

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session – Fourteens Legislature
14th Day

Tuesday, February 28, 1961.

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

On the Orders of the Day.

Statement

Mr. Speaker: — Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to say that on last Tuesday I referred to a statement that I would like to make in regard to interruptions and privileges and personal explanations. I do not desire to make it now, because it would, I'm afraid infringe upon air time, but with the permission of the House, I would like to have the opportunity to make it sometime later today.

Welcome to Students

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to call the attention of the Assembly to a group of students up in the public gallery. They come from Rosemont School, Regina, and they're here with their teachers. We're delighted to have them, and we hope they'll find it a pleasant and a profitable afternoon. I am sure you'll all join me in greeting them today.

Question Re Unemployment

Mr. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would just like a direct question to the Premier.

February 28, 1961

In view of the delegation which he received today, I wonder if the Government is considering any emergency measures to deal with the very crucial unemployment problem in the province at the moment.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the delegation met with the Government this morning, and finished about 1:00 o'clock. I think any announcements that Government makes will be made sometime during the Session.

Re: Motion on Purple Tax Free Gas

Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the motion that is placed before you, and before hon. Members, on the order paper this afternoon, because of the fact it deals with some suggestions and some conditions for reducing farmers' costs, to begin with, I would like to draw the attention of hon. Members in this House, to an hon. Member on this side, who for a great many years has stoop up, not only on the floor of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, but on different platforms through the province, at all times defending the rights and the privileges of the farmer. I need not mention to the hon. Members opposite the carious and numerous occasions that he stood before this House, stressing the plight and the position of the farmer to the people of Saskatchewan. I refer to none other than my very able senior colleague, Mr. Herman Danielson from Arm River. I think it is very fitting this afternoon and very significant that we recognize his position in this House in the past, and for new Members here this afternoon, I would like to tell you at this time, that this is his twenty-seventh consecutive Session in the Legislature.

Not only has he served twenty-seven consecutive terms, I believe he has also served in three special Sessions, and so I think it is only fitting and only proper, that those of us who are farmer Members, who represent rural Constituencies, regardless of which side of the House we sit on, should acknowledge the tremendous work done in the past by our very able Member Mr. Danielson from Arm River.

Mr. Speaker, before I make this motion, I would like to read it to the House:

“That in order to provide some aid in reducing farmers’ costs of production, this House recommends to the consideration of the Government that the use of purple tax free gas in farm trucks be permitted.”

Mr. Speaker, the motion that I have the privilege to present this afternoon, in all sincerity I believe is a very important motion, especially in view of economic conditions as they pertained to farmers in this province in the past, as they are at the present time, and as we are led to believe, or we expect it will be in the future.

In my remarks this afternoon, I want to draw the attention of Members of this House to a statement made by a very faithful and very able professor in our University. I am sure all Members in this House are quite familiar with the efforts of Professor Van Vliet. I would draw your attention to a statement he made, when speaking to the ag. rep. conference, on February 10th of this year. In assessing the economic position of the farmers of Saskatchewan, for the year ahead, he had this to say, speaking, and I’m going to quote, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, at the 3rd Annual Agricultural Representative Conference at Saskatchewan House, in Regina, Professor Van Vliet said,

“Farmers will be working on narrow operating margins, until 1980.”

Using that prediction, as a background, from one of our most able agriculturists in Saskatchewan, I think that we on both sides of the House should pay particular attention to that statement.

In viewing past events, Mr. Speaker, I first would like to bring to the attention of Members of this House the economic conditions of our farmers in this province, after seventeen years of a socialist administration. There is no other segment of our people who have been discriminated against to the extent that our farmers have under this Government. There is no other basic industry that has lost as many people as has the agricultural industry of this province. I need only to point to the tremendous numbers of people

February 28, 1961

who have moved off the farms, who have moved into the city, who have moved into towns, who have moved into villages, creating a tremendous employment problem in those cities, towns and villages.

Not only that, but because of the unemployment problem we have today, it is further aggravated today by a tremendous increase in social aid costs. Further to that, there is no other group of people who had to bear as many various methods of taxation as do the farmers of our province. There is no other group of people who have had to pay as much in some of these taxes, as the farmers of our province. All of these taxes may not have been a direct tax affecting the cost of production, but they certainly have been a major factor in reducing the income of the farmer.

It is now necessary to review the past results of this Government's policy; we must assess the present economic position of our farmers, insofar as they are affected by these policies. Now, in all sincerity, we must come to grips with the various problems and try to do something immediately to alleviate the depressed condition of our basic industry, namely agriculture, and to put into the hands of the farmers more necessary purchasing power in order to stop the continuous flow of our people off the farms.

