its financing and the size of its budget, necessary though this may be. The acid test is what percentage, what share, of that revenue comes back to the people of the province through the various services for which an administration is responsible not only, Mr. Speaker, for maintaining but for expanding.

It is in this field that may fears arise in regard to the policies of the present government so slavishly dedicated to private enterprise. It is possible, Mr. Speaker, for such concessions to be made to private industry, but that, beyond a handful of employable people, there is very little left for the people of the province whose heritage has been given away. It is possible to have a wealthy industry and poverty side by side. This is happening, Mr. Speaker, all over the world and it is happening in Canada today, and for most parts under Liberal policies and administrations. It is possible as I said to have high production with profits leaving the province and for which the people of the province receive all too little. The best illustration that I can think of is the insurance business in Saskatchewan before the advent of the Government insurance Office. This, Mr. Speaker, is a very good illustration of what has been accomplished and the services that have been given to the people and the amount of capital that has remained within the province and gone to the provincial treasury.

There are alarming features of this budget, Mr. Speaker, in the field of agriculture. You turn to the Budget Address, and the Premier states that he considers agriculture the most important sector of our economy, yet the estimates for agriculture are down. Mr. Speaker, agriculture today is getting into real trouble in spite of the announcement that has just been made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) regarding the final wheat payment. Our grain prices have dropped below the cost of production. Our livestock products have declined until there is little or no margin left for the producer. Likewise, Mr. Speaker, along with the markets, the agricultural vote has dropped. Which suggests to me, Mr. Speaker, that as far as agriculture is concerned, the farmer does not mean too much to the hon. Premier, apart from votes. Over the last twenty years the party opposite chided the CCF government for its niggardly vote for agriculture, and yet, Mr. Speaker, in the most buoyant times that this province has ever known, we have a drop in the vote for this basic industry of our province.

However, I do notice that in the budget, provision was made for the poultry producers. It lifted the sales tax on egg washers, egg candlers, egg graders, laying cages, brooders, and above all, on the poultry thermometers. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, that there is more second hand equipment of these articles mentioned in the hands of poultry producers who have been liquidated by federal government agricultural policies and lack of policies, then the market could absorb, and if the gentlemen opposite would like to keep track of the temperature of the disgruntled poultry producers, I will give them our poultry thermometer, along with the brooder, but I would like them to turn in the value of the sales tax to the treasurer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — At that, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer did a little more than his seatmate for the poultry man. I noticed in the Leader Post, that the provincial Agricultural minister was addressing a group of poultry men here in the city on the 22nd of February and he said amongst other things:

As Agricultural minister, I do not have all the answers. There are many problems that confront us. I look to the people such as yourselves for the answers.

Mr. Speaker, I perused the news items, I have gone through Gary Wade's account, item by item, of this meeting and I cannot find one suggestion from the Agricultural Minister in the way of leadership to solve any of the problems of the poultry men. But I do not think he needs to feel too badly, Mr. Speaker, he is a little better than his federal counterpart. I have here in my hands . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . a diary? . . .

Mr. Wooff: — . . . a report of a meeting that the turkey producers had with the federal minister of Agriculture. The report by Mr. B.O. Brown, Turkey Editor, in the October 1964 issue of Canada Poultry Men, is an account of the convention of the turkey producers to which the federal Minister of Agriculture was invited. He addressed the meeting and he talked with the producers following the meeting and here is the editor's final note:

In effect we were told injustices might exist and

March 2, 1965

because of our minority position in the total Canadian economy, we must be sacrificed to the common evil.

This is a pretty blunt, pretty cruel statement, but you have to give the gentleman credit, he was honest.

I would like to turn to the livestock industry for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, and to farming in general. As a farmer, I have become pretty fed up, Mr. Speaker, with being lectured on efficient management not because there isn't need for good management but because all too often it is a substitute for fair square treatment of the agricultural industry. Farmers have produced more and more with fewer and fewer people. We were told when grain was filling our bins and carry-overs were high, that we should go into the production of livestock. Well, we did, Mr. Speaker, and what is the result? Along with others, I said then that if farmers all over Saskatchewan were persuaded to go into cattle, the whole industry would be in trouble. I am not against having a strong livestock industry in the province, Mr. Speaker, and we have accomplished that to the point of breaking the market. To quote the Western Producer of January 30th, 1964:

The vast expansion of Saskatchewan's beef cattle production during the past few years is pushing the wheat province near the lead as the major beef producer in Canada, Saskatchewan cattlemen were told at the annual convention at Regina.

As I said I am not against a livestock industry in the province but it has resulted, Mr. Speaker, in exactly what some of us predicted, a price drop for the whole cattle industry. I am fed up with the childish reasons why we should do these things, first one and then the other.

Right at the present time, Mr. Speaker, I think it is probably the hog producers' turn to wallow in the slough of Liberal economics. I wonder how many of you saw this little market item on Hog Production? In big black letters in yesterday's Leader Post of March 1st, you have "Higher Hog Prices" and if you read it, Mr. Speaker, there are just six words dealing with hogs and not one price quoted. This is enough to tell you that the hog markets are shaky and in need of bolstering by the free enterprise press of the country. All this report says about hogs is that prices were higher in some centres, and there is not a price quoted and there is not a figure given.

To return to cattle for a moment, the late Hon. J.G. Gardiner, federal Minister of Agriculture, I recall, made a statement when cattle were between 30 and 35 cents a pound, that cattle stood at a parity, I believe he was right, Mr. Speaker. The question that I want answered now is, if cattle were at parity then, some ten years ago, where are they today with production costs spiralling and the market constantly dropping? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if cattle were only at parity then, that they are now below the cost of production.

As I said a moment ago, I think it is the hog producers' turn next. The present situation, Mr. Speaker, is not just a cost-price squeeze. It is a two-way stretch that girdles the entire agricultural industry. It is about time I think that we embark on the ex-federal minister's program of tree planting. We have gone the circle of grain, cattle, hogs and poultry. I think we ought to start tree planting. At least it might employ the recipients of old age assistance in their declining years while they are waiting for the Prime Minister and miss La Marsh to graduate their pension plan over the years from sixty-five to seventy.

In the budget debate on page six, and I hope I won't run afoul of the wheat debate, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer said that in 1965 one of our concerns will be our ability to sell wheat. Well, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that we have just had a very good report covering wheat sales for this last season, I was interested in an item appearing in the Regina Leader Post, February 25th on exports. The Board of Grain Commissioners has reported that exports of Canadian wheat flour last month total 21,498,381, compared with a year ago, of 35,380,444. In other words, Mr. Speaker, those exports have dropped 13,500,000 for one month and this does not augur well for agriculture.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as one of the outlets for some of our farm products, we would start making some of these foodstuffs available to the people in Canada that are ill-fed. This is something within our own borders, something within our own vaunted economy that could make a big

difference, not only to agriculture, but to those people who suffer need.

I must say that I listened with bated breath as the hon. member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) the other day painted rather a dark picture for agriculture. I was hoping that when he was through, he was going to come up with some kind of an answer, but, Mr. Speaker, it was the same old solution, curtailment of production in a hungry world. He must have been reading the Leader-Post dealing with the International Wheat Agreement and finished up the editorial by saying that the price cuts may have had a sobering effect on our competitors and they might now be ready to discuss an approach aimed at effective production control. This is the old, old answer, Mr. Speaker. The only variation that is ever given is that we are told to raise wheat when we are growing cattle and cattle when we are growing wheat.

This was quite evident, Mr. Speaker, again, in the reaction of the Hon. minister of Trade and Commerce when he flatly refused the request of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture for wheat subsidies. I was very interested in two or three sentences that he uttered when he was speaking on this subject. Mr. Sharpe said "Recent downward adjustment in wheat prices on the world markets brought them back to the days of pre-Russian sales". Mr. Speaker, what a childish, what an imbecile argument, that because they came back to the days of pre-Russian sales they were right, in spite of the fact that during that period the cost of production has gone up. We went on with the argument that if we sold for less, we would sell more and I have just quoted the figures for January. We were 13,500,000 bushels behind. These are the kind of arguments that absolutely sicken the farmer, Mr. Speaker. We listened to the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce as quoted in the Regina Leader Post, but at no time did they endeavor to answer these problems or give us any statesmanlike leadership in dealing with them. The kind of economic approach, Mr. Speaker, that they want to apply to agriculture is diametrically opposed to free enterprise philosophy. I am quite sure that the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) could supplement his farm income and I am just as sure that the Leader Post and the minister of Trade and Commerce do not directly derive their living from agriculture, but I would like them to give us some leadership, some kind of reasonable answer towards solving the problems that face people in the farming profession. The people, for instance, who have geared their capital investments in machinery and land to a certain production and the young farmers who have purchased farms and equipment on borrowed capital over the last few years, and the thousands of people who are still trying to farm between those difficult years of 65 and 70, these are the people that find it impossible, Mr. Speaker, to curtail their production and still come out on the right side of the ledger, regardless of what is said about management and efficiency, and what have you.

These people seem to think that we can sell more and more for less and less regardless of costs. It reminds me of the chap who boasted that he could sell for less than he bought for, and when asked for an explanation of how he did it, he calmly replied "I make it on the turn-over". I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is some kind of a turn-over that we the agriculturalists are supposed to make it on, but I am never quite sure what the turn-over is. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, that the answer that was given by this gentleman about his turn-over is just as good and just as enlightening as answers that are given to us by some of our leading so-called statesmen who are responsible for the agricultural industry of this country. The grain officials were only too pleased with the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and his approach to the problem. Yet these are not the answers that are going to solve one solitary problem for the agriculturalist of today.

Mr. Speaker, the statement by the Minister of Trade and Commerce is the final unveiling of the free enterprise scheme whereby the farmer will feed the hungry world and foot the entire bill for the privilege of doing so.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — This, Mr. Speaker, is the quintessence of free enterprise philosophy. This is the philosophy, Mr. Speaker, that has been responsible so far for all the major troubles of the world, poverty and disease and hatred and war. No nation is ever so well off as when its wealth is distributed amongst all its citizens, when every segment of society is able to have a decent standard of living and make a contribution to the progress and the development of their country.

This, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced the present budget does not do

March 2, 1965

and I will support the amendment and sub-amendment but I will vote against the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, when the debate on the budget began, I really had not intended to speak. I thought perhaps in this first session of the legislature, it would be well for a new member to find out what was discussed in the Budget Debate and mind you I was not very far into it, when I realized that everything is discussed in the Budget Debate. In the course of these last days we have heard a great deal of talk.

In the beginning I was a little bit surprised to discover that very much of it was very remote from the budget as such, but I must say that most of it was interesting and some of it, I am sorry to say, in many respects, was very revealing, and some if it, I think, was an expression of an act of faith in the Liberal government and for this I think we must thank some of the members opposite because the kind of suggestions that have been made as to what we should have been doing, it seems to me, to indicate an expression of faith in our ability to do it. And so for this, we thank you very much.

Early on in the Budget Debate there was a reference to the city of Saskatoon. I think perhaps this goes back into another debate, and I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether I am in order in even referring to it. But there was a reference to the city of Saskatoon as having been dead for twenty years and then as I heard the four members for Saskatoon, other than myself, get up and speak against the present budget that we regard as a development budget, that has been hailed as a budget that will do a great deal for the province of Saskatchewan, as I have heard the other members get up and speak against it, I was afraid that perhaps this house might believe that the city of Saskatoon had been dead for twenty years and wanted to stay that way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — That is why, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say a few words in this debate, I do not want to make these at any great length, because my experience in television has taught me that simply because there is time to use, it is not wise to use it. So the fact that there is an outside limit, would be no indication to me that people should speak at great lengths, and as a matter of fact, I think most of what can be said about the budget has been said.

In respect to criticism of the budget, I would at this time like to compliment the member from Saskatoon who has just taken his seat, because I think he has given us here, perhaps one of the fairest criticisms of the budget that we have heard in this debate. These are not criticisms with which I agree. Very many of them from my point of view are not justifiable criticisms but they are criticisms from a Socialist point of view and, I think, criticisms well taken and so I would like to compliment him on this. Some of the points that he brought in as he went along, seemed to me to be so utterly black and white. His description of Mr. Buckwold as a man who sells overalls, is so utterly black and white. I find this, or the reference to, I forget the gentleman's name who was a Conservative, but this kind of thing I find unnecessary in a debate in the house. It seems to me that we, on both sides of the house, rather fool ourselves — we whistle to keep our courage up, and I regret that the member from Saskatoon introduced this kind of thing into a speech that I felt, until that point, was a very good one. Mind you, I should say about the member from Saskatoon, that he had me utterly intrigued with his ability to reel off figures. He invited us to check them in the report, but to tell the truth, he reeled them off from memory so quickly that I am not sure anyone here is quick enough to catch them and check them. This may be a trick or it maybe true.

As a member here, I feel that certainly I don't think I would be fooling anybody if I said that I gave consideration to which way I would vote on the budget. As a Liberal member, I believe that this is a good budget. It is a budget that is in line with the kind of thinking that we on this side of the house have expressed over and over again, both before the election and after the election. It is the kind of budget for which the people of Saskatchewan voted when they voted for a Liberal government to put these policies into effect.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

So, as a Liberal member, I would be voting in favor of the budget. But thinking in terms, and I hope this is something that never leaves me as the years go by, as a member of this house, I am also representative of people and it is very easy here to forget that you are a representative of the people. Earlier one of the other members from Saskatoon and I were talking about a busy week-end that I had had. I said to him at that time, that I was busy about things that did not get into the paper and which I took two or three hours to do over the week-end. I know that what I did is not going to be anything in the way of scientific survey, but I thought, as a representative of the people of Saskatoon, I should perhaps have some idea of how they were thinking, and so on the telephone I made what I hoped would be a reasonably good survey of how Saskatoon is feeling and this is why in the fact of the four members opposite who have indicated that Saskatoon does not want this budget, I think I have something to say and I want now to say it.

I was only able to telephone thirty-seven people. I hope I won't bore the house when I describe how I did it. I flipped the pages of the telephone directory and where my finger fell, I called that number. If it was a business which I could not call I went to the number underneath. If they were out, I then called the number underneath. If I knew them, I went to the number underneath. Then we have the problem in the city of Saskatoon of having a great number of people who live in the constituency of Hanley and whom I might call by chance. I regret that the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) is not in his seat again today, but he has assured us that the people in Hanley do not want any of the things that exist in the budget, and so there was no use calling the people in the Hanley constituency to have this reiterated. In any case, I called thirty-seven people. Most of the people I called felt that the education tax was a very valuable thing. I identified myself to them and we had a small conversation about the various things that have been criticized as poor inclusions within the budget. Vocational training was something that the people were very interested in seeing expanded as well as up-grading. The member for Saskatoon mentioned this but very many people in the city of Saskatoon within this thirty-seven (and I admit it is a very small sampling, but it is the best you can do on a Sunday afternoon). Many of these people indicated that this is something in which they were tremendously interested. Either they, themselves, or people they knew, were subject to the problems of unemployment or low incomes.

This was something that I think has been subject to their approval right across the board. Purple gas was something that I asked everyone about, because there has been a good deal of talk about favoring the farmers, and I asked the urban people with whom I talked exactly what their position was on purple gas. Some of them indicated that they would have liked some concessions to the city dweller as well. This is not in this budget and it may never be possible to make as broad a concession within cities as it is possible to make with the rural communities or with the farmers as a part of the economy. But they indicated that they would have liked this, but on the other hand, not one of them indicated that they did not want the farmer to have this tax concession because all of them I think are conscious of the fact that we in cities are dependent upon agriculture and in this way we will profit from it.