I think it will be very interesting to you, Mr. Speaker, and to Members on both sides of the House, to know that at the present time about two-thirds of our farmers have a net income of less than \$1200 per year, or less than \$3.50 per day. On the basis of a family farm, with the husband and wife and two children, this points up the fact, when you divide the \$3.50 a day among a family of four, the four people concerned are getting less than a \$1.00 a day. Surely, the term "slave labour", wouldn't even compare with conditions such as this. These are the conditions the agricultural industry and the farmers concerned are trying to cope with in the province at the present time.

What are some of the policies enacted by this Government, some of the programs enacted by this Government that have led to this type of a situation? You all remember this Government has taken a large

number of actions which have added to the farmers' cost of production. I am only going to refer to a few of these. Since they came to power the tax on gasoline for both cars and trucks has risen from 7 cents a gallon, and as of April 1st, to 14 cents, an increase of 100%. In addition to this the license on the farmer's truck has increased from \$10.00 to amounts reaching at the present time from \$10.00 to \$30.00. On top of that he has been obligated by this Government to pay an auto insurance premium on his farm trucks. The retail sales tax has increased to 50%. The socialist Government has imposed a mineral tax of nearly \$20.00 on a section of his land – 4 quarters of land. This Government has increased royalties, fees on lumber, fence posts, and other coarse products which the farmer must use in order to make his livelihood. They have raised grazing and haying fees on provincial lands, and have increased numerous other things, on which the farmer must depend for his livelihood. Add to this excessive power installation costs; our farmers are charged electric power rates far in excess of those in Manitoba. Taxes have increased by a corresponding percentage, until the last year that we have figures for we find that arrears of municipal taxes alone amount to \$14 ½ million. Wherever we look we are confronted with items of the farmers' cost of production which are affected by the policies of this Government. Almost without exception these policies have been such as to increase instead of reducing the farmers' operating costs.

In a motion which I am going to move this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I will propose that the Government depart from some of its entrenched attitudes, and make at least some move in the direction of reducing these costs to the farmer. I want at this time briefly to review some of the conditions which have developed under policies of the Government so far as they reflect on his cost of production, but more important on his net income.

I was quite interested the other day, when I was checking through the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture, and I was perusing the last report of the book. It was very interesting to me because it was the first report of the Family Farm Improvement Board. There was some very startling information in

February 28, 1961

that report, Mr. Speaker, I want at this time to bring it to the attention of all Members of this Legislature. In that report, drawn up by the Department of Agriculture of this province, it stated that 50,000 farm homes in Saskatchewan require modernization. It also stated that data acquired from other provinces points up the fact that Saskatchewan has one of the highest percentages of non-modern farm homes among Canadian provinces. So I suggest, in all sincerity, that there is a field alone, in which a great deal of concern and a great deal of practical policy making must be done to help the farmers in this province, in one case alone, in the modernization of farm homes, Wherever we can cut down the cost of production, wherever we can cut down on something that will leave more money in the farmer's pockets, then it will tend to erase this situation, far more than any other policy we could bring into effect.

I was interested especially in the budget, which was brought down yesterday, because as I said before, the gas tax to the farmer, to all people of Saskatchewan as far as that goes, but especially to the farmer has been increased by some 100%.

Premier Douglas: — On a point of order, if it is in order to discuss the budget on this motion, I am sure we would all be glad to do so, but I think we should have a ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes I think so.

Mr. McFarlane: — I only point out the budget yesterday, Mr. Speaker, because it indicates that there will be a further 2 cents added on to the present cost of . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McFarlane: — I want to draw to your attention, the gas tax in the other provinces at the present time. In Manitoba the gas tax at the present time is 11 cents per gallon. In Alberta the gas tax is 10 cents per gallon. In Saskatchewan the tax is 12 cents as of today, 14 cents as of a week from now, and for diesel gasoline.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I must insist that the hon. Member does not discuss

portions taken from the budget speech which should properly belong under the . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, I think the budget is pretty well a matter of information to all people concerned at the present time, and when I state that it will be 14 cents, I think that you will concur with me in that. At any rate, it is certainly going to add up the production costs to the farmer in the year ahead.

The significant point is this. At the present time I think most gasoline tanks in all makes of cars, and in farm trucks too, hold about fifteen or sixteen gallons of gasoline. So I don't think the farmers are going to very happy when they realize that every time they go to the filling station, or go to a pump, in order to have their tank filled with gas, they are going to have to pay \$2.25 in tax alone to this present Government — \$2.25 in tax alone to the CCF Government every time they fill their car or their farm truck with gasoline. I suggest that this is the highest tax of any of the three prairie provinces.

The other policies that have added to the farmers' cost of production which we should be considering at this time are the ever increasing rates of municipal tax. I am only going to give hon. Members in this Legislature one indication, and I am going to cite as this indication a farmer who lives in my own Constituency, and this will show the tremendous increase that is taking place during this Government's term of office. I have one particular person in an area of my Constituency who has fairly heavy and highly assessed land. In 1944 his total taxes on six quarters of land was \$385.10. Last year, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't \$385.10, it was \$1,187.00. Added to that are these other things that I have pointed out where costs increase the cost of production and decreases the net income: municipal tax of \$1,187.00, mineral tax \$24.00, hospital tax \$37.00, which meant that when he went to pay his taxes on three items alone he had to pay over \$1200. The point that I want to make here is this; that same individual had gone through a period in the district of three crop failures. Now, as they are faced with ever-increasing production costs, the farmers are going to be faced with ever-increasing municipal taxes. How in the world

are they ever going to stay solvent, if we ever reach a period similar to those that the farmers went through in the 1930's? That is something that I want to draw to the attention of the Members opposite – the members of this Government – you cannot go on and on forever increasing taxes, imposing more taxes on the people of this province, when two-thirds received a net income of less than \$1200, or as in the case of a family of four, less than a dollar a day.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned in the House before, and also mentioned to people of this province whom we visited during the election, when we form the Government, we will repeal the tax on gasoline for farm trucks. We were ridiculed at that time, and I recall statements made by Members opposite, during the course of the summer, telling the farmers and telling municipalities that if this tax was to be repealed, then there wouldn't be any money for grid road construction. They left the inference that this would be depriving the municipalities of their grid roads. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no farmer or municipal man will receive much comfort in the year ahead when they realize that the allotment for grid road construction will be less than . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think that there is a certain analogy between the budget speech and this motion, but I think that the hon. Member can have a satisfactory discussion of this motion, in this House this afternoon without direct reference to the budget speech.

Mr. McFarlane: — Very well, Mr. Speaker, I want, for the benefit of the Members opposite, and to support the motion I have to move, to read to you a portion of the Act in Alberta where the farmer doesn't have to pay tax on the gas he uses in his farm trucks. In Manitoba you know the situation there has always been different. But to support my motion, I would just like to read a portion of the Alberta Act. It says this: I am quoting from the Alberta regulations for 1960.

“Farm trucks (this is how they define farm truck). Farm truck means a farm truck or jeep truck bearing F license

plates, and licensed pursuant to the Vehicles and Highway Traffic Act as a vehicle owned and operated by a farmer, rancher, or market gardener, and used solely in connection with his own farm, ranch, or market garden operations, and not in connection with any other line of business, in which the owner may be engaged. But does not include a passenger car, station wagon, suburban ranch wagon, etc. Where petroleum gas is used for the operation of farms trucks bearing F license plates, the purchaser of the gas is exempt from liability for the payment of the tax.”

Mr. Speaker, I would point out, because as this regulation is already in effect in the province to the west of us, and because we know that they do not have a similar type of legislation in the province to the east of us, I think that it now bears consideration by this Government, at least to try and reduce some of the production costs of the farmers in Saskatchewan. I would point out this, that because these other provinces have recognized the situation of the farmer, recognized the importance of the agriculture as a basic industry in those provinces, and have brought down legislation helping the farmers in those provinces, we find an entirely different pattern of movement off the farm in Alberta and in Manitoba than we do in Saskatchewan. I would point out that the movement of farmers off the farms in Saskatchewan is four and one-half times greater than it has been in the province of Manitoba. The movement of farmers off the farms in Saskatchewan has been twice as great as it has in the province of Alberta. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Government take full recognition of the fact, and do something immediately to help alleviate the cost of production as far as the farmers are concerned.

That is why this afternoon, I take pleasure, in respectfully submitting this resolution to you, seconded by Mr. Gardiner, the member for Melville.

I so move this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — In rising to speak on the motion and

February 28, 1961

support the motion of the Member from Qu'Appelle, I am only going to take two or three minutes of your time to stress one or two arguments with regard to allowing farmers to use purple gas free of tax in the farm trucks.

It has often been said, particularly by Members on the Government side of the House, that conditions are changing in this province and accordingly we should make changes, not only in our laws, but in our taxes and in our systems.