In Saskatoon, a city of the university, I asked several people on the telephone about the position that we are taking on the borrowing of \$7,000,000 for capital expansion at the university. The university people themselves are very much in favor because they take the position, and I think rightly so, that we should not wait upon annual revenue to expand the university. My approach to economics is, as you all know, a very simple one, but if we were to do as the opposition suggests and pay attention to the criticisms that you offer for borrowing \$7,000,000, it seems to me that this is just a little bit like buying a house and not having any clothes or food, until you have paid for the house. I think perhaps the university people feel that if we hold up the expansion of the university, to wait upon the annual revenue, this will seriously impede the development of education in the province and so while I did not have any specific expressions of opinion on this, in my telephone poll, certainly the university people feel this way.

One of the other things the member for Saskatoon tried to do was to draw in a situation that we are facing in the city of Saskatoon, as a criticism on the budget. This is one of the things that disappointed me about his comments this afternoon, because the situation that we are facing in the city of Saskatoon in terms of expansion that will be the result of industrial development around the city, and the expressions of opinion that have come from the real estate people and from the city council itself, has

March 2, 1965

nothing whatsoever to do with the budget as it is now. This has to do with the city of Saskatoon, preparing itself for a problem it knows it will have. It is preparing the provincial government for the sharing of this problem when the time comes, but it was drawn in as a criticism of the budget. This is something that I find is not the intention of the council of the city of Saskatoon.

I think I need not go any further. The criticism that we have heard here of the budget and particularly by the members from the city of Saskatoon, I feel, are not representative of the voters in Saskatoon, and though I did not talk to all of the voters I felt I must get up here and express an opinion on behalf of the city that seems to be diametrically opposed to their position. Perhaps the members are talking to each other rather than to their constituents but in the face of what I have been doing, Mr. Speaker, I think I would be a very bad representative in this house if I did not speak with the voice I know exists in the city of Saskatoon. If I did not vote for the decreased education tax, the increases in education and vocation training and certainly the tripled expenditures in up-grading, certainly improved highways, if I voted against these, I think I would be a very bad representative in this house, Mr. Speaker, and so I will be voting against the amendment and the sub-amendment and I will, on behalf of the constituency of Saskatoon, be voting for the budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Allan Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to participate in this debate, I must first of all compliment our Premier and Provincial Treasurer for a budget that for the first time in twenty years is related to the economy of our province, rather than to the political mileage that could be derived from it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I intend to spend some time later this evening on referring to the use of political propoganda as it was practiced by the former government, and the hon. member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) can laugh because I will be able to show that he was one of the best users of political propoganda under former Premier Tommy Douglas.

In fact there are very few members sitting opposite that were in the cabinet of Tommy Douglas and his successor who did not become past masters at the use of political propoganda. However, before I go into that particular subject which will be interesting, I am sure, to the members opposite, I would like to refer to some of the statements that have already been made in the debate, particularly by the members opposite.

I would like, first of all, to congratulate the financial critic from the other side of the house, for his attempt to criticize the first Liberal budget in twenty years. If it had been a CCF budget, it would have been much easier to criticize. We all realize that. However, I was pleased that the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) was given the important job of replying to the budget. I was dreading the idea of sitting here for an hour or so listening to the member from Kelsey (Mr. J.H. Brockelbank) because his record is such that he puts his speech on the records of the house only once a year but so far this session, we have listened to the member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) read the same old speech into the record books three times. It gets a little boring after you listen to it three times every year . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — . . . for a number of years. However, I am quite sure that we will only be listening to it for another two or three years and the member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) will bow silently out and fold his tent like the Arabs and silently steal away.

Mr. Nollet: — I shouldn't expect it would affect you in the next twenty years.

Mr. Guy: — You know, the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney)

did well enough that he left no doubt in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan that he would be the next Leader of the Opposition when that time comes. I am glad that he did, because I have been concerned about rumors that have been going around that now that the CCF have lost the farmer vote, their next leader might be one of the power hungry labor leaders sitting opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — The financial critic opposite said that the CCF believed in public, co-operative and private enterprise. The significance of that statement, Mr. Speaker, is in the order in which he listed them, because it is true that they believed in public ownership first, co-operative ownership secondly and when these two could not make a go of it, they give private enterprise a chance. This idea was clearly stated back in 1945 when the hon. J.L. Phelph, then Minister of Natural Resources and Industrial Development said in his first annual report:

It is the intention of the government to effect an orderly change to social ownership in the industrial development of our natural resources.

This was tried by means of crown corporations, first of all. Their failure record is well known and there is no need of going into that again. Then it was tried by the co-operative approach, and again there was very little better success. In the last few years, realizing the failure of public ownership and co-operative enterprise to develop our natural resources, they made a feeble overture to private enterprise to come and bail them out, but private enterprise recognized these half hearted efforts that were being presented to them, and they were completely ignored.

However, now with a government that puts private enterprise foremost in the development of our resources, companies are anxious and willing to come to this province and assist in our development.

For the first time, Mr. Speaker, in twenty years, we have a budget that gives fair recognition to the development of northern Saskatchewan and I am proud to be a member for this government that is putting private enterprise first, in order to do it, because I am convinced as the members on this side of the house are convinced that private enterprise will succeed where public and co-operative enterprises have failed.

I am not going to take the time of this house to repeat what I have said on previous occasions about the Socialists' failure to develop our natural resources in northern Saskatchewan. Enough to say that, under the Socialists' northern Saskatchewan became the last under-developed frontier in Canada. Timber and mineral production declined steadily particularly over the last few years, and with this decline, came increasing unemployment and lack of opportunity for our northern people.

Several members opposite have referred to the Liberal government giving away our natural resources. What they do not realize is that there is a difference between giving away and developing. It is true they did not give away, neither did they develop, and by not "giving away" as they like to refer to it, many millions of board feet of lumber and pulp wood rotted away in our forests, of no benefit to anyone.

During the years the CCF were in office they took less than fifty per cent of the allowable cuts of our forestry resources, including fire losses that the Stamford Report said we could take. We must realize, Mr. Speaker, that we have two types of resources, renewable and non-renewable. Renewable ones must be used continually to give full value, if they are not, they will go to waste. Non-renewable ones can be used only once. It was all very well for the former government to say that we are going to save our natural resources for the present and future generations, but by sitting and doing nothing for twenty years they did not help either one of them. It is necessary for the present generation to start developing them for future generations, and that is what the new Liberal government is trying to do, as evidenced by the opening of the Anglo-Rouyn mine.

It appears that the main concern of members opposite, particularly the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and I am sorry that he is not in his seat, is whether this is the first mine, whether it is the second mine, or what it is, and they do not seem to be able to agree, because in the Prince Albert Herald, December 1st, 1964, two reports appeared. One was a report of a CCF constituency zone meeting in Cumberland, where the MLA for that area is reported to have said:

March 2, 1965

It is an insult to Saskatchewan to say the Anglo-Rouyn mine at La Ronge is the first base metal mine to come to Saskatchewan.

In another report on the same page in the same paper, we have a report of a CCF caucus that was held in Regina, that the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) I suppose attended, where a prepared statement issued after the caucus was over, said:

Technical training facilities could play a big part in ensuring that Indian and Metis persons obtain jobs at the mine — the first major base metal producer in Saskatchewan.

Here we have a clear indication that the mouth did not know what the head was thinking. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not care whether it is the first mine, whether it is the second mine, or whether it is the tenth mine to come to northern Saskatchewan. All I know, is that I was mighty proud last fall to sit at the head table with the Hon. Mr. Winters, President of Rio Algoma and our Premier, while they announced that Anglo-Rouyn was going into production in my constituency. I know that the people in my constituency were pleased to hear it because it is a big boost to our economy.

Also, Mr. Speaker, although one would never guess it from the remarks of the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky). And I am glad that he is going to take his seat finally, it is providing employment for the Indian people of his constituency. At the present time nine Indians from Molanosa, who in other winters have had nothing to do, are working at the mine site. The member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) said that I should stay in my constituency. I can remind him that I was there long enough for these nine Indians to come to me and ask if there was anything I could do to get them work, and I was pleased to recommend them for jobs, because I knew that their MLA would not bother to visit them except just before an election.

In view of this employment of his constituents, it is hard to understand his reference to the mine as a peanut mine, and nothing but a promotion by a former Liberal cabinet minister to fleece the stock holders. I know his constituents, who have found employment there, do not feel the same way. This concern over the head of Rio Algoma being a former Liberal cabinet minister is also hard to understand. I think we will find Liberals at the head of most of our major companies in Canada, because their understanding and belief in free enterprise make them a success. You will never find a CCF-NDP at the head of a successful company. I would say also, that I would rather invest my money in the stock of a company with a Liberal at its head than have a Socialist — Anglo-Rouyn is a good example. No matter what the member opposite said, a year ago the stock of Anglo-Rouyn was twelve cents and it had remained there for a considerable period of time. Today that stock is trading at between \$1.60 and \$1.70. This is certainly evidence that here is a company whose stock is based on the potential, the financial situation at any given time. It is another good example of free enterprise at work.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I would hesitate to think what would have happened to any money that had been invested in the CCF box factory, woollen mill or shoe factory, and I could mention one or two others.

Anglo-Rouyn and its parent company Rio Algoma are above reproach. It is an old and respected company and its stock has always reflected the true financial picture and the development stage of the company, so that it was with regret that I received two phone calls the other day from people in my constituency. One of them was from inside the province and another was from outside the province, asking for up-to-date information on the progress of the Anglo-Rouyn mine. I asked them what had caused their concern at this particular time and they replied that a friend of theirs had shown them a copy of the Commonwealth of February 24th, 1965, and after reading the article which had appeared there, they were wondering if there was any truth in the allegation that had been made.

I looked up the issue and this is what I found, an article by the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky):

Shareholders will lose their shirts, says Berezowsky.

Mr. Berezowsky: — They sure will.

Mr. Guy: — Now, here is a man opposite, Sir, here is a man who stands up in this house and continually says he is for the people of northern Saskatchewan. Here he has got an opportunity to prove it and the first thing he does, he writes an article for the rag, the Commonwealth, in which he says the shareholders of a reputable company will lose their shirts. If he had said that outside of this house he would have been taken to court.

Mr. Berezowsky: — He doesn't know what he is talking about.

Mr. Guy: — Statements like this, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the member opposite knows that they are untrue, and yet he continues to say them. These are statements which will do irreparable harm to the development of northern Saskatchewan, and a statement that falls into the same category as "hate literature", and all this, Mr. Speaker, is because the members opposite would rather see the whole province go to destruction than to see a new deal for the north under a Liberal government. They are taking every step possible to try and defame every company that comes into this province. However, I am very pleased to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they are having very little success because today we had another company which is coming into this province and is preparing to start work immediately in my constituency. I would like to refer to an announcement which was made just a few minutes ago by Torwest Mines, an exploration and development company, now registered in Saskatchewan, formerly registered in British Columbia, who have come into this province to start a development and exploration program of some quite large proportion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — This company holds a group of claims twelve miles north-west of Stony Rapids, on which they plan to spend \$100,000 in the initial stages of their program. The first work was done in 1952 on these claims by a company known as Canex, but because of various problems, they were forced to let them go.

In 1957, Torwest gained control of these claims but they were not prepared to do any work in the province of Saskatchewan until the political climate changed, and this, Mr. Speaker, has been the story for the last number of years. Major companies in this province have come into Saskatchewan prepared to spend money, finding the political climate the way it was, they spent a few dollars and then they left.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Will the member permit a question?

Mr. Guy: — You have made your speech, please sit down and you can ask questions when I finish.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I just want . . .

Mr. Guy: — I still suggest that you sit down, it will give you time to think up a sensible one. During the last few years, Mr. Speaker, mining companies would only spend the money that they could not spend anywhere else when they came into this province, but as the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) announced yesterday this is changed, and we can look forward to a period of great expansion, particularly in the metal mining industry in northern Saskatchewan.

Torwest announced that diamond drilling will start immediately, and that geological, geophysical, geochemical surveys will be carried out simultaneously. Now, this is tremendous news for an area such as my constituency where we have such tremendous distances, that have no road or rail communication. As important as the Anglo-Rouyn announcement was before Christmas, and the tremendous benefits that it has brought to the people of my constituency, and the constituency from which the hon. member over there comes, it still did not do very much for the northern half of my constituency, or the extreme northern part of the province.

However, with Torwest going into the Stony Rapids area, with hopes of eventually developing a mine in that area, it is going to be a boon for that whole north-west corner, and will contribute greatly to Uranium City until such time as the uranium market improves.

March 2, 1965

So, I want to take this opportunity to wish the company well. My only hope is that our friends opposite will refrain from attacking this company in the same manner that they attacked Anglo-Rouyn and that they will refrain from publishing in this "hate" publication of theirs known as The Commonwealth, the same type of propaganda as I mentioned earlier today.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot help but notice the similarity in approach to the attacks on our budget by members opposite. I picked up the newspaper this morning, the Leader Post by the way, and I noticed that there were three very similar statements, all three of the statements in the paper this morning claimed the Liberal budget was based on discrimination. The first article I picked up said "Budget said Sell-Out for Workers".

The provincial government budget for 1965-66 was criticized Monday for pitting worker against worker, and class against class. In the budget debate, F. Dewhurst, member for Wadena, welcomed provision for tax free gasoline for farmers, but asked what was to be done for carpenters, bricklayers, and others.

Now on the same page there was another article, also claiming discrimination. This one was "Whelan Attacks Budget, says it curries favor". This was a speech that he made in Melville, we will wait and see if he has the courage to make the same speech in the house.

Mr. Whelan said discrimination is part of the Liberal budget make-up. There is purple gas for farmers' trucks, but carpenters, bricklayers and electricians are ignored.

One wonders when the statements are so close, who is writing the speeches for our members opposite, and then I turned the page and I came to a third report, and I think that I came across the answer, because the third clipping had the same approach of discrimination against the worker and the farmer.

The provincial government's 1965 budget made public February 19th, was described Saturday as a financial policy aimed at decreasing the financial load on the wealthy, and loading all the expenses on the back of the workers, farmers and small business men.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — We have known for some time that there has been a great affinity between the members opposite and the Communist party and they sat there now and they say "agreed, agreed, Hail to the Red Star. Well done, Sir, well done."

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I just want to say to the hon. member, no matter where truth comes from, it is still truth.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I still suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great deal of significance that so many members opposite and the Communist party agree in their thinking and criticism of our budget. I am convinced that there is considerable truth in the saying "that birds of a feather flock together".

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the former Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer) the other night, but as usual I found very little in what he said that was worth answering with perhaps one exception. He seemed

to be quite concerned about the proposed sale of Saskair. I would like to remind him, and the other members opposite, that it was only a couple of years ago that the CCF government was prepared to put Saskatchewan Government Airways up on the block. The only difference was that at that time it was done with the ulterior motive of threatening its employees to accept a new wage agreement. They had to back down when no bona fide bids were received, but in the meantime they had forced the employees of their company to accept a new wage agreement on the threat that if they did not the company would be sold and they would be out on the street.

I am convinced that the companies in northern Saskatchewan will be quite capable of providing the necessary service in a safe and efficient manner, as they have done in the past. These are companies that are interested in the development of the north, and they realize that increased development means increase business for them. So, I am confident that they will place the interest of the people they are servicing first and foremost in their future operations.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Guy: — He is thinking up that question? Good. He will probably get it out of this paper here, this Commonwealth.

I am going to save my remarks regarding the proposed Indian and Metis branch until second reading of the bill, but I would just like to remind the members of this house that a change from one side to the other certainly causes some drastic changes in the thinking of some members.

I can recall a year ago, the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and the former member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) screaming to high heavens for assistance and help for our Indian people from Indian Affairs in when they were the government. Repeatedly they ignored their responsibility in this regard and continually criticized the federal government for not helping our Indian people, yet our Metis friends who were the complete responsibility of the people opposite, lived in even worse conditions than our treaty Indians did. Now he stands up in this house and he says the Indians want us to leave them alone, and let them solve their own problems. I wish he would make up his mind and perhaps he could offer some constructive suggestions for a change. They know, and we know, and everyone knows that our Indian people need the help of everyone concerned to make up for twenty years lost time. The attitude of the former government towards our Indian friends will be shown quite clearly before I finish my remarks tonight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have considerably more to say, but I do not particularly wish to break it up, so I will call it 5:30.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member asks leave to call it 5:30. Is leave given?

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — No.

Mr. Speaker: — We have to have unanimous consent of the house, I believe.

An Hon. Member: — What is the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) talking about, he hasn't been here all day?

Mr. Guy: — Where is the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker)? Oh, he is in his seat, eh? Well, let's see — maybe the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) would prefer to ask his question at this time.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask a very sensible question and I am sure the hon. member (Mr. Guy) will answer me, I wanted to know if this is the same mine that was called the "Axis" mine, which was found away back in 1929, and with which there has been development over the years. If there is going to be a mine now, I am going to be just as happy as he is, will he answer me — if that is the same area, Axis Lake?

Mr. Guy: — Would the hon. member (Mr. Berezowsky) repeat the question, I missed the name of the mine . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Axis Lake, 12 miles north-west of Stony Rapids, Cross Lake is

March 2, 1965

in there. You have never heard about it?

Mr. Guy: — Oh, yes, we have heard about it. All I know, Mr. Speaker, is . . .

Mr. Henry Baker (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that you called time, I was accorded the courtesy two weeks ago, and I would suggest you let the Speaker call it 5:30.

Mr. Guy: — I would like to thank the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Baker) for his comment. May I have permission to call it 5:30 at this time?

Mr. Speaker: — Now I just don't know where we go procedurally on this. Suggestions come from here and here, that we call it 5:30 and . . .

Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, the debate is ending tomorrow and some of the members are not going to have the chance to have their full time, and the hon. member has another ten minutes if he wants to use it.

Mr. Speaker: — I will be happy to listen to the points of order before I make a ruling on this . . .

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I will go ahead, I am not going to go into the main part of my address for a few minutes, I am going to read a few things out of the Commonwealth. I have this paper here. The people opposite do not seem to mind whether they are sitting here or not. There are some pretty good statements in here. On this page is a picture of the MLA for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) . . .

Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — A cartoon?

Mr. Guy: — Oh, here is one, I was going to refer to this one a little later on, but I will refer to it now. Big heading — "Woollam Challenges Thatcher to Make Statements Outside".

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Yes.

An Hon. Member: — He will make better ones yet.

Mr. Guy: — You will hear some more about that one before you are finished. Here it says:

Mr. Woollam said that the allegations that he had advocated bribes should either have been made without the protection of house immunity, or should have been laid as a criminal charge. If the Premier has spoken with integrity, I would suggest that these courses . . .

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, isn't he referring to a previous debate that took place in this house . . .

Mr. Guy: — What! Are you ashamed of your own rag . . .

Mr. Michayluk: — I am not ashamed, I am only worried about the procedure in this house, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Guy: — Your point of order is out of order, and I am going to continue reading from this newspaper . . .

Now we are coming to a key paragraph. . .

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, point of order, members on the government side have risen time and time again to bring us to order when we were making reference to other debates, and this member, the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is definitely making reference to the Throne Speech debate . . .

Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — This point of order is well taken, because all the member is doing is reciting what is in one of the most infamous papers in this province. He is just reading a record of some of the misstatements that are in this paper, and drawing it to the attention of the legislature.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I do feel very reticent about trying to hinder the hon. member from reading from the paper which he was going to read, because I know it would be edifying to the house but, I believe there is a very strict rule here that no outside source, any comments in regard to what happens in this house is to be read to this house. If this article, whatever it is, is discussing what has taken place in this house, then if it is the opinion of someone outside this house, it is not to be brought in. The debates in this house are the concern of members of the house and we can bring forth our own ideas, but the ideas of people outside of this house are not to be introduced in regard to debates which have been carried on in the house.

An Hon. Member: — This is right.

Mr. Speaker: — There is a ruling somewhere in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Guide and I will try and find it for you, regarding reading newspapers, and I think one of the cardinal principles of reading the newspaper is the member reading it must state the name of the paper, and the date thereof. That settles that part of the argument. The next part of the argument is what he can quote from a newspaper, and I think that he can quote from a newspaper providing it does not reflect on anything that took place in the house.

Mr. Wood: — It is not supposed to discuss anything that has happened in the house, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Not reflect upon anything that has happened in the house? Now whether you are discussing anything which has happened in the house, is a reflection thereon, or whether it is a reflection whether you discuss it or not, that is another question.

I will try and find this and settle that point of order after supper. Now, just a minute, the member for Kelsey was trying to rise, I think on another point of order. I do not think it was the same point of order the member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) raised.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — No . . .

Mr. Guy: — It is getting very, very, close to 5:30 and I want to place on the record books of this house a statement before 5:30 so that I can enlarge on it afterwards. This has nothing to do with anything that has been said in the house before. This is a statement made by Mr. Woollam to the editor of this Commonwealth. I noticed that when he made a statement to the Leader Post that he did not have the courage to make the statement to them that he has to the editor of the Commonwealth. This is what he says:

Mr. Woollam said in every election period, complaints were made almost daily to him, about alleged bribes of cash and liquor for votes. At no point . . .

Now listen, I want you to get this. I want you to open your ears for a minute. I hope the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) has got his ears open.

At no point in my recollection were any allegations made against the CCF.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend that this is a deliberate falsehood, and I am

March 2, 1965

going to produce letters tonight that are going to show that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I have found, I think, the citation that I need to answer the question of the member — the point of order raised by the member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood). Citation 157, page 132 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms.

The practice of reading extracts from newspapers to support an argument in debate, has been followed in the British house since 1840, when Speaker Peel, with the acquiescence of the house, allowed a member to proceed to read passages from the newspapers. In 1856 when a member was called to order for reading an extract from a newspaper, the Speaker stated that on former occasions when he had attempted to enforce this rule he had been overruled by the house. A similar statement was made by the Chairman of the committee March 9th, 1857.

It is out of order to read extracts in a debate if —

and I think this is what the hon. member was thinking of.

It is out of order to read extracts in a debate if they refer to other debates during the same session or to any question not under discussion, reflect upon any proceedings or any determination of the house. Contain any unparliamentary expressions, as no language can be heard in quotation if it would be disorderly if spoken — refer to, comment on, or deny anything said by a member, allude to debates in any other House of Parliament —

that is in the Senate.

other treasonable or seditious words, such as the use of the King's name irreverently, etc., refer to matters pending a judicial decision, reflect upon the conduct of persons in authority, make personal allusions derogatory to members.

It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters, or communications emanating from persons outside the house, and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member for expressing any opinion or reflections on the proceedings within the house.

I think that is the quotation the member was looking for.

It being 5:30 the Assembly recessed until 7:30 p.m.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, before 5:30 was eventually called, I had referred to several matters that I figured were of significant importance to this house. I pointed out, with the agreement of several members opposite, including the Deputy Opposition Leader, (Mr. Brockelbank) that criticisms of certain members, or criticisms of our budget were very significant, in the fact that those from members opposite and the members of the Communist party were very close. I had also announced a new major mineral development in northern Saskatchewan, in my constituency, and I had shown that the efforts of the opposition, in making untrue and misinformed statements in regard to these mines, were detrimental to the development of our province. I had also had the opportunity to point out how I had been able to assist some of our Indian and Metis people, from the constituency of Cumberland, in gaining employment in this new found economic climate in northern Saskatchewan. I had also promised that I would make some reference, later on in my remarks, to the former government's use of propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, we heard considerable the other night from the member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) and I am sorry that he is not in his seat

as usual, in regard to the use of propaganda, although from the remarks that he made no one could really tell whether he was for it or against it. But, since he was a member of the Socialists, I would imagine that he was for it. I noticed that he accused the Leader Post and the Star Phoenix and other newspapers, of spreading political propaganda, but I noticed also that the CCF-NDP are not above using these same newspapers to disseminate their propaganda as shown by a little column which they happen to be running each week, called "Inside the Saskatchewan Legislature" and at the bottom it says, "CCF Saskatchewan section of the New Democratic Party. I might add the new Democratic party is in very small letters, compared to the CCF. Now, whether they are ashamed of the NDP, I don't know, but this is the way they choose to show their true colors.

Now, one method of spreading propaganda, which the member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) made no reference to, was that of using a faithful civil servant to do the job. The example of the former government, Mr. Speaker, was a disgrace to Canadian politics, as they created the greatest propaganda disseminating machine in the history of any political party, past or present. I propose, tonight, for a few minutes, to place evidence on the record books of this house to show that the two former Premiers and their cabinet ministers, deliberately used the civil service as a means of spreading their political propaganda. Also as a means of gaining information on which they could formulate their policies to the best political advantage.

I will prove beyond doubt, in spite of their cry of humanity first, that every action taken, particularly in respect to our Indian population and our minority groups, was taken first of all for its political gain rather than any desire to help the people concerned. To prove my point, it is unfortunate, that I must refer to correspondence and activities of a former civil servant. I could no doubt have used several other examples, had the necessary evidence not been destroyed by the former government when they left office. At the outset, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I have no animosity towards the gentleman in question. I am sure, that he was a dedicated and loyal civil servant, intent on serving his masters to the best of his ability, and I might add to his credit, that he did a creditable job.

The only criticism that one can make in this regard, is that in his attempt to serve he never stopped to consider the true role of a civil servant in our system of government. By his actions, he brought discredit to the Socialist government and to the civil service of which he was a member. The qualifications of the gentleman, I am forced to refer to, are impressive and his dedication to his duties left nothing to be desired. The only misfortune was that he became, possibly unsuspectingly, the pawn and the tool of a man who put politics before people and who was prepared to ruin a man's reputation, if need be, to achieve his aim of perpetual power.

The master mind of this civil service infiltration was none other than the former Premier of this province, Mr. T.C. Douglas, national leader of the NDP in Canada and a member of parliament for some remote British Columbia riding.

In September, 1959, Mr. Ray Woollam came to the province of Saskatchewan on the request of Premier Douglas, and took a position with the adult education branch of the Department of Education. He remained in that branch until March of 1960. During this time, when not under the authority of Premier Douglas, there is no evidence to show that he was doing political work on his job. The year 1959, we all know, was a pre-election year, and the government opposite realized that the coming election was going to be difficult and very close. The burning question facing the government of the day was how to get votes. The former Premier supplied the answer. In the province were several groups of people who had not participated in politics before. Why not work on them in the hope that their support would tip the scale?

How to make this appear legitimate, was a problem. Again the master mind solved the problem, by setting up the provincial committee on minority groups. Who became its executive director — responsible solely to the Premier and to the executive council? None other than the said Ray Woolam, who remained in that position from March 1960 to February 28th, 1963, during which time he received \$31,036.58 of the taxpayers' money. Whether he earned it, I will leave to the members of this house and the people of Saskatchewan to decide.

What were his responsibilities? According to the terms of reference which were outlined in a report on a permanent organization for the

March 2, 1965

provincial committee on minority groups, it stated that the director of the provincial committee on minority groups shall be responsible for planning and carrying out such programs of research, field work and extension activity, as he may be directed to do. His duties shall include advising the committee on matters pertaining to Hutterite brethren, Indians, Metis and other minority groups, collaborating with extension workers in other government departments, consulting with all departments of the provincial government whose activities affect minority groups, and I hope that the members of this house are following this outline of his duties because I propose to show that during the time that he was employed as a civil servant, there is some question as to whether these duties were carried out to the best of his ability.

Fourthly, he was to maintain contact with officials of the Indian Affairs Branch of the government of Canada in matters pertaining to federal-provincial joint programs benefiting Indians. He was to act as the liaison person between the federation of Saskatchewan Indians and the provincial committee on minority groups. He was to represent the interests of the provincial government in obtaining Hutterite colony settlement. He was to maintain contact with the minority group programs and policies of other provinces. He was to interpret the attitudes and needs of the minority groups. He was to prepare the agenda for meetings of the provincial committee on minority groups. He was to prepare an annual estimate of expenditures. And in all these cases, he was to be responsible directly, to the executive council and to receive his instructions from the president of the council who I would imagine was Premier Douglas at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what was his record? Here again, I must point out to the house that this civil servant was directly responsible to the Premier of Saskatchewan, T.C. Douglas, and as such, the former Premier must accept full responsibility for the actions of this civil servant. Of immediate concern to the former Premier, was the June election of 1960, which he knew would be very close. What better time to give the Indian people of Saskatchewan the franchise? Indian votes could well decide the election in a dozen or more constituencies. So in the session of 1960, the franchise was given to Indian people without prior consultation with them. Now, no one will deny the right to vote was long past due for these people. But why was it not given three years instead of three months, before an election, so that the Indian people could learn the process correctly?

The executive director of minority groups, after his appointment, on March 1st, 1960, lost no time in showing his willingness to obey his master. In a letter of March 4, 1960, to the Hon. T.C. Douglas, he writes — now Mr. Speaker, I propose to table these letters as I go along. These are letters that are not Photostats. These are the carbon copies of the originals that were sent to the persons concerned. Now, the members opposite are going to say — Where are the originals? The originals are only in one place, Mr. Speaker, They are with the people who received the letters which I propose to table tonight as I go along.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think it is time we got one point of order cleared up in this house and . . .

An Hon. Member: — It didn't take long.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — First of all, the member did not tell us whether he is quoting from a signed or unsigned letter. Second, I want to raise the question as to whether correspondence between civil servants and their superior officers, their deputy ministers, or their ministers, whether this is privileged correspondence or not? Or is this correspondence that should be produced at any time? I want to ask you, Sir, is it right that every civil servant, working for the province of Saskatchewan should realize that any time he expresses his honest and candid opinion in a letter to his minister or to his deputy minister, that this may be produced and he may be injected into the political fray? Now, if this is the way that things should be conducted we should know it. Personally, I do not think it is. I think there is a good reason for this kind of correspondence being privileged, so that a government can get from its civil servants their frank and honest and fearless opinions on the various matters with which they have to deal. I would suggest that any correspondence, and this may even be private correspondence, between a civil servant and the minister, deputy minister, or other officials of a department, is privileged correspondence and should not be used without the consent of the principals. I want members of this house to think of the situation as it exists today. If this kind of thing goes on, what kind of position will we be in?

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would further point out, that this subject was a matter of previous debate as well.

Mr. McFarlane: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I can appreciate the concern of the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank). I, personally, as a minister of the crown, I, too, would have reservations of correspondence of a personal nature, or of a departmental nature, insofar as it affected the every day workings of a government, being brought to the attention of the public. But I think that, if it can be proved that some person or persons was a civil servant and working for a department and at the same time doing political work, then I think that this type of work should be exposed to the public. Anybody who is doing a conscientious job for a minister or for the people of Saskatchewan, I think he should be accorded all the privileges and rights that are due to him. If it can be proven in this house that this has not been the case, that there have been people paid by the taxpayers of this province, working in office time for a political party, doing straight political work, then I think the people of the province should know about it.

Mr. Wood: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would assume that the hon. minister who just sat down (Mr. McFarlane) would be quite willing to table at any time, the correspondence between himself and members of his staff.