I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that in this regard, they are right. With regard to farm implements, with regard to the things that the farmer uses on his farm, there has been a great change over the past few years. The farm truck today is considered as much an implement on the farm as the tractor, the combine, or anything else that the farmer uses as a means of production. So, I think, it is only fair to say that for that reason alone the farmers in Saskatchewan should be allowed to use purple gas in their farm trucks free of tax.

Then, Mr. Speaker, as well, to add to what the Member from Qu'Appelle has said about the position of the farmer in this province at the present time, I think it is only fair to point out that in receiving the various services that he must receive in order to carry on living in our province as an agricultural producer, the farmer is placed in a position that he must use much more gasoline than other residents of this province and so he is actually being penalized by the tax on the fuel that he is using in his farm truck.

I would just point out that the average farmer, in order to get his children to school, must drive quite a number of miles every day. As well, if he wants to get other services, he has to go to the store. He can't walk a block or two down the street; he must take his car and he must use it for that purpose. If he wants to get the other services that the towns and other communities offer, the farmer must make use of the vehicle that he has on his farm for this purpose.

So I say that in granting him the use of

purple gas tax-free in his trucks, it will be equalizing to some extent the burden that the farmer must face at the present time in this province, the burden of taxation and the burden of costs that he must face in order to carry on as an agricultural producer.

Then, Mr. Speaker, for some time now income tax regulations have recognized the farm truck on an equal basis with combines, tractors and other farm implements for depreciation purposes and also for the full operating costs of the truck as a farm implement. So I say here as well that it should be placed on an equal basis with tractors and with combines and that purple gas should be used in farm trucks.

With these few words, Mr. Speaker, with these arguments, I think we can point out to anyone in the province that we are not asking a gift for the farm people of this province, we are not asking something that is not fair; we are asking fairness and consideration for the farm people of this province to equalize the burden of taxation to some extent. We know it is not going to solve a complete problem, but it will be an indication to the farm people this province that we know that they have a problem facing them and we are prepared to meet it as a provincial legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in seconding the motion of the Member from Qu'Appelle.

Mr. Bernard D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, in supporting the motion moved by the Member from Qu'Appelle, it should be quite clear to all the hon. Members, what the purpose of this motion is. It is clearly found in the first line of the motion.

This Government has been talking about the farmers' cost-price squeeze for at least the last ten or twelve years. Of course, most of their remarks are directed to the Federal Government. I am very glad to know that the hon. Gentlemen opposite realize that the farmers are caught in this cost-price squeeze, and because of the fact they should be able to support this motion.

February 28, 1961

It contains of course the very same thing that we in the Liberal Party have been saying for many years. We realize that taking 14 cents a gallon off the price of gas that is going to be used in farm trucks, is not going to solve the farmers' problems, nor is it going to get them out of this cost-price squeeze. We also realize that the Provincial Government cannot do everything to relieve the farmers' plight. But the use of purple gas is just one way that the Provincial Government can help the farmers and there must at least be a dozen other ways that this Government could help, if this Government took steps like steps mentioned in this motion. To save the farmers \$30 here and \$50 there, would not only help to relieve the farmers' cost-price squeeze, but it might wake up the Federal Government to the fact that we are having an agricultural depression in this province.

There are some in the Government who would probably say that the few dollars saved by the farmers using purple gas will amount to very little. Anyway, let's just suppose that the farmer has no car, he uses his truck for transportation as well as for farm use. If he drove 10,000 miles a year and his truck made fifteen miles to the gallon, at 14 cents a gallon gas-tax, this farmer would save \$93.24 and let me remind you, Sir, that any farmer who cannot afford to buy a car for transportation, who must use his farm truck for transportation, for him \$93.24 is not just peanuts.

It was suggested by one of the supporters of the Government, that if a farmer was allowed to use purple gas in his truck, he might take his wife to the beach on a Sunday with the farm truck. I can only say this, Mr. Speaker, that if he cannot afford to buy a car, more power to him if he does take his wife to the beach with the truck. I think that the farmer's wife is just as entitled to go to the beach as anyone else. Furthermore, if he can save 14 cents a gallon on gas, he might have enough money left to buy hot dogs for the family.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, has always pretended to be such a friend of the farmers. At the same time, practically every action of this Government, since it was elected in 1944, has cost the farmer money. First they created the mineral tax; then the

education tax went up; municipal and school taxes have risen practically every year since this Government came in office. With the increased consumption of gasoline in this province, the money collected from the gasoline tax has risen many times and if this Government was really a friend of the farmers and had the farmers' interests at heart, surely this is one step that they could take that would help the farmer out of this cost-price squeeze.

This, Mr. Speaker, should only be the first step among many that the Provincial Government should take to help the farmers, and in supporting this motion, I urge the members of the Government who make their livings on the farms, to consider the farmers' interests rather than the interests of the Provincial Treasurer or anyone else in this Government who have no regard whatsoever for the rural people of this province. If they don't support the motion, they are certainly not voting in the farmers' interests. We are not asking for anything that is ridiculous; we are only asking for something, we in the Liberal Party feel is coming to the farmers.

Now, if the gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker, are truly representatives of the farmers and especially those farmers in the back bench, then they will support this motion.

Hon. Mr. C.G. Willis (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, may I first of all congratulate you on your election to the office which you now hold and I congratulate you too on the manner in which have conducted the deliberations in this Chamber. I must add my sympathies, however, especially on a day like this. You as a farmer up there with your hands tied and your mouth closed, are not able to take part in this debate discussed the problems of the farmer.

You will agree with everyone in this House, Mr. Speaker, that the farmer has a problem, and that this is a serious problem. Members on the opposite side of the House have outlined some of these problems.

I want to quote from a table prepared by

February 28, 1961

the Economic Advisory Planning Board to show you just how serious this economic problem of the farmers actually is. Here is a table for the years 1951-1960 which shows that the farm income is tremendously high in the first three years of the 1950's; \$644 million, \$716 million and \$746 million and then it fell to a low of \$449 million in 1955, recovered by 1960 to a total of \$587 million.

This is a significant table, Mr. Speaker, but the total cash income table does not give the whole picture of the problem facing the farmers today. On the other side of the chart we have the total net income in farming operations in the same years, and again in 1951, the total net income in farm operations showed a high in the first three years of the 1950's; \$561 million, \$585 million in 1952, \$500 million in 1953 and then a series of lower years, Mr. Speaker, from 1954 until the present. The highest net income in the latter 50's was experienced in the year 1956 when the amount was \$439 million.

The significant thing about these two columns of this chart, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that cost of farming operations has gone up. If you subtract the total net income of the farmers from the total cash income, you will get the cost of farming. In 1951 \$644 million was the total cash income and the net income in 1951 \$561 million. Farmers' costs in 1951 totalled \$83 million for the purpose of carrying on their farming operations. It is an entirely different picture in 1960. If you subtract the total net income of \$379 million from the total cash income of \$587 million, you get a cost of \$208 million.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it cost the farmers \$208 million in 1960 to carry out their farming operations, while back in 1951 the total cost was \$83 million. This is indeed a serious problem, a problem, Mr. Speaker, which cannot be met just by allowing farmers to use purple tax free gas in their trucks.

Mr. Thatcher: — We did not say it would.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, with the defeat of the Federal Liberal

Government, that a fair share of the national income would accrue to the farmer, and his financial problems would be over. However, conditions under a Conservative Government in Ottawa are no better than they were under the Liberal Government in Ottawa. The promise made by the Federal Government is not being fulfilled.

One good thing has come about in the past four years though, Mr. Speaker; the Liberal Party in Opposition has discovered that farmers have a problem. Now, after having made this discovery, they are promising to make conditions better for the farmer, when and if they return to office both federally and provincially.

The present Government here in Saskatchewan has pressed upon the Federal Government consideration of the cost-price squeeze, which is affecting farmers. We have urged the Federal Government to see to it that farmers do receive a fair share of the national income.

Mr. Thatcher: — What have you done yourself, George?

Hon. Mr. Willis: — The Federal scene is where this problem should be met and solved and the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, knows that full well.

Mr. Thatcher: — Sometime you can do . . .

Hon. Mr. Willis: — He knows that the Provincial Government has nothing to do with marketing grain, nor with the amount of grain, which is sold —

Mr. Thatcher: — No, but you have with purple gas.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — nor with prices received for farm products, nor can we control prices paid by farmers for farming equipment. The C.C.F. protested to the Federal Government the removal of price control in 1947 by the Liberal Federal Government. The Liberal Government of that day . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh, George . . .

Hon. Mr. Willis: — . . . removed price control and now the farmers are reaping the results.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

February 28, 1961

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, there are really two problems here. One has to do with farmers; what the farmers have received for their labour. The other has to do with the provision of means of transportation here in the province. The first is the federal responsibility, as I have indicated. The second concerns the provincial and municipal government mainly, and this second problem is the one I wish to discuss briefly this afternoon.