Mr. McFarlane: — I would be quite happy to do that any time, Mr. Speaker. I hope that when I leave my office, if that day ever comes, that the files that have accrued over the years will be left in my office and not an empty office and no files at all, as I found when I took office.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw): — Mr. Speaker, apart from the question that the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) has raised, it seems to me that we are dealing here, with carbon copies of we know not what. They have not been identified. We do not know where they came from. It appears to me that it is incumbent in any event, upon the member to identify the correspondence, and if we take the language of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane) — I think he used the word "proof" — to have some proof that this correspondence was, in fact, the correspondence that was signed and was allegedly received by the principals.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, before you give your ruling, I presume if you act on the advice given by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane) you will be ruling that from now on, any member might ask for the production of any correspondence between any minister and any member of his staff, so that the house at large can decide whether or not this correspondence is in the public interest. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if this is to be the ruling, this is certainly a new principle in parliamentary government in this country, or any other country, and I suggest that you consider carefully the implications before you give your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — It seems to me that we have two schools of thought here and I will deal with the one raised by the member for Saskatoon first.

That is, that any correspondence which is either moved for by motion for return or asked for in questions, of whatever nature it may be, is governed by the usual rules that have always governed the same in this house. They will continue to be governed by the usual rules of parliamentary procedure.

Now, we come to the other matter of letters or correspondence of whatever nature or kind it is, that a member is reading in debate at the present time. Now, I have settled the answer, or I hope I have, of the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson). If there are any other points of order in regard to the matter of the tabling of documents now, and anyone else wishes to raise a point of order, I would like him to do so at the present time. I just want to settle these things, one thing at a time.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, would you kindly make a ruling on the objection that I raised, that this matter was the subject of a previous debate?

Mr. Speaker: — Well, whether it was a subject of a previous debate or not,

March 2, 1965

I could not exactly say unless, and until, I see the correspondence, but I would draw to the attention of the hon. member who has just raised the question, that I think all the correspondence which was referred to in a previous debate (I think you were referring to the Throne Speech debate) I think all that correspondence was tabled. Therefore, any further correspondence must be new correspondence or different correspondence because if it was previously tabled, it is now in the clerk's office and is the property of this house and it stays there, if I understand correctly, henceforth and forevermore,

Now, I think that is the answer to that question. One can hardly raise a point of order on correspondence when the said correspondence has already been tabled. Now the member for Wadena.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I believe the member just mentioned, these were not signed letters, carbon copies, and if you turn to Beauchesne 158, sub-section 3, it says:

An unsigned letter should not be read into the house.

On May 16, 1928, a member stated, during debate that a letter which he had been quoting was not signed. The speaker said, such a letter should not be read into the Hansard. All letters when read must be signed and they become part of the documents of the house.

That is in Beauchesne, on page 134.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, in regard to the point raised by the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) who sits behind me, concerning the point made by the minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane) that all correspondence between a minister and his staff should not be regarded as privileged but should be open to be tabled. I want to suggest to you, Sir, that these are one and the same question, the question raised by the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) and the question I raised. Whether the correspondence between the Premier and members of his staff should be producible on motion in this house, or whether it is privileged, they are privileged papers. I do not think there is any doubt about it, they are privileged papers. But if we are going to take it the other way, well I am certainly going to ask for a lot of correspondence between ministers and their staffs. I do not think that is the right thing, and I do not think that is the way we should proceed.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I think it is a well known principle and practice that under normal consideration and in the normal course of events, correspondence between a minister and officials in his department is privileged. But, Mr. Speaker, we have a little different situation.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — No.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — You just remain quiet for a moment, and listen, you may learn something.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Normally, correspondence between a minister and his officials concerns the operation of his department. Normally, it is not political propaganda or requesting civil servants to perform political propaganda.

Now, the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), if my hearing is correct, has not stated at this point who these letters were addressed to.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Oh, yes he did.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — No, he did not.

An Hon. Member: — He did.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Well, you go and read the official record and I think you will find that he has not stated yet.

An Hon. Member: — But he will.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when people are employed by the taxpayer of this province, to conduct a political campaign, that this is a horse of a different color, and that the members of this legislature and the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know what went on and how the taxpayers money was spent. No one could agree more that normal correspondence between a minister and his officials is privileged, but this is not normal correspondence. My friends opposite, also know that correspondence between a minister and his officials, or vice versa, that copies of that correspondence are not signed. Is there any ex-minister who can produce carbon copies of correspondence between him and his officials, or vice versa, that has been signed?

An Hon. Member: — No.

Mr. Nollet: — Sure.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — This is not the procedure. I don't know why the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) would say "sure" because when he left his office, there wasn't even a blotting pad left.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — He just cleaned it out.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — There wasn't a file left . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — He stole the files.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . signed or unsigned. I suggest to you, that it is in the public interest for the information that is contained in the documents that the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is referring to, is in the public interest and in the interest of Saskatchewan that this type of activity should stop forthwith and be carried on by no government.

Mr. Berezowsky: — It would be better if the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) were working for the Department of Education.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Oh, there might be a letter or two to you, too, Bill.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Yes, good.

Mr. Speaker: — Now it seems to me that in all the citations that I have read in all the authorities, that correspondence falls into three general categories. That is the category of private and individual letters that are written probably in long hand from one person to another person. It does not seem to me, although I have no means of knowing this, that we are dealing with that type at the moment. Then there is another category that of state papers, which fall into a different category. Now, whether or not this is a state paper, I could not say.

Then there is the question of private or confidential correspondence passing between offices of a government department, which fall into categories to which somewhat different rules apply from those which apply to letters or state papers. I have no means of knowing and neither has the house until such time as the correspondence is tabled, of what nature these particular letters are, whether they are private letters, confidential letters, or state papers. I am going to read the citation from the authorities:

In regard to private or confidential correspondence passing between offices of a government department, which forms a category to which different rules apply other than those which apply to state papers and letters. This correspondence, if cited in debate need not necessarily be tabled — especially if the minister declares that it is of a confidential nature.

Now this citation is from Bourinot, page 338:

It is important to note that this class of correspondence while dealing with public affairs is essentially private correspondence

March 2, 1965

And, as May points out:

As the house deals only with public documents in its proceedings, it could not thus incidentally, require the production of papers, which if moved for separately would be refused as beyond its jurisdiction.

Now it seems to me that this matter is fairly clear, that if the member wishes to quote from these papers, I do not think he is obliged to table them, but I certainly think he should table them, all of them. I don't think anybody should quote from any letter, that he does not table unless he has a thundering good reason for not doing so.

However, if he wants to quote from whatever he wishes to quote from and he is willing to table that correspondence, so that every member of this house will have the same access to it that he has, then I think he is perfectly entitled to proceed to do so.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, would you please rule on the citation I raised? That was on page 134 of Beuchesne, sub-section 3 of 158.

An unsigned letter should not be read in the house . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Now, this is sub-section 3 of 158, I will rule on that now.

An unsigned letter should not be read in the house . . .

I think it also follows in some other citation that If the member quoting from a letter and not wishing to table it, and I am referring to a letter, he must take responsibility for the signature and responsibility for the contents. Now this is something different, because the member is prepared to table the correspondence and it is not, at least I don't think it is, a private letter, this, I would say, falls into the category of correspondence passing between offices and departments of the government. So we have another category here.

Mr. Dewhurst: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is that an unsigned letter should not be read, but if a member has a signed letter and he assumes full responsibility, as though it were his own statements, then he does not have to table it. But this point here, in my thinking, makes it quite clear that an unsigned letter cannot be read because no one knows and there is not way of proving who wrote an unsigned letter if it is not signed. The same rule holds for telegrams because there is no way to prove who sent a telegram because they don't have signatures.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Before Your Honor rules on that, I wonder if I might just add a word. A letter which is not signed is not a letter. A letter is only a letter when it is addressed to someone and signed by someone and, Mr. Speaker, the reason for the rule that an unsigned letter cannot be read to the house, is because it is a thoroughly anonymous piece of paper, and to read an anonymous piece of paper with some typed name at the bottom of it is to endanger the misleading of the house because it is not a letter. Any citations which Your Honor has read referring to letters, do not apply to a piece of paper that is not signed. To call an unsigned piece of paper a letter is so obviously a travesty upon the meaning of words, it could not possibly come under the rule that applies to letters and, Your Honor, this is the reason why the section says that an unsigned letter cannot be read to the house.

The citations that Your Honor has been referring to are letters, letters because they are signed. Letters which are not signed are not letters, and that is why the rule that the hon. member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) referred to permits no exceptions. It doesn't provide for any exceptions, it is categorical. Now, if the hon. member wants to state, as his opinion, the contents, he may do so, but to attribute it to someone, as though it were a letter when it is not signed, is obviously to misrepresent its essential nature. Its essential nature is merely a piece of paper with some typing on it — no signature — no letter, Your Honor.

Mr. Speaker: — I thank the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) for his . . .

Hon. J.M. Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources): — May I just say a word on that before you make a ruling? Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the confusion here arises over whether this is a letter or not a letter. I suggest that this type of correspondence is not in the nature of a letter as referred to in Section 153. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a public document and I want to refer to Section 159 of Beauchesne, and I think that this falls squarely within the first two lines of that section, it says:

1. The reference to a public document in the possession of a committee, which is not taking action on it, is not irregular.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this particular document that the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is making reference to is a document in the possession of a committee. It was a committee set up by the Executive Council on Minority Rights . . .

Mr. Walker: — Oh, no . . .

An Hon. Member: — No, no.

Mr. Cuelenaere: — Well, that is what it says, the committee is auxiliary to cabinet. These documents, Mr. Speaker, are public documents and they were simply reports of this particular servant working on this Committee on Minority Rights, to presumably a cabinet minister, or the Executive Council, and these are part of the records, part of the public records, and they were found in his office at the time, or after he had left, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite in order to refer to these documents. It is not irregular. It goes on to say, this has been admitted, that a document which has been cited ought to be laid on the table of the house, if it can be done without injury to the public interests. And as it has been pointed out by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) it is in the public interest that these documents should be brought out and laid on the table. It is without injury to the public interest, in fact, to the contrary, it is the benefit of the public interest, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling should be that these documents are public documents and that it is not irregular to refer to them.

Mr. Walker: — On the question which were raised by the hon. minister, first of all the committee referred to in the context of the rules of procedure, can only mean a committee of this house. It cannot mean a committee of the United Nations, or a committee of the Boy Scouts, or a Church Committee, or Legion committee, or any other committee, except a committee of this house, Your Honor.

Furthermore, Your Honor, my hon. friends say, of course, that this is not a letter — it is a document. Well, Your Honor, is every piece of paper a document? Is every piece of paper a document — a piece of paper that has no signature? It has no seal — it has no coat of arms — or any letterhead, or anything else at all about its character, except that it is a piece of paper with some typing on it. Is that a document? Your Honor, if that is a document, this does violence to the use of the English language.

A document is a document that has some substance, some sanctity, some reality about it. Is a match cover a document? It has some words on it. Is it a document? Is the microphone here a document? It has some words on it — it has a name on it. Is it a document? A document requires a seal, or something to give it some substance, or a signature, or a letterhead, or something to identify it. Surely every piece of paper with some typing on it is not a document, Your Honor.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order and on the point just made by my hon. friend from Hanley (Mr. Walker). This is a very curious and interesting display of inventiveness and originality. My friend from Hanley (Mr. Walker) is arguing that copies of letters are not documents, and yet he and his colleagues, who were in the government of this province until the 22nd of May, shipped cartons and carloads of documents to the Archives and they were defined as public documents within the meaning of The Archives Act.

March 2, 1965

You will find a great many of those cartons contained carbon copies of unsigned letters. Now he cannot have it both ways, he cannot blow hot one day and cold the next. I submit that these are documents, and to say that a microphone is not a document is just a refuge of someone who is trying to buttress a very weak case. I submit that the observations made by the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources, (Mr. Cuelenaere) are correct. These are public documents and everybody knows it, including the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker).

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, if they are letters then they come within the express prohibition of the rules and are not admissible because they are not signed.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Make up your mind, take a stand. You say they are printed documents, privileged documents, letters, etc., make up your mind!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, what you have said so far has not decided the point that I raised originally. That is, whether or not the correspondence between civil servants and the members of their departments or their minister is privileged. Is it right that they should not be produced except with the consent of the people and the principals concerned? Or can we ask for all the correspondence between the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his deputy minister and his branch heads during the month of last November and expect to get it tabled in the house? We can ask for it, but we can't get it, I can guarantee you that.

The only difference, if this is a letter that the hon. member is referring to, that passed between this civil servant and the former Premier of this province, and that is what they said. They said it was addressed to the former Premier of this province, then it falls into this class, and the fact that it is six or seven years old does not change the situation. The fact that it was lifted or stolen from a wastepaper basket or a file does not change the situation. Either it is still entitled to be a privileged document or it isn't, and if this kind of material can be produced in this house, then we have the right to ask for all of the correspondence, all of the communications between the ministers and their deputies and their branch heads, for all time.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. minister wants to call for all documents that were found in the wastepaper baskets, I presume we would give them to him, but I can assure him that any documents that are in my department, that are privileged, are certainly not going to be taken. As I pointed out earlier on, Mr. Speaker, this is not a normal situation. Normally, correspondence that passes between a minister and his servants concerns the everyday workings of his department. It does not concern a political campaign. This material, which we are now discussing, is political propaganda between a civil servant and his minister, and I think it is the public interest that it ought to be made public.

Why are my hon. friends refusing and squeamish? They know what is in this correspondence, and they have a guilty conscience, if you didn't have . . .

Mr. Walker: — We know what . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . you wouldn't be opposed to the reading of this correspondence in this house. What we want in this case, I suggest to the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) is honesty and sincerity, and to bring to the light of day some of these happenings and you must accept responsibility for it. These documents, as I understand them are the report of the workings of this committee and surely this house is entitled to this information. If the house isn't entitled to it, then who is? If any person appends some \$31,000 of the taxpayers' money to get this information, surely this house is entitled to that information, but my friends opposite do not want this. Why? Because it is politically incriminating . . .

Mr. Walker: — Point of order, has the hon. member the right to impute

motives? Mr. Speaker, we do not want to see the rules of this house trampled upon, and the hon. member has no right to impute motives to any member of this house.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Well, then let us read the correspondence.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Now you want a ruling. You are going to get one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Now, I have no means of knowing what these documents are, and neither has any other member of this house who has not seen them, but I am assuming that they are documents which came from some government file or other, and on that assumption, I am going to make a ruling in regard thereto. Now, I may be incorrect in assuming this, but I am assuming that there are cases and cases of files in the administrative set-up of this government in everybody's office, which contain the copies of letters or correspondence, which were transmitted from one person to another, from a minister, from a civil servant, to various places . . .

Mr. Walker: — Purported copies, Your Honor, purported copied . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Now, just a minute, you have risen three times on this question of order, and I think that should be fairly well enough, I have listened to both sides of the house as well as I can. I think that if this house passes a motion for return, asking for certain correspondence, that would be correspondence which would be produced, whether it was the original, or whether it was the copy, and I think hon. members would have the right to move such a motion. If the house passed it, they could expect the correspondence. If the house did not pass it, then they would not get it. I am presuming, because these came out of some government file or other, that they are documents which could be asked for on a motion for return, and I, therefore, think that they are documents which the member can quote from, providing he tables them, but also in so doing, I think the member should take a responsibility as to where he got them from, wherever they came from, out of a government file, out of an office in this government . . .

Mr. Nollet: — . . . wastepaper basket . . .