Gasoline taxes for financing road improvements are not a recent imposition. They were first levied in 1928 in this province, when a 3 cents a gallon tax was instituted. The tax grew to 7 cents in 1944, when there was a Liberal Government here in the province. Then farmers had to pay the tax on gas used in farm trucks. Presently the gas tax is 12 cents.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that everyone agrees that this gasoline tax along with motor license fees is the fairest of all taxes that can be levied to finance road construction. Then those who use the roads pay largely for their improvement and their maintenance. This is how it should be.

If we look further, we will find that in 1960, \$21 million was collected from the gas tax, and \$7 million from license fees, making a total of \$28 million collected from the users of the provincial highways and municipal roads in this province. If we look at the other side of the picture, we find that this Government paid in the same year \$23 million on highway construction and maintenance and besides helped build rural municipal roads to the extent of \$7 ½ million.

For these two items, provincial highways and municipal roads, a total expenditure was made in the year 1960 of \$34.5 million. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this Government collected \$28 million from road users in the province and paid out \$34.5 million or approximately \$2 ½ million more than was received from those who use our roads. These figures, Mr. Speaker, refer only to roads and highways in the southern part of the province, and the expenditures on those roads in the southern part of the province.

No one will say, Mr. Speaker, that we have

not received value for the money expended on our roads, during the term, of office of this Government. My predecessor, the former Minister of Highways boasted that in the sixteen years the C.C.F. has been in office, we have taken Saskatchewan out of the mud.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — This is true . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — So did every other Provincial Government.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — . . . Mr. Speaker, there was more mud in Saskatchewan in 1944 than in any other province.

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh no, there was not. There was not!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — This is true, Mr. Speaker. There is the old story about the sign on the provincial highway back in the early 1940's, which was labelled: "The Gardiner highway, choose your rut with care, because you cannot leave it for 20 miles."

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . Turtleford.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — This has changed.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Remember, when I used to pull you out of it, Ross?

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Our provincial highway system has been improved to the extent that motorists do not have to fear to travel in any time of the year . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Why shouldn't they be?

Hon. Mr. Willis: — . . . winter or summer. We have received value for our highway dollar, Mr. Speaker, and to witness the fact, there are more than 2500 miles of dust-free surfaces in our provincial highway system today. More than one quarter of total mileage is dust-free here in the province. The people of Saskatchewan as a whole, farmers as well as others, have paid for this improvement in their gas

February 28, 1961

taxes and license fees. Not only have we improved provincial highways, but we have aided the municipal road improvement scheme, which has won the approval of practically every rural road user here in Saskatchewan. A 12,000 miles grid system was laid out in 1952 and municipalities were encouraged to build, to all-weather standards, by the payments of grants from the Provincial Governments, such grants averaging 60% of the cost of construction.

This grid road program is in its fifth year and approximately 6,000 miles of half of the total grid mileage is complete to the satisfaction of our people in our rural areas. This grid has been laid out, Mr. Speaker, so that when completed, almost every farmer in the province will be at least under three or four miles from an all-weather road. The cost of this grid, Mr. Speaker, is being paid for not only by farmers, but by all the motorists of Saskatchewan. It is a fact that 25% of the total amount collected from gas taxes and license fees is being spent on municipal roads. This is a large percentage for this purpose, Mr. Speaker, when one remembers that it is estimated that only 15% of the total vehicle travel in the province is on municipal roads, and yet in spite of this fact, 25 cents out of every tax dollar collected by this Government from road users has been spent on municipal roads.

What a different picture we had, when the Liberals were in office, Mr. Speaker. The gasoline tax in 1944 yielded \$3.4 million, while license fees brought in \$2 million or a total from road users of \$5.4 million. Yet we find that the Provincial Liberal Government of 1944, while they collected \$5.4 million from those road users, spent only \$3 million on roads.

Mr. Thatcher: — There was a war on. We were asked . . . Why don't you compare Manitoba and Alberta?

Government Member: — Why don't you keep quiet?

Hon. Mr. Willis: — In 1944 the road users were being required to finance general government to the extent of \$2.4 million per year. What a contrast, Mr. Speaker, when we spend \$3 to \$5 million over and above

what we collect from road users here in the province.

Mr. Speaker, when I first entered the House as a Member in 1952, I obtained from the Department of Highways the recode of assistance to the municipalities in my Constituency of Melfort-Tisdale, over the ten-year period of 1935 to 1944. The nine municipalities, Mr. Speaker, received in grants the grand sum of \$20,000 over that ten-year period, or an average of about \$2,000 for a municipality for a year. Every municipality received a grant in only two years, both of which were prior to a provincial election. Mr. Speaker, the Government of that day could have paid more in grants, if they were interested in better municipal roads, because they were collecting besides the gasoline taxes and license fees a two-mill public revenue tax on all property.