Mr. Speaker: — He has to take the responsibility of where they came from, and I think that is only reasonable, and that is the ruling.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, with that ruling I will proceed. I left off with mention that I wished to read a letter from the executive director of the provincial minority group to the Hon. T.D. Douglas. This was on March 4th, 1960, and it would be only four days after he had taken on his new position. He writes:

Extension of votes to Indians and Your letter of March 2nd.

and this is to the Hon. T.C. Douglas with a carbon copy to the Hon. J.H. Sturdy.

Having chatted the matter over with Mr. Cliff Thurston and Mr. Sturdy, I proposed to take the following course of action. To spend March 10th and 11th meeting the executive of the Chiefs and listening to their point of view. This should convey to them the good-will of the Premier and reassure them of his friendly intentions. I think the likelihood of their becoming propagandists throughout the other agencies of the province would be increased if we did not evidence our concern by personal contact.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I am quite willing to table this letter, in fact I wish to do so at this time. I agree with the Minister of Agriculture that it is not normal to have carbon copies signed, and I am sorry that

March 2, 1965

the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) was so anxious to make a fool of himself that he couldn't wait to see whether this letter was signed or not, because Mr. Speaker, this is a signed letter by Mr. Ray Woollam and I wish to table it at this time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — All right, if you want . . .

Mr. Walker: — We heard that before, it wasn't so, you know.

Mr. Guy: — All right, if you want to deny it was a signed letter, stand up and say so.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, we heard that from no less gentleman than the Premier when it wasn't so.

Mr. Guy: — You have been wrong before. There is no reason why you can't be wrong again.

Mr. Speaker: — Now, the letter is tabled and every hon. member has the opportunity of taking a look at it and drawing his own conclusions therefrom.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) will not leave his seat because I have some correspondence here which I am going to table later on, which concerns him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there must have been considerable doubt as to the intention of the Premier in giving them the franchise if it was already necessary to . . .

Mr. J. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, when you gave your ruling I think you said something about the member taking responsibility and informing the house where he got the letter.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, these letters came into my hands in an honorable and acceptable way, and I will take full responsibility for quoting from these letters at this time, and I hope that that will satisfy the member from Kelsey.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, it doesn't because I do not believe that they came into his hands in an honorable way.

Mr. Guy: — And I can assure you that they did not come as a result of Mr. Beeching or the Communist party.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) to withdraw that statement. This house has no interest in what he thinks or what he doesn't think, the statement he made is out of order and I would ask him to withdraw.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. It is a matter of opinion as to what is an honorable manner. The hon. member has every right to believe that he got them in an honorable manner, and I have every right to believe that he did not.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to draw the attention of the house to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules, citation 154, to which I think I drew the attention of the house once before —

The imputation of bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged, misrepresenting the language

of another, or accusing him in his turn of misrepresentation, charging him with falsehood or deceit, or contemptuous or insulting language of any kind and all these are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference.

Now this is the imputation of bad motives, as I see it, and I think the point of order raised by the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) is well taken.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I don't think this was a questioning of his motives at all, but this was just a difference of opinion as to how he got them. If it is offensive I will withdraw the words.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I understood it was in order to impute bad motives. The member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) imputed bad motives to everybody on this side of the house and nobody asked him to withdraw it.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I shall . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Did the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) rise?

Mr. Walker: — I did, Your Honor, I did.

Mr. Speaker: — And what did he say?

Mr. Walker: — He said nothing, Your Honor, he got away with it as usual. He said that all hon. members in this house were objecting to the production of these documents because they were afraid that these documents would disclose wrong-doing by them, and that we knew it, and I objected, Your Honor, that that was attributing motives.

Mr. Speaker: — That is all the more reason for letting the documents lie on that table and see whether it is true or not. Improper language . . .

Mr. Walker: — Improper language, the test is not whether it is true or not, the test is whether it is offensive, as to whether it should be withdrawn. Your Honor, are we going to have him withdraw this imputation of motives or not? Does he have to withdraw this imputation of improper motives or not?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — I would like to point out that nobody asked me to withdraw it, if they had done so, I . . .

Mr. Walker: — Your Honor will recall that I rose to my feet and I asked that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) would withdraw that attribution of improper motives, and no ruling was made by Your Honor on this question until it was objected over there on the other side, that Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey) had made an objectionable statement.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, if I said anything that offends my hon. friend, I would be glad to withdraw.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I think I had better say that I also lost the trend in the rest of the hassle.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying there appears to be some doubt as to the intention of the Premier in giving the Indian people the franchise at this time, if it was already necessary to reassure them of friendly intentions.

This was the first time the Premier placed politics ahead of the welfare of the people, and took advantage of a civil servant's desire to serve his minister. What is unfortunate is that it had to be the Indian

March 2, 1965

people of our province that first were taken advantage of for the political advantage of the Premier and the party in power.

Now the next work to which the Executive Director of Minority Groups turned his hand was outlined in a letter of March 22nd, 1960, to the Hon. J.H. Sturdy, this time with a carbon copy to the Hon. T.C. Douglas, entitled "Political Question Affecting Northern Indians" and this is what he writes:

In a number of constituencies, I would think it would be appropriate for a candidate to have an Indian campaign manager. This person could be carefully selected as one whose judgement would be sound regarding choice of interpreters on various reserves, etc. An interpreter standing near the blackboard helps the voter to understand that he marks his "x" opposite the number of the candidate of his choice. If we follow this procedure, the Indian would be less confused.

He would be less confused all right, Mr. Speaker, because he would have been told in his native tongue, exactly where to put his "X".

Here we have a servant of the province, advising the Premier and J.H. Sturdy, regarding ways and means by which the CCF, through carefully chosen interpreters, could control elections where Indians vote. Immoral and illegal!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — As a result of this information, we find the plot begins to deepen now, because it is no use having the Indian people vote unless they vote correctly. So, the Premier and cabinet decided to combine the franchise with the granting of liquor rights. Again, an action perhaps overdue, duty again an action that should have been requested and discussed by the people themselves . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, again I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has imputed motives to all of us who were in the previous government and he should withdraw the imputation.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I shall withdraw that imputation. All I will say is that, at the same time that they gave the franchise to the Indian people, they also gave them the privilege of having liquor — for the first time. Now, if there are any motives imputed there — if the shoe fits, let them wear it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — In a letter to Mr. Henry Charles, a treaty Indian, a northern Indian, on April 28, 1960, Mr. Woollam writes —

Mr. Sturdy has asked me to reply to your letter of March 10th. We can say to you in confidence that the matter of granting liquor rights to Indian people will be proclaimed by the cabinet, some time before the end of the year.

I wish to table that letter, Sir.

Mr. Walker: — Garbage.

An Hon. Member: — Wait until we get . . .

Mr. Guy: — Maybe he should be a page boy! He would contribute more to the house than he has at present.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall go on, because this was not good enough for the people that sit opposite today, for on June 2nd, 1960, just six days before the provincial election, a hurried memo from the executive director

to the Hon. R.A. Walker, said:

Mr. Sturdy has asked me to remind you to prepare an immediate Order-in-Council, regarding the proclamation of that provincial legislation which will extend liquor privileges to Indians of Saskatchewan. Mr. Lee tells me that Premier Douglas made the announcement to a group of northern Indians this week, and that this matter would be proclaimed by July 1st. I doubt that this is possible.

However, there we are, a rush to get the liquor privileges to the Indians . . .

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I have much spicier letters than that.

An Hon. Member: — When we find them we will read them to you.

Mr. Guy: — Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General, at that time, had had the integrity that he has lead us to believe he has, throughout the many years that he has sat in this house, he would have refused to pass an Order-in-Council under the circumstances, and he would have persuaded the Premier of this province not to mix liquor and politics.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — However, there is absolute proof that the former Premier of this province, and his candidates, were not content to wait for the Indians to get legal liquor privileges by the regular channels, instead they beat the gun by a few days. I have a letter here dated July 14th, 1960 to Mr. Allan Quandt, Lac la Ronge, who just happened to be my defeated CCF opponent in that election and this is what Mr. Woollam writes, and I want to table this letter, as soon as I am finished — Mr. Allan Quandt, Lac la Ronge.

Dear Allan:

Just a line to indicate to you my hopes that you have recovered from the blow of the recent election. You should have spent more money on liquor.

Table that, please.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — He doesn't say some money, he says more money, showing clearly that in spite of what members opposite claim, it was the practice of the CCF-NDP candidates to use liquor as a means of buying votes, and clearly recommended by the Director of the minority Groups, responsible to the Premier and the Executive Council, that this was their way of helping Indians under the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! All that correspondence that goes on that table is going to stay there until the clerk numbers it.

Mr. Guy: — Now, Mr. Speaker, just to bear out what I have said, I have a letter here to Mr. Percy Brown, CCF Central Office, Regina, in which the Executive Director for Minority Groups says that he had been discussing the matter of liquor with Mr. Ross Thatcher, who was the Leader of the Opposition at that time, he says:

It appears that the Liberal Party would be quite prepared to make similar accusations against the CCF for alleging pouring of liquor in the Athabasca election. There does seem to be a general rumor that Allan Quandt has not been guiltless in this regard, and it would be well if we checked it out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is in entirely different circumstances, and entirely

March 2, 1965

different attitudes than we saw this afternoon when I quoted from the Commonwealth where Mr. Woolam said that

at no point in my recollection were any allegations made against the CCF.

Here in a letter, he has admitted that allegations have been made and in a former letter he has said you should have spent "more money on liquor . . ."

An Hon. Member: — No, no.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Toby says that we should have . . .

Mr. Guy: — Toby agrees, well, that sounds like it. I think they spent a little . . .

Mr. Nollet: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is reading from a letter, written by a person who was never in this house, never in this house and from it he interprets a meaning which indicates that all of us over here have been guilty of giving liquor to the Indians. Now is this not imputing motives by association with a letter, written by a person outside of this house? Maybe this one is signed, or unsigned, I don't know, but the opinions of that one person and his viewpoint — if they did, in fact, indicate that Mr. Quandt, or someone else, should have distributed liquor to get the Indian vote — is not necessarily the viewpoint of the government or the members on this side of the house.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, never in my entire experience has any candidate on this side of the house ever offered any liquor to Indians for their votes and I have talked against it repeatedly, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — Others have done this, and I think what Mr. Woollam means is that he should have done what the Liberals did, and given them liquor if they wanted to get elected.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the gentleman in question was responsible to the Premier and the Executive Council and any of his actions must be accepted by those people I have another letter here that I would like to table. Now, Mr. Speaker, a further interesting note was added on July 4th, in a letter from the executive director to the Hon. T.C. Douglas, in which the director is discussing the possibility of his Committee on Minority Groups being shifted to Municipal Affairs and this is what he writes:

I think you will understand how much it is our hope that we may remain under the Executive Council for at least a year. I think we would be well advised to capitalize on the security which many of the Indian people feel concerning this intangible relationship with the Premier. Putting it bluntly, this matter of leader-image is all important to them.

And I would like to table that letter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what an image! The Premier of the province using an ethnic group, untrained and unversed in politics, and through mixing voting and liquor, attempting to gain their support for his own political advantage. From that time on, the executive directory was busily engaged with the problems that had been created by the giving of liquor privileges before an adequate education program had been carried out. In a letter on December 14, 1960, to the Chairman of the Liquor Commission, he admits the Premier was wrong. He signed this one — this is a good one. Referring to the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, he says:

They, too, have strong feelings that some kind of educational campaign ought to have preceded the granting of liquor rights to Indian people.

and I would like to table this letter, which was signed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all this turmoil, misunderstanding and prejudice

could have been avoided, if the Premier and his cabinet had only placed people ahead of politics.

The next event which I wish to refer to, is beyond the comprehension and understanding of good Christians, whatever their religion may be. On November 2, 1960, the following letter was written to the Hon. T.C. Douglas, from the executive director, Mr. Woollam:

You may have heard of some rash, but interesting actions that were recently taken by your friend, Earl Stotesbury. In view of a gathering Oblate monopolization of residential educational facilities for Indians, Earl gathered up 44 youngsters in a bus and stole them across to two Protestant institutions in Alberta against the will of Indian Affairs Branch people. Matters later became very complicated when half a dozen of the youngsters professed both Protestant and Catholic Churches' affiliation.

Earl left a copy of the enclosed correspondence with me yesterday. You may like to peruse same.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this was a deliberate attempt by a United Church minister to drive a wedge between Protestant and Catholic churches, as well as between the Provincial and Federal Indian Affairs. But what was the significance of the fact that Mr. Woollam himself, a United Church minister, found it necessary and desirable to bring this action to the attention of a Baptist minister and former Premier of this province. There only appears to be one answer. These deplorable actions mentioned, were carried out, if not at the command, at least with the blessing of the Hon. T.C. Douglas, then Premier of Saskatchewan, certainly an action not be condemned, rather than praised, by a man whose terms of reference outline his duties as maintaining good relations with the officials of the Indian Affairs Branch.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — The hon. member did not table the letter . . .

Mr. Guy: — I would like to table the letter at this time.

Now, in early 1961, we find our Executive Director of Minority Groups, under the direction of Premier Douglas, helping the minority groups by becoming involved in the Turtleford by-election. I guess he felt that the CCF was a minority group needing his assistance. The first correspondence of not took place on February 3, 1961, when he wrote to Mr. F. Turgeon, in the CCF committee rooms:

Hilliard McNab is now on his way back to Witchekan and Pelican Lake Reserves.

It is regrettable that Hilliard was not able to complete some carefully planned ground work which he had done both at Onion Lake and Thunderchild. I have discussed this with the Premier and we feel it is important that he go back up there for two or three days before the election in order to do this.

I will be driving Mr. Douglas from Spiritwood to Leoville and over to Turtleford on the 19th and 20th.

I wish to table that letter. He and the Premier were real buddies when it comes to political involvement on the taxpayers' money — a fine example of a non-political civil servant.

Now, for the first time, it appears that perhaps the Executive Director of Minority Groups has other interests which he feels will help the minority groups of this province. On February 7th, 1961, he writes to Stan Rands, in the Public Health Department, as follows:

Stan I have just stumbled on to your radiation hazards bulletin of January 1st. If you would like to send me over about 20 of your Nuclear Disarmament pins, I will be pleased to get rid of them for you.

March 2, 1965

No mention on that one, whether it was at the request of Premier Douglas, but also no mention that it was not on the request of the Premier.

Now we come back to the Turtleford by-election, we find that since the liquor promises of the 1960 election were not successful, the Premier decided to promise things which would not lead to so much trouble for the government. So, again, Mr. Woollam comes up with the perfect answer. On February 13, 1961, in a letter to Hon. T.C. Douglas, he says:

I discussed with Tim this morning the possibility of your being in a position to make some commitments to the people on Onion Lake reserve regarding road work they want up to Little Island. Tim has asked Mr. Kuziak to memo you on this.

Now certainly this is a valuable employee of the government, when it comes to ideas for gathering Indian votes.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not table that one.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to table these letters that I have read and they are very interesting.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — There is one over on the other side, there.

Mr. Guy: — These are the ones here, Sir.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Put it over on the other side.

Mr. Guy: — You better clean your glasses, Sir.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Your slight of hand is not good enough.

Mr. Guy: — Now we come to a very, very serious aspect of this whole question, because it was most unfortunate that Mr. Douglas was not content in using those directly responsible to him for his political gain, but he also placed other civil servants in a very embarrassing and dangerous position by practically forcing them to carry out actions on behalf of the CCF.

I wish to refer to a letter to Mrs. Edith Mills, Onion Lake Nursing Station, Onion Lake, Saskatchewan, on February 16th, 1961.