The assessments of the nine rural municipalities in what is now the Constituency of Melfort-Tisdale, totals \$25 million. A two-mill public revenue tax meant that the tax payers of these nine rural municipalities were paying the provincial government in public revenue tax approximately \$50,000 a year for these nine rural municipalities received back from the Liberal Provincial Government over a ten-year period the grand total of \$2,000 a year . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . purple gas of course.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — On the one hand, public revenue taxes alone totalled \$50,000 a year. On the other hand, the Liberal Government of the day paid out to municipalities to assist in building municipal roads, a total of \$2,000 a year. Fifty-thousand – two-thousand. What a contrast, Mr. Speaker! And in addition to public revenue taxes of \$50,000 per year, gasoline taxes and license fees on automobiles, along with farm taxes were also collected from the farmers in my Constituency, yet the nine rural municipalities received only \$2,000 per year in road grants. What a change has come over the Liberal Party in Opposition: now they do not want to collect any gasoline taxes on farm trucks.

Mr. Thatcher: — The war is over now.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Now they do not want to build roads. Today you cannot fool the farmers, Mr. Speaker . . .

February 28, 1961

Mr. Thatcher: — You found that out in Turtleford, didn't you?

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Farmers know, whether it is in Turtleford or in Melfort-Tisdale or in any other Constituency in the province the farmers know . . .

Mr. Thatcher: They certainly do.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — . . . that if they want services they have to pay for those services. They have told the Liberal Party of this province in the last two elections in the province, that they do not mind paying road-users' taxes when they get value for their tax dollar.

Mr. Speaker, they are getting value for their money. The hon. Members for Yorkton asked for information the other day which showed this. He questioned what the rural municipalities in his Constituency received in grants from the Provincial Government, for the years 1956 up to 1959. The answer, Mr. Speaker, showed that the seven rural municipalities in the Constituency of Yorkton received over a four-year period for grid roads, for equalization grants, for other purposes, a grand total of \$571,000. This amounts, Mr. Speaker, to over one-half million dollars in four years. What a comparison to the \$20,000 over a ten-year period to the nine rural municipalities in my Constituency during the last years of the Liberal regime.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, there was a war on.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, I am willing to bet that the new Member for Yorkton was told off and in no uncertain terms for asking such a question. You will not get the Member for Arm River or his seat-mate, the Member for Maple Creek asking such a question, for they know what the answer is.

Mr. Danielson: — No objection.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — They do not want such figures to become common knowledge. The hon. Member for Yorkton, along with the other new Members in this House, should be told also that this is not the only tax relief provided to the rural municipalities by this Government. The municipalities in the Yorkton

Constituency are still collecting the public revenue tax of \$2 million, but collecting it no longer for the Provincial Government. They are collecting it and retaining it for their own use.

Mr. Thatcher: — The Opposition pressed you into it.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — As I have mentioned the nine rural municipalities in the Melfort-Tisdale Constituency, receive approximately \$50,000 each year, have received \$50,000 each year since 1952 in extra taxes without raising their mill rates, because the Provincial Government withdrew from this field of property taxation. Similarly, the seven rural municipalities in the Yorkton Constituency with assessments of \$14.7 million, received \$29,500 annually, since 1952 as a result of the Government withdrawing from the public revenue tax field.

Mr. Speaker, the provincial highways and municipal roads have been improved, because the people of the province have wanted them to improve and were willing to pay gasoline taxes and motor licenses in order that this could be done both by the province and by the municipalities. I would say further that they do not want to be classed as one who would not pay his fair share in the improvements of the roads and highways over which they operate their trucks and automobiles.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the farmer does not want to be a second-class citizen.

Mr. Thatcher: — The Farm Union passed the resolution . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — . . . in the last two elections . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — What about Turtleford?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — — the farmers have made it clear that they were pleased with the

improvements in our roads and our highways, that they have been . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — They did not in Turtleford.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — . . . treated fairly, and that they would like to continue with the road improvement program throughout the province. The farmers as a whole, Mr. Speaker, are opposed to this motion introduced by the Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — On the one hand, a small amount saved each year for farmers in gas taxes, would not solve his financial problem. On the other hand the over-all results would be bad so far as assistance for road improvement programs is concerned, for more and more farmers would buy these flashy looking half ton trucks and use them for their ordinary driving. You cannot blame them if they did. As a result, the revenues which the province would receive, would fall off. There would be a reduction in the assistance that would be granted to municipalities for their road programs. The farmers do not want this, nor do they want a slackening of our highway improvement program. Again, if farmers were allowed to use purple gas in trucks, other people would want and should have the same treatment. I can think of a grocery man in the town of Melfort who operates a truck for his delivery service — five days a week throughout the entire year. This is a cost of his business, and his truck probably does not operate off the town streets. If farmers were granted the right to use purple tax free gas in their trucks, this grocer would also demand the same consideration and rightly so.