You may wonder why some cheques from the CCF office arrived in your mail box. I was asked how the Provincial CCF could get some expense money out to David Knight, Eli and Lennox Wuttunee, who are working on the Onion Lake reserve, most easily. I felt that you would not mind seeing that this money got to them right away.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this woman had refused this request . . . (I would like to table this letter, Sir) . . . no doubt, her job would have been in jeopardy. No person or profession was free from political involvement under the former Premier and his colleagues.

Now, the by-election over, and the CCF defeated, the executive director, even though his advice had not been too successful up in Turtleford, still remained in the role to political adviser to the Premier. Members of this house will recall in the spring session of 1961, the Socialists introduced amendments to the Northern Administration Act, which would have provided jail terms for residents not paying hospital premiums and also forcing storekeepers, fish-buyers, etc., to collect these premiums or fact similar treatment. After strenuous objection from the Liberal opposition the government let the bill drop. (I hope the member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) will not leave, because I have a letter here that concerns him that is of considerable interest). At the time we gave them the benefit of the doubt and believed they dropped it out of concern for the people involved. But in a letter from the executive director to the Hon. T.C. Douglas in which he discussed Bill no. 72, we find the following:

I suggest that a majority of these buyers and employers are only now beginning to understand

some of our government programs in the north, and I think they are beginning to feel sympathetic. I further suggest that this is a definite way of discouraging such growing sympathies.

This scheme is sure to have an adverse effect on the Metis vote — and certainly it will have an adverse effect on the Treaty Indian vote as well.

So here when we thought the government was acting in the interests of the people involved, we find again that it was politics ahead of people, but this time it worked out in favor of the people of northern Saskatchewan.

Now while being political advisor to the Premier on provincial matters, the Premier is also involving his Executive Director of Minority Groups in Saskatchewan, into the minority groups on the federal scene.

An Hon. Member: — Table that, Sir.

An Hon. Member: — The one on the left side

Mr. Guy: — Don't point, it is rude.

Now, Sir, this minority group happened to be the NDP party which was in the planning stage at this time . . .

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — The man is very, very sure of himself, and he is very free with his advice on the side, but if he is reading from a paper, Sir, this is the one that should be tabled, not some other copy. The one that he read, he laid down at the other side. Playing slight-of-hand is no way of doing business in this house.

Mr. Guy: — On April 6th, 1961, a letter . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I couldn't say, I think he has tabled all the letters he has quoted from.

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, he has not been tabling the ones he has been reading from, he has read them and laid them down and handed another one to be tabled.

Mr. Speaker: — Now I am going to make a ruling that from here on in, I am going to make the Page boy stand down there, and as he is handed a letter, he goes up and tables it. Now, get down there.

Mr. Steuart: — He doesn't have to table his notes.

Mr. Speaker: — No, he doesn't have to table his notes.

Mr. Guy: — Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the minority group . . .

Mr. Willis: — Could we have the report?

Mr. Guy: — What report would you like, Sir.

Mr. Willis: — Oh I thought the Page boy was to make a report . . .

Mr. Guy: — Well he could probably make a report far better than some of the members that are sitting across on the other side.

Mr. Speaker: — The Page boy is to stand there and table the letters as they are handed to him, and that is that.

Mr. Guy: — I will say again that this minority group happened to be the NDP Party which was in the planning stage at this time. On April 6th, 1961,

March 2, 1965

a letter to the Hon. T.C. Douglas went as follows:

Would you care to comment on the enclosed list of five suggested "planks" for the new party? We would appreciate your comments as to these five suggestions.

Incidentally I am chatting with the Lakeview CCF Club on this subject this evening.

There you are, Sir, table it.

I would remind this house and the people of Saskatchewan that this was work that was being done on the taxpayers' money, with the full cognizance and blessing of the former Premier and his cabinet. It was deplorable enough to use a civil servant for political purposes on the political scene, without involving him in federal affairs. No doubt, by this time Premier Douglas was envisioning himself as the Messiah of the new party.

A similar letter goes to Mr. Berry Richards, April 12th, 1961, I am not going to read it, but I am prepared to table it.

Now, during June, 1961, the executive director informed the Premier that he was "Hutteriting" with Everett Wood, former Speaker of this legislature, who more than anyone else, on that side of the house, should have recognized the importance of keeping politics out of the civil service.

An Hon. Member: — Are you going to table it?

Mr. Guy: — Yes, the letter will be tabled as all other letters have been tabled.

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I say that politics did not enter into our discussion, while we visited three Hutterite colonies at that time.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, may I have that letter back, Sir.

Mr. Fred Dewhurst (Wadena): — No, the clerk first has to initial it.

Mr. Guy: — Alright, I shall quote what was said, and if I am wrong, you can correct me from the letter when you have a chance to see it. And this is what it says:

At the Simmie meeting we had agreed that I would take the whipping boy role and he the role of the politician.

No politics had been discussed between the two members! Oh, no! I might as well read a little more:

Although only one person at the meeting showed any signs of a changing point of view, I do think the community is much less politically hostile than they were as a result of this visit.

Now, whether that was the result of the part that the executive director played or the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, I do not know, but he managed to swing one in his direction during that time. (No, the letter has already been tabled.)

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member whose words are these?

Mr. Guy: — These are the words of one of your civil servants to the Premier.

Mr. Nollet: — Who?

Mr. Guy: — The Executive Director for provincial Minority Groups.

Mr. Nollet: — What is his name?

Mr. Guy: — Why? You were there when he was doing all the political work. Don't you know? Weren't you any closer connected?

Mr. Nollet: — What is his name? What is his name?

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Woollam.

Mr. Nollet: — Well, that is not Mr. Wood's words. These are not his words.

Mr. Guy: — No, but he said . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Sure, imputation.

Mr. Guy: — Yes, and Mr. Woods will not stand up on the floor of this house and deny that he was with Mr. Woollam at this time — I will sit down and give him the opportunity.

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, it was with thoroughly legitimate purposes that we visited the Hutterite colonies. They were having trouble being established in the Swift Current constituency.

Mr. Guy: — Well, I am glad, Mr. Woods was not a whipping boy. I am glad that he was a politician.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again evidence points that political interest in Hutterites was of foremost importance, rather than the needs of the Hutterite people themselves. I have here an interesting letter from June 20th 1961, which the executive director writes to the Premier:

I am making interim plans to take some of my holiday time during July to end with a hitch-hiking trip to the Founding Convention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, surely to goodness he had proven his value to the Premier over the past year, to the point that Tommy could at least have bought him a bus ticket or a bicycle. Later in the same letter he refers to the fact that he would be prepared to take Saskatchewan Indians to attend the convention and participate in a presentation, and he said:

I mention this for your consideration only, and will take no action until I hear from you.

How it is difficult to see how taking Saskatchewan Indians to the NDP convention fits into the references that were outlined at the beginning in regard to his responsibility for the minority groups of this province. But the last sentence is significant because it bears out my contention, Mr. Speaker, that this man did only what the Premier told him to do, and that all his regrettable actions were the result of orders from the former Premier, who used a willing and faithful friend to carry out political activities, where political activities were not warranted.

Now, back from the Founding convention and still proud of his idol, Premier Douglas, he writes to Percy Brown, on August 18th.

Dear Percy:

Would you bundle up a few of those large photos of Premier Douglas and send them to C.H. Herick, Publisher of the Indian and Eskimo Review. Thanks, Percy.

During this time, the cabinet had agreed to send eighty members of the Royal Regiment of Canada on a Saskatchewan tour during July, 1962, and plans were made to meet with the Colonel of the regiment to consider how to use the occasion of the visit to publicize the history and situation of Indian and Metis people. On August 18th, our executive director sent a letter to this effect to these people:

Dr. Peter Worsley, Mr. Berry Richards, Mr. Malcolm Norris, Mr. David Knight.

March 2, 1965

He mentions in this letter:

To lay plans for further discussions with Colonel Frost, a small group is being asked to meet with Tom Hill in the King George Hotel, at 1:30 on September 8th.

Then he says at the bottom:

Incidentally I have memoed Brock asking him to "spring" Malcolm for the day. Perhaps Berry, Malcolm and Dave will be able to drive down together.

Now this would appear evident that the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) also favored the political activities of our friend, because the Malcolm Norris referred to was a civil servant in his department at that time, but he had been asked to "spring" him for the day. Table that.

On September 6th, the following letter was sent to the same chaps with the disturbing notation to a new member of this particular committee, Mr. Mike Kew, and in a P.S. it says:

P.S. to Mike Kew:

Our intention is to discuss with Tom Hill, the possible itinerary of the Royal Regiment in Saskatchewan and to lay some plans for counter demonstrations by Indian and Metis people. This, of course, is right up your alley. Please bring your 30-30 and a few hand grenades to the King George Hotel at 2 p.m. on Friday.

Now, Mr. Speaker, certain counter demonstrations, complete with 30-30 and hand grenades are not in the best interests of the Indian people.

Mr. Walker: — Is that all you can find?

Mr. Guy: — Rather, it seems to be part of the philosophy which significantly the letter writer and his friends believed in.

Now it was during this same period that the executive director had many irons in the fire. I hope the member for Battleford (Mr. Kramer) is in his seat because the executive director was involved in the formation of an Indian and Metis Service Council in North Battleford. For once it appeared he was doing work that was within his responsibility — but let us see how he went about it. During the past few years, Mr. Speaker, many Indian and Metis Service Councils have been formed across Canada, and without exception, the success of these organizations has been directly proportional to the involvement of Indian and Metis people in the planning and organization of these councils. It was, therefore, with wonderment that I read a letter of September 6, 1961, to Mr. Eiling Kramer, MLA concerning a meeting to organize a Service Council in North Battleford, and this is what the executive director writes:

We do not, of course, want to have any large numbers of people present from the reservation, nor do we at this first meeting want any particularly large or representative group from the community. It would be ideal if about 20 concerned and sensitive people came together having many contacts in the organizations of the town as well as with Indian and Metis people.

Mr. Kramer: — So what!

Mr. Guy: — He says — so what! Now, why doesn't he want Indian or Community representatives present? Again, it was quite obvious that this new Indian and Metis Council, being set up in North Battleford, was not being formed for the benefit of the Indian people, but it was an attempt by a few CCF politicians and friends, including the local MLA (Mr. Kramer) to gain control over the activities of these people for the benefit of the political philosophy they represented.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. member for Athabasca

(Mr. Guy) is once more imputing motives, and I suggest that he should withdraw that statement, and I have proof that this did not happen, Sir. First of all, I want a withdrawal of that statement.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to say again, in that letter . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I asked for a withdrawal of an imputation of motives.

Mr. Thatcher: — What motives?

Mr. Kramer: — Motives that we were cooking up a political deal . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh, cooking it up, cooking it up . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is an imputation of motives, with all due respect.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I think the letter speaks for itself. When it says "that it didn't want any of the members from the reserves, it didn't want any of the interested people in the community, except those that were sensitive", well, I will leave you to draw your own conclusions. I am thoroughly ashamed of the member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) to use his position as a MLA to organize such a meeting, and I am sure that the people involved must . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the hon. member for Athabasca, (Mr. Guy) ought to be also ashamed of some prominent Liberals who were at that meeting . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — We are ashamed of them too.

I think the prominent Liberals likely showed up to see what the dis-prominent Socialists were up to.

Mr. Guy: — Now, Mr. Speaker, this again was an example of putting politics ahead of people, to the detriment of the people concerned. Now, on September 25th, 1961, he turns his attention once again to federal politics, while still being paid by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, still with the complete support and knowledge of Premier Douglas, as shown by his letter to Professor Michael Oliver, (I think he had something to do with the CCF party, I am not sure) where he says:

Since then I have carefully reviewed the resolutions that were processed and have culled and synthesized the same with the resulting list which I have reviewed with TCD. The Premier suggests that I forward this list to you and inform you of my eagerness to correspond or meet with those persons who will be finally responsible in this regard.

I would like to table that, Sir.

In fact this involvement in politics gets deeper and deeper, because on October 2nd, just six days later, in 1961, he writes again to Mr. Berry Richards, and he says:

Martin Semchuk, Meadow Lake, is awaiting an answer from a potential federal candidate, which he should get some time tomorrow. Meanwhile Martin and others in the west side of the constituency wonder if I will consider possibilities of letting my name stand at the Nominating Convention, October 28th.

Table that please.

March 2, 1965

Now, Mr. Speaker, one would certainly suppose that not even the Premier of this province would have the bare-faced gall to allow a civil servant to stand and campaign for a federal nomination, and still remain on the public pay-roll of this province. Yet, a memo to the Premier for his work program November, starts out:

I propose to concentrate my efforts on the Meadow Lake area for a six month period, as per our previous discussions.

Yes, in the next six months, and on the taxpayers' money, he campaigns in the Meadow Lake constituency, and this is another one, and the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) does not expect them to be signed, it is signed in ink "Ray Woollam".

He is proud of it, proud of the fact that he is going to work on the taxpayers' money.

An Hon. Member: — You won the Turtleford by-election . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Meadow Lake.

Mr. Guy: — Well, all I can say is that I am glad that the Conservatives won it and not the NDP's. Now that this program was carried out, and we have no reason to believe that it wasn't, very clearly outlined in a letter to Mrs. Cass-Beggs, president of the Lakeview CCF club, where he says:

I am now pretty well located at Meadow Lake for at least the next five or six months. However, I think it would be best if I resigned as program convener of the Lakeview CCF club. You sill know that Meyer Brownstone is committed to give a talk on his chapter of the book "Social Purposes for Canada" on November 27th.

Now, Mr. Speaker, final proof that Premier Douglas aided and abetted this action on behalf of a civil servant is shown in a letter to the Hon. T.C. Douglas in which he says, on February 22nd, 1962:

My activities here have slowly been adding up since last October, to where I consider to be good chances if I should stand as an NDP candidate in Meadow Lake.

For the last two weeks I have given addresses on the brotherhood week theme in each of the high schools of the constituency. This has had quite an effect on the teachers and students.

I am also getting into every home and school group in the area and each of the service clubs.

Really quite a busy man. I am going to refer to this a little later on so I will table it in the next few minutes. Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears from this letter that the Meadow Lake Federal constituency can thank one man that they did not get this misguided civil servant as their NDP candidate . . .

An Hon. Member: — Bert Cajew . . .

Mr. Guy: — No it wasn't Bert Cajew, it was Mr. Bob Wooff, the present member for Turtleford, sitting in this house, at the present time, Mr. Woollam continues in this same letter:

Frankly, my big source of difficulty has been one, Bob Wooff.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Bob keeps playing the theme . . .

An Hon. Member: — Not so fast.

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Would you please repeat it?

Mr. Guy: — Alright, Sir, for your benefit . . .

Frankly, my big source of difficulty has been one, Bob Wooff. Bob keeps playing the theme that we need a local farmer and Roman Catholic candidate. Therefore, Bob at many points, has chosen to do a little blocking.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, Bob!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I cannot but impress on this house, the seriousness . . .

Mr. Wooff: — Mr. Speaker, regardless of what you are reading, this is not the truth.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — This is not the truth as far as the whole picture is concerned, and as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the whole thing that this man is dealing with is just a lot of one-sided documents, for the most part.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we, on this side of the house, particularly care whether Mr. Bob Wooff was in favor of the person I mentioned there as being a candidate. Actually, I do not think we would have been in favor of having him for a candidate either. However, I cannot but impress on the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) the seriousness of a civil servant campaigning for a federal nomination on the taxpayers' money. Most serious of all is the fact that he was aided, abetted and encouraged by the Premier who should have had more moral integrity, even if the other members of his cabinet had not.

Now, probably seeing the writing on the wall, as far as getting the nomination, the Executive Director of Minority Groups turned his interests to the new field. On February 16th he wrote a letter to the Grove Press and this is what he asks:

Would you kindly rush one hand pocket book 'Red Star over China' and submit your bill in triplicate? Thank you.
Ray Woollam, Executive Director.

Mr. Thatcher: — Charging . . .

Mr. Guy: — Now, as we all know, a handbook is usually used during an election campaign. Who was going to use this one? NDP leader Douglas? Premier Lloyd? The MLA for Cut Knife? The member for Kelsey? After his complete agreement with the Communist party this afternoon, one begins to wonder. But regardless, Mr. Speaker, of who is going to use it, it appears that the taxpayer was going to pay for that book. Now, one cannot help but admire a man as dedicated to his beliefs, not only dedicated, but having the energy to carry them out, because during his six months' campaign in the Meadow Lake area, as well as campaign for the nomination, he wrote a political article for the Toronto Star Weekly, entitled "Million Dollar Pine Trees". I have it here, just in case the members opposite do not believe that it was ever written. "Million Dollar Pine Trees" by Ray H. Woollam, and in this article, he openly attacks Canada's defence policy and the building of the Mid-Canada Radar Line. Then, because he thought it was such a good article, he wrote a letter to Mr. Jack Shapiro, of the Regina News, on November 22nd, and he writes:

I have just returned from the Canoe Lake, Ile a la Crosse area and find many of the people up there in a state of high glee over the Star Weekly article. I wonder if you would feel like dropping notes to other distributors wherever you can, asking that they pull this article if possible.

For political reasons, I would like to have considerable quantities of the thing to distribute later among northern Indian people.

Mr. Thatcher: — Big fellow.

March 2, 1965

Mr. Guy: — Now he also had time, on the taxpayers' money, to carry out two other little projects, as were outlined in a letter on December 15th, to Mr. Frank Coburn. Now, I do not know who Mr. Frank Coburn is, but it seems to me I noticed in that paper tonight there was some reference to him being made . . .

Mr. Nollet: — You should go and see him, he is the fellow you should see.

Mr. Guy: — However, this is what he writes . . .

Mr. Nollet: — . . . ghosts, real interesting.

Mr. Guy: — This is while he was campaigning for the nomination, writing an article for the Toronto Star, he says:

I have been holding a number of meetings through this Meadow Lake area in an effort to generate some enthusiasm on the subject of radiation hazards . . .

An Hon. Member: — Bob Walker . . .

Mr. Guy: —

I would be pleased to enrol these people as rural members of the Saskatoon group . . .

where the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) comes from, only he didn't say that, but no doubt that is where he professes his membership. And then, not to be outdone, he is not going to give Saskatchewan the full benefit of this nuclear disarmament campaign, he says:

There is a possibility that I may hold a couple of meetings in the Fraser Valley in B.C. during the Christmas recess . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

Mr. Guy: — Oh, there is our nuclear disarmament . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, when you ruled a moment ago, that the hon. member had the right to table documents — would you rule, Mr. Speaker, whether this particular correspondence falls in the category of documents?

Mr. Speaker: — It seems to me that they are all much about the same. He is tabling as he goes along, so I presume he has the right to refer to them.

Mr. Guy: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a minute to remind the members opposite about the NDP Founding Convention in the summer of 1961. The members opposite were extremely proud that their provincial Premier was chosen leader, with the support of Claude Jodoin and David Lewis.

During the convention and the provincial NDP convention that followed, a resolution on the subject of NATO was the burning question of the day. It is interesting to me, and I think it will be interesting to the members opposite, even though it is three years later, to learn how hon. T.C. Douglas handled the matter, because in a letter to Dr. Peter Worsley on November 20th, 1961, Mr. Woollam writes:

You will know that T.C. Douglas pulled the same fast deal with the provincial CCF convention as he did with the Ottawa Founding convention on the

subject of NATO. This time he waited until the whole convention had unanimously endorsed a 'withdrawal from NATO' position, and then he rose up to flagellate any opposition and create a leadership issue resulting in the new determination of the convention to go along with his recommendations as they had already been stated by the Federal NDP.

You may also know that he made many wild statements about NATO as usual. He stated, for instance, that NATO may become the nucleus of the needed world police force.

An Hon. Member: — So what?

Mr. Guy: — I want to quote from this again so I will hold on to it for just a second.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the former Premier was not adverse to pulling the wool over the eyes of his own followers, as well as the general public for political gain. It also appears that this philosophy did not agree with the executive director for in a later paragraph, it appears that he will try and swing the NDP leader a little further left in his thinking, because he writes:

Could you round me up some pamphlet material, or a book or two, on the question of NATO's position in order that I might peruse the same and then persuade Tommy to read the material?

I had some brief discussions with him on the subject the other day and he admitted that he had not read very much on the subject . . .

I will table that, Sir, when it is time for it.

Mr. Nollet: — Demonstrates the mentality on that side of the house regarding their sense of responsibility in this legislature.

Mr. Guy: — My, it is hitting home, isn't it?

Mr. Nollet: — A bunch of rubbish!

Mr. Guy: — With that letter, an era in the life of the executive director ended. I suppose he had a falling-out with the NDP leader over NATO and now, of course, since Tommy had left the Saskatchewan scene, he no longer needed his obedient servant to gain more of his political aspirations, after he had duped his supporters into making him the leader of the new political party.

However, the distaste of a Premier deliberately and openly using a civil servant to further his political ambitions, provincially and federally, can never be forgiven or forgotten. He made a complete mockery of the role of the civil service in our system of Democratic government. And it was to be hoped, that with his leaving the province, this practice would end. However, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this does not seem to be the case.

Mr. Walker: — It is still . . .

Mr. Guy: — Oh, he can laugh. I have got some more on him too. From 1962 to the termination of his employment, the executive director changed his allegiance to two masters — the new Premier W.S. Lloyd, and Meyer Brownstone, Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, in whose department he now became lodged.

The first letter I wish to refer to was one to the new Premier, but on the same old subject, because on May 3, 1962, Mr. Woollam writes to the Hon. W.S. Lloyd, Premier of Saskatchewan:

You may wish to peruse the attached first draft of a statement which I have prepared for Tommy Douglas' use on the subject of NDP Program for Canadian Indians.

March 2, 1965

Since the NDP policy-makers have not had time to spend on this kind of detail, I have phrased the document as a personal pitch for Tommy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the policy-makers had no time, but a Saskatchewan civil servant, on the taxpayers' time and money, had lots of time to work for the federal NDP. On July 3rd, 1962, we all knew what was underway. The province was embroiled in the Medicare Crisis. It appears the Indians are even upset and losing faith in the government, because as Mr. Woollam writes:

The Central Executive of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians have been meeting today in Regina. They point out again that repeated attempts have been made over the last provincial election to secure some written assurance that the government intends to include Treaty Indians in the Medical Care Plan. They point out that there is much hostility on the reserves over the fact that Mr. Douglas made this promise politically in 1960 but nothing further has been stated on this matter.

A further letter to Mr. Wes Bolstad emphasizes the situation:

The government may be interested that the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, attending a meeting in Prince Albert, were quite unanimous in their hostility over the dilemma faced by the Indians with respect to their exclusion from the Medical Care Plan.

The observation may be quite irrelevant but I suggest that our handling of this issue has not been appropriate to the upbuilding of political support on the reservations in this province.

Here again, politics before people.

Now, in the fall of 1962, the executive director turned his attention to the Centre for Community Studies. I was surprised that the MLA for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) the other night, recommended that we read the reports from the Centre of Community Studies, because I think all members of this house will remember that on numerous occasions I asked for returns to be tabled in this house, requesting the report from the Centre of Community Studies, and always I was refused. So I was pleased to note that on October 1st, 1962, I became the subject of one of the executive director's letters, when he writes:

I have several times heard it rumoured that Allan Guy is trying very hard to secure copies of the three reports printed to date. Buy argues that these are research studies, were made possible by public funds and that the opposition should have access to them. He has been informed that these are confidential reports to the government and will not be released. Guy will soon find, as I found, that copies of these reports have been given to every major library in Canada.

I would point out further that my former terms of reference require that I advise the cabinet on such general matters.

From this, Mr. Speaker, I would gather that there are two terms of reference, those I read at the beginning which were only window-dressing for the real terms of reference for his gentleman, which are nothing more than reporting to the cabinet on such general matters as politics.

Now, in another letter to Brownstone, he writes regarding the DNR contract with the Centre of Community Studies and he says:

I was not able to find Baker in his office but had lengthy discussion with Mike Kew, who indicated to me that DNR does not seem to be happy about northern research. It was also indicated that most DNR officials are completely hostile toward myself and toward the proposed Community Development Branch.

Table, please.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this confession of his lack of appeal to those he has worked for, marks the beginning of the end. The only other letter which I wish to table at this time, occurs on February 28th, 1963, when the executive director writes to a friend of his for whom he was responsible for finding employment, and he writes to Mr. Jack Emms, Kamsack, Saskatchewan.

Dear Jack:

I am out on my ear as of tomorrow and my mailing address will be P.O. Box 4411, S. Edmonton.

The postscript is, of course, that subsequently he received a contract with the NDP government as a private consultant, to the value of \$12,000 as year, a nice way to go out on your ear.

Now, as I said at the beginning, it was most unfortunate to have to use one man as the example of malfunction in the provincial civil service.

Mrs. M. Cooper (Regina West): — How sad!

Mr. Guy: — However, the actions of the executive director is of secondary importance to the main issue. What we must consider, in the light of the remarkable attitude of Premier Douglas, Premier Lloyd, and their cabinet toward civil servants participating actively in politics, as I have outlined, is how many more of these political heelers in the NDP were working on government time and the taxpayers' money?

Mr. Thatcher: — Dozens . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — One and the same guy.

Mr. Guy: — Since the Executive Director of the Provincial Committee on Minority Groups was responsible to the Premier and the Executive Council, one must assume that every cabinet minister under Premier Douglas and Premier Lloyd, while this man was employed, must have condoned the policy of a civil servant working and participating in politics on the taxpayers' money and the taxpayers' time, to the detriment of the people of Saskatchewan, whom he had pledged to serve. If there is one former cabinet minister sitting across the way who did not agree with the policy, let him stand up at this time and say so and what is more important, tell us what he did to try and stop it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — One would have to assume further that, seeing this policy was carried out by the executive council as a whole in regard to one man, that every minister making up the council had one or more civil servants actively promoting the interests of the CCF-NDP hidden away in his department, under some remote title. So, the question arises — how many civil servants were hired solely for their political activities by the former administration?

The extreme seriousness of this situation was not that there was one civil servant campaigning openly on the taxpayers' money but that the former CCF Premiers of this province, in their role of setting an example for other departments, branches and crown corporations, actively condoned, aided, and abetted the policy of political civil servants. One finds it difficult to believe that T.C. Douglas, a man who sat in the House of Commons, and the provincial legislature, a man who professed to be a strict guardian of legislative protocol, a man who should have guarded with his life, the sanctity of an institution as important to democracy as the civil service, would instigate and carry out such a policy of political involvement of the civil service, as I have outlined here tonight.

It was made even worse by the fact that he and his successor chose to do these things under the guise of helping the underprivileged minority groups of the province, while in fact, he had no concern whatever for our Indian or Hutterite people, other than exploiting them for his own political advantage. Mr. Speaker, members on this side of the house, who would be justified to look with contempt on those who sit opposite, who participated in the activities that I have mentioned, have in reality only pity for the blind acceptance of a principle, which deep in their hearts they knew was wrong, but who because of their weakness and for political gain, shrugged off the voice of their conscience to support a policy which will have an everlasting effect on the image of the Saskatchewan parliament.

March 2, 1965

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had several more matters which I wished to refer to, but the members opposite have delayed the time to such an extent that I do not wish to take any more time. I have a few referenced I could make to labor but all I can say, Sir, is that I certainly cannot support the amendment but I will support the budget.

Mr. Walker: — Before the hon. member resumes his seat, I would like to rise to a question of privilege. The hon. member said a little earlier, purporting to be quoting from a document, that I had received a letter advising that an Order-in-Council should be passed before the election of June, 1960, and that this was a reflection on my integrity. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that so far as that accusation is concerned, my integrity is completely intact. The hon. member will recall that the election in 1960 was on June 8th, 1960, and that no Order-in-Council was passed by the provincial government allowing liquor on reserves. This is an Order-in-Council which can only be passed by the federal government and an Order-in-Council was so passed by the federal government on June 30th, 1960, a full three weeks after the election.

Mr. Nollet: — Wrong again.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — Go dig for more.

Mr. Ed Whelan (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, as an anti-climax for the long speech by my hon. friend from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) perhaps you would like to know that it has just come in over the teletype wire that Lucien Rivard has escaped.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — You mean . . .

Mr. Whelan: — I predict that the Dorion Commission would be disappointed but all Liberals will breathe easier.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — How much money did the Liberal party get for this one?

Mr. Speaker: — On the matter of the Rivard case, if I am not mistaken, it is subject to a federal inquiry and, therefore, subjudice.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert): — On a pint of order. The sanctimonious member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) rises in his place and assesses us for imputing motives, and then rises and says "How much did the Liberals get for this one?" I ask that he withdraw that.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I understand it is the federal Liberals that are dealing with Mr. Rivard and so, so far as the hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, I am pleased to withdraw any imputation.

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, I had planned to make a non-controversial speech and I intend to proceed, if I may have the consent of the house.

This marks Saskatchewan's sixtieth year as a province. As citizens, we cannot help but express the pride which all of us have in our accomplishments in such a short period of time — a period less than the biblical life span of three score and ten. We are also about to celebrate the hundredth birthday of our country. The Jubilee and Centennial Committee is at work on this joint project. Also, as citizens, we are constantly thinking of the future of our province with its great natural wealth and its imaginative and progressive citizens.

In this sixtieth year of our province's history, and in the prospect of our country being a hundred years old in 1967, perhaps we should look, for a moment, at the area to the north of us, an area which is part of Canada, in this respect that it has elected representatives to the House of Commons. This huge area above the sixtieth parallel, inhabited by about 35,000 people,

about one-quarter of the population of the city of Regina, comprises one and a half million square miles, approximately forty per cent of all of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the 35,000 people are sprinkled here and there over this vast almost unknown land which represents, I have said, forty per cent of our country. It has no capital city, no civil servants of its own, and no fully elected body such as this legislature. Its largest single revenue is gained from the sale of alcoholic beverages. Mr. Speaker, without population, without technical people to develop its known resources, this country lies dormant, perhaps the envy of other nations because it is virtually unoccupied. Some parts of the north are unknown to any person. Some parts of it have a relatively warm climate. It is a country of mountains, it has more lakes than the rest of the world combined. It has Canada's largest river system, the Mackenzie. Aside from the familiar resources, that is fur and fish, we are told that located in the mountains and in the terrain of this land, perhaps the largest lead and zinc deposits in the world are to be found. We are advised that there are at least two such deposits. There is, in this area, we are told, silver, cobalt, copper, nickel, coal, gypsum, oil, natural gas, uranium and gold. Recently a federal minister announced an iron ore deposit, the value of which is so large it has not been estimated. In another area, there are millions of tons of tungsten, never before mined in Canada. The mightiest untouched hydro potential on earth is at present wasted and could be used for the development of the north's mineral resources. recently, Mr. Speaker, Michael Myersdon, Director of the Montreal Office of the Arctic Institute suggested and I quote:

A supreme submarine system would not only take the riches of the north to the rest of the world, but would also link the world's major production regions by the very short routs through the Polar basin.

This land sits, Mr. Speaker, on the Arctic Ocean, on the hub of the northern hemisphere. One key to the economic development of the north is transportation, transportation of men, of supplies and building materials to build communities, to build roads, to develop resources. Mr. Speaker, the north challenges our imagination. It challenges our technical know-how and it challenges us as Canadians to no longer leave untouched and excluded from the federation of provinces this great region that comprises forty per cent of Canada.

One provincial Premier has suggested, that his province should be extended north to the Arctic circle. Certainly there is merit in this suggestion. We could consider extending each of the four western provinces, perhaps, so that each could take on a portion of the development of this vast unknown area that extends to the North Pole. Mr. Speaker, to say that it is impossible to build cities and industries in the north, is to challenge those who have studied the development of the north in other countries. I have, in my hand here, a brief presented to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects dealing with the Northwest Territories. It was submitted by Mr. R.G. Robertson, Commissioner of the Northwest Territories and it is dated November 22nd, 1955.

It begins, Mr. Speaker, by telling of the railways, the development of cities, the building of highways in Siberia, and the northern portion of the Soviet Union, he concluded, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

It is apparent that the Soviet Union is well aware of the importance to its own future of its enormous northern areas.

Mr. Robertson says we have not done as much and that this is not necessarily a reflection or a discredit, but he challenges us to do something and quote him:

If we are going to want and to need the resources of our north land in ten or twenty years, the time to begin the work of getting them is now.

I point out to all hon. members that this was written in the year 1955, ten years ago. The brief to the Royal Commission is well worth reading and I would recommend it to every member of the house. There are other interesting reports, for instance, the 1962 report on the Northwest Territories. It is an inter-departmental committee on Federal Territorial Financial Relations, which sets out the income of this area, the need for educational facilities, the lack of health and hospitalization facilities,

March 2, 1965

and incidentally, in regard to this point, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note that the second volume of the Hall Commission Report recommends improvements including the organizing of a hospital plane for the north.

Mr. Speaker. I think I have given this house some information about Canada's north, and some indication of its wealth, and its challenge to us as Canadians. If, in 1955, Commissioner Robertson felt that there was an urgency to develop the north, the urgency is greater ten years later, ten years in which relatively little has taken place in this area. Mr. Speaker, the time will come when the world will need the resources and the space in Canada's northland. Now is the time to take action to prepare for the future. Mr. Speaker, I believe we should demonstrate to the rest of Canada, and to the people who will come after us, that we took the initiative in these few months before Canada's 100th birthday. Let us as a people and a province, Mr. Speaker, take steps to have the northern portion of our country become genuinely and permanently a part of Canada. There is talk of separatism, but I speak to you in terms of Confederation, Mr. Speaker, I address my remarks, particularly, to the Premier, but to all members of the house, (I wish the Premier were in his seat, at the moment) and also the all members of the federal government. Another northern country allocates four per cent of its gross national income to northern development. If Canada were prepared to take similar action, this amount of our gross national income, \$1,300,000,000, would be ten times what is actually being spent at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, we could take the initiative to implement Confederation of the north by the year 1967, by initiating the calling together of all provinces bordering on this region, representatives of the federal government, representatives of the Northwest Territories, of the Yukon, with the thought in mind of either amalgamating portions to each of the four western provinces, or establishing a new province. Personally, AI would like to see the amalgamation of portions with each of the four western provinces. My reason, and I still have in mind the allocation of four per cent of the gross national product to develop this area, my reasoning is that each province is established and has the technical know-how, teachers, engineers, civil servants, road builders, and with these people we could extend the borders of the provinces to the North Pole. I think we have to accept our differenced, provincially and inter-provincially, Mr. Speaker, differences which are trivial in comparison to the challenge that development of this great northern area presents. Let us be positive. Let us speak in terms of building this area that Providence gave us. Let us make use of the land that is ours. Ours to develop, to share, ours for generations to come, ours as Canadians, ours in part as citizens of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended to put a resolution regarding this proposal on the Order Paper, but I have refrained from doing so because I felt that it might lead to a division in this assembly on this matter. I hope that my remarks have not done this, I believe this is a matter on which we should work together. Surely, Mr. Speaker, making Canada, making forty per cent, forty per cent of Canada's territory in the north a full fledged part of Confederation by the year 1967 is a good objective for all of us. An objective and a challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the sub-amendment and the amendment and I will oppose the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in opening that my remarks are going to be brief, I do not feel sorry for myself, I will have a great saving in voice tonight, due to the previous part of the debate, but I do feel sorry for those who had to, for one of the few occasions, type out a speech at my request, because I regret that the work that they did in the last two days will not be to much avail, since most of it will not be delivered this evening. I might also apologize to the press who possibly have a copy of it, because most of it is not going to be presented, so they will have to take it as read, possibly.

However, I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that the previous part of the evening was much more enjoyable than the dull statistics I had to give to the house, and the information with regard to the departments that I have to manage in the government of the province. However, in the few minutes I have at my disposal, I want to deal first with some of the opposition's criticism that we have heard in this house, and find out whether the opposition

has even attempted to prove their case. As I remember the arguments that were advanced by the representative of the opposition, the member for Regina West and he used arguments that have been used by every speaker who has risen on the opposition's side of the house since the debate opened. Those arguments were as follows:

One — that the Provincial Treasurer had presented to this house what he called a deficit budget.

Two — that the Provincial Treasurer had failed to provide sufficient monies for education.

Three — that for some unforeseen reason he, and some other members across the way, felt that some place, or somewhere, the people of this province have lost services due to the fact that there is a new government in this province.

One of the other major claims that has been made in this debate, and throughout this province is that it was unfortunate that the present government did not hold a session at an earlier date in order to put into effect the promises that they made in the last election campaign. Well, do you know, Mr. Speaker, that when you review what has taken place in the last eight months in this province, you will find that there has been more action taken in those eight months, than was taken, I believe, by any other previous government in the history of this province in the first eight months following an election, even without calling a session. That is one of the reasons why today the sound approach to government with the opportunity of the fulfilling more election promises in a sensible and reasonable way than has ever been done before, I think, by any government in the province of Saskatchewan, and probably by few governments across the Dominion of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — During the last election campaign, the major promise that was made by the Leader of the Liberal Party, was that he was going to see to a re-organization of government, which would provide efficient and economic administration for the people of the province of Saskatchewan. During the last eight months he has been able to work toward the fulfilment of this purpose, in such a way that in his first budget he has provided something that every government in Canada today wishes that it could copy. Every paper that we pick up states that they admire the fact that Saskatchewan, of all the governments in Canada today, has been able to find it possible to reduce the heavy load of taxes upon its people

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Papers from British Columbia to Newfoundland have praised the budget of the Provincial Treasurer in the province of Saskatchewan and the opposition have failed to show where services to the people of this province have been reduced. Actually, what the government has been able to show is that they have reduced costs, whereas in session after session, when we demanded economic measures be taken when they sat on this side of the house, they refused to take them and said it could not be done and that the money of the people of this province could not be spent in a better fashion or in a way in which dollars would be saved for the people of this province.

I think in the last eight months that the new Liberal government has been given the lie to the argument of my friends across the way. We have proven that millions of dollars of the taxpayers money can be saved by economic measures taken by a government prepared to govern for the people of the province, and not for the political ideal that they happen to represent, which, of course, in my friends' case was Socialism, which placed on the back of the people of this province the heavy load of taxation that we have today.

Mr. Speaker, in the department that I have the honor to administer on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan, I am proud to say that in the first eight months we were able to carry out the request of the Premier to reduce costs by very close to the ten per cent that was requested of the department that I administer. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this was without loss of services to the people, because Public Works has been a department which provides service to the other departments of government in this province. It is not one that provides services to the public, but service to the government itself, and in achieving the result of reducing the cost of that

March 2, 1965

department by nine per cent, I think it has been proven that costs of administrating the government can be lowered. I think I can also indicate that in the coming year costs will further be reduced without any loss of service to the people of Saskatchewan, but with the savings of many dollars of the taxpayers' money.

The job of the Department of Public Works, generally speaking, is to provide the office facilities and equipment and maintenance of all government buildings in the service of the province. Public Works at the present moment is also accepting the responsibility of trying to establish a basic quality of space for government facilities. In doing this during the last eight months, my deputy and I have visited almost all the offices in the province. We have visited almost all the centres where government facilities are located and have taken a look for ourselves at the problems that exist in many of the centres of the province. This first-hand investigation will help a great deal when the space survey of the Department of Public Works Is completed — when it comes to the time when decisions will have to be made, decisions which we feel will eventually result in savings of the taxpayers' dollars.

The program for the coming year, as far as Public Works is concerned is to pretty well glide over the department as such, and to try and get in some of the programs for next year. The program for 1965-66 again will be slightly reduced, even over the reduced budget of the 1964-65 budget. One of the reasons for this is the fact that the Johnson Commission, which has been making investigations that are being conducted in the Department of Public Works, make it necessary for us to withhold not only re-organization of our own department, but make it necessary for us to withhold other construction under Public Works until these investigations have been completed, and we can tell where best construction can take place and improvements can be made throughout the province of Saskatchewan.

We have heard a great deal from our opposition about the lack in the budget of reference to Technical Schools. We have heard them state that when they went out of office they had some money in the last budget to construct two technical schools in the province. Well, I want to say to my friends, there has been no indication that I know of in my department or in any other, that no plans had been undertaken at the time that budget was brought into this house to build two technical schools. There was no commitment made by my friends, and nothing in writing as has been indicated by the member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) that a school was committed for his community by the previous government. I do not think he can find any place where that commitment was made. I can find you centre after centre in this province which will proclaim the same thing, that the gentlemen that sit to your left today promised them a new technical school if they were elected to office. So, when we came into office there were no centres in which technical schools had been committed. There were no plans on paper for the construction of the technical schools and I am quite certain that they would try to say to us that we should have, in their first year, gone ahead and spent the money that was placed in the budget for that particular purpose without proper investigation and thought.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the government that now sits to your right, before it undertakes costly expenditures at the expense of the taxpayers of this province, will consider seriously those expenditures and will investigate them, and when their job is completed that they will have done it in such a way that the result of that program will be of true benefit to all the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I think the taxpayers deserve this kind of respect from any government they support, that they should give full investigation before monies are spent by the government of their province.

So, I think that I can assure the members of this house and the people of this province that before costly expenditures are undertaken, full investigation into those expenditures will be taken, not only by the department concerned, but also by the Department of Public Works, which will have the responsibility of the actual capital construction of the undertaking. Next year, as has already been pointed out by the Provincial Treasurer, certain construction undertakings have already been decided upon. Dales House will be built in the city of Regina at an approximate cost of \$175,000, during the coming year; an addition to the Technical School in Saskatoon will be commenced in the coming fiscal year, 1965-66; the construction of a Correctional Institute in the city of Prince Albert will be undertaken in the coming fiscal year. Money has been placed in the budget in order to bring this about. In addition, the second phase of the Correctional Institute in the city of Regina, will be completed as one of the largest projects of the Department of Public Works in the coming year, along with smaller projects in other departments.

As I said in the beginning of my remarks, Public Works is the servant of the government of this province. It is here to undertake the proposals given to it by other departments of government and by the Provincial Treasurer.

I just want to say one or two words before taking my seat, about the other major undertakings for which I have been given responsibility, and made reference to by the previous members who have spoken this evening. It has to do with the celebrations of the Saskatchewan Diamond Jubilee and The Canada Centennial. Since the official opening on January 31st, I believe that the people of the province of Saskatchewan have commenced a celebration, the like of which we have never seen before in our history. I believe that we are going to continue, and in a sense complete the celebrations that were commenced by the previous government in 1955, in the celebration of our Golden Jubilee. The reasons I say that is that when we have come to our sixtieth birthday, it is time that we see to it that the history of our province is drawn up, because it will not be too long before we will no longer have with us the pioneers who can remember the historical days of the past. I hope that, during our celebrations this year, that we can see to it that the history of our province is recorded in such a way that my children and my children's children will know something about the greatness of the early days of our province and something about the greatness of the pioneers who built the province of Saskatchewan when they read their history and story books, many years from now. I believe that we in this province have a history of which we can well be proud, and that in this birthday year, I would hope that one of our major jobs will be to set that history down in a way of which we can all be proud.

So, I say today, as the Minister in Charge of the Jubilee and Centennial Corporation, that I hope in the next ten months that those that are sitting in this house, along with the people of the province, will work together to provide a birthday party of which we may all be proud.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — With regard to the jubilee and Centennial celebrations, I would like to indicate that the first large number of grants that have been approved by the federal authorities will be announced at an early date and tonight all I want to say with regard to them is that when these acceptances of applications are announced, we will have fifty-four projects approved in the province of Saskatchewan with a total grant of \$163,000.

The other thought that I want to leave is that the total expenditure on these projects will amount to \$690,000, or at least four times the amount of the grant that will be paid by provincial and federal governments. I think this indicates the importance of the Centennial program of which we are a part, a program which will initiate a construction period in the next two years which should bring a great deal of prosperity to our province and to the Dominion of Canada. This program is initiating the construction of worthwhile projects, not only in Saskatchewan, but in every province in Canada. The people themselves are prepared to put in more money than governments are, in order to make these programs possible and so I say tonight, that I am proud as a representative of this government, to be part of the Centennial program in co-operation with the federal government which will promote memorials of lasting interest in Saskatchewan and in Canada generally.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have indicated that I will not be supporting the amendment and the sub-amendment, but I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) for giving me a few minutes before ten o'clock. I sympathize with him and I would suggest that he might lay the last forty-five pages of his speech on the table for us and then we would have it.

I have not time to make many remarks about what the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) said tonight but he did drag out that old hoary one about the people in the CCF being tinged with Communism. I would like to quote a good authority, a CCFer in the House of Commons and this CCFer said:

To begin with, we of the CCF party believe first and foremost in Democracy and individual freedom.

Mr. Thatcher: — That's what I thought but I found out differently.

March 2, 1965

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — And again he says: "The second difference . . ."

Mr. Thatcher: — I found that it was all wrong.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): —

The second difference that I believe applies to many of us is that we Democratic Socialists fundamentally believe in the laws and teachings of the Christian church.

In the third place, Communists in Canada, are teaching a philosophy which advocates loyalty to a foreign state, first of all, and loyalty to Canada afterwards.

The members of the CCF party can no more endorse such a principle than can the members of other political parties in this house.

Mr. Thatcher: — I found I was wrong, Brock.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Discussing the budget last year in the legislature of my province, Premier T.C. Douglas spoke as follows:

I have inquired into the Communist party and studies Karl Marx. Knowing their philosophy I feel it is false and I believe it is wrong from the economic, moral and sociological standpoints.

Last January 22nd, Mr. M.J. Coldwell, the leader of our group, speaking over the C.B.C. network said:

There is a fundamental difference between the methods and philosophy of the CCF and those advocated by Communists. We have always opposed every form of dictatorship. We loathe Communist methods. I firmly believe . . .

And these are the words now of the speaker:

I firmly, I believe firmly indeed, that in this country, the CCF will be in the vanguard of any struggle against totalitarian communism.

Now that is from Hansard.

Mr. Thatcher: — I found I was wrong, Brock.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — That is from Hansard, May 24th, 1948, page 4316, and it is by Mr. Thatcher.

Mr. Thatcher: — When I resigned, I said I found I was wrong, that they were tinged with communism. That is on the record of Hansard too.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Premier, that I recognize he is not infallible — that he can sometimes be wrong, but he cannot always be wrong. This is one of the times when he was not wrong.

It is true. It is true that we in the CCF have been attacked by both the extreme right and the extreme left and particularly the Communists like to attack us, one way or another, because they know . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — They didn't . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — . . . that the only hope to have Communism prevail and to have a Communist revolution succeed, is to let things go and do nothing. Let things get into such a bad shape that you can have a revolution. On this note, Mr. Speaker, may I adjourn the debate?

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.