There must be thousands of others in similar circumstances, small truck owners in our towns and in our cities, who would demand the same treatment. As a result our Government revenues would fall off, our road improvement program would suffer.

The use of purple gas in farm trucks is not a solution to the economic problems for the farmers. It is not the solution to our road building problems. Let us not demote farmers to the rank of second-class citizens, with their hands out for special favours. Farmers do not want, are not asking for such

treatment. Various annual meetings of farmer organizations have opposed this concession, including the Wheat Pool annual convention, and the S.A.R.M. annual convention. Rather than asking for special consideration of the farmers' cost-price squeeze predicament, let us in this Legislature fight for their right to an adequate share of the national income, so that they can pay their portion of a fair tax as a first-class citizen.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the motion.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder, before the Minister sits down, if he would permit a question. I would simply like to know how much money he feels the Government would lose if this particular amendment were passed.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — I think the figure as given on your side of the House was \$30.00 a farm.

Mr. Thatcher: — Will you lose a million dollars — \$2 million? Have you not estimated how much your Department would lose?

Hon. Mr. Willis: — I would say, somewhere between \$2 million and \$5 million. This is only a guess.

Mr. Thatcher: — Holy Christmas, I should say this is a guess, surely we should have that information . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Thatcher: — Just one more question . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, we are not in committee of the whole, I object to this type of procedure.

Mr. Thatcher: — You can object all night or not. I can ask a question about this.

February 28, 1961

Premier Douglas: — No, you can't unless . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh yes, I can, certainly I can ask the question. I know the rules as well as you do.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member knows the rules, he better display it.

Mr. Thatcher: — All right, I am going to ask another question.

Premier Douglas: — I asked your Honour for a ruling. Is the hon. Member . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! It is in order to ask a question after the proposed speech, but one question is one question and we cannot . . .

Premier Douglas: — Only with his consent.

Mr. Speaker: — State your question briefly and quickly.

Mr. Thatcher: — Yes, Sir. Does the Minister also know that the Saskatchewan Farmers Union has approved this motion? He says that the farmers . . .

Hon. Mr. Willis: — I know that the Farmers Union voted against this two years ago.

Mr. Thatcher: — They certainly did not. They have approved . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I think the question has been answered and I think we should proceed.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The debate was adjourned on motion of Mr. Dewhurst.

Resolution Re Unemployment

Mr. Ed. Whelan (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, today we are faced with a very serious problem. The problem is chronic, permanent unemployment. A study of the economic history of Canada proves it is symptomatic of the way we do business, for it has occurred at regular intervals in our history. In Canada this week 690,000 people are looking for work. In Saskatchewan last year, 1960, on the average 5.8% of the working population, according to statistics, were out of work, 10.6% on the yearly average in the province of Quebec, and 11.9% in the Province of British Columbia. At the present time, our yearly average is the lowest in Canada, but in Saskatchewan this week, Mr. Speaker, 28,000 people are looking for work. What does this mean in the everyday life of an unemployed person, and to the community where he resides? Unemployment looms as a spectre of despair. The children wonder why their father never goes to work. Those receiving unemployment insurance only survive. The family buys no new clothes; they patch the patches on the old ones; they cannot afford to buy proper footwear; the heat is turned down in their homes because fuel costs money; the other children in the neighbourhood go to shows, and buy candy, but not the children of the unemployed. The head of the house goes out to look for work, any kind of work, but it is a futile gesture. He collects this unemployment insurance once a week, and after his claim to this fund runs out he swallows his pride and applies for social aid. This is the picture of the home. What is the situation in the community?

Mr. Speaker, a worker fully employed bought

February 28, 1961

butter, but now he buys margarine. When employed he bought bacon, and now he buys hamburger. New clothing was in the budget at regular intervals; now the merchant sells him very little clothing. He cuts down on groceries. The unemployed person cuts down on clothing and all luxuries in order to survive. Business in the community suffers, for purchasing power has disappeared. As a customer, the citizen without any income, or very limited income, seeks credit, thus unemployment injures business activity, and cuts sales in the community. Socially the situation results in mental anguish for the entire family. On the wrong side of the ledger in the community appears such entries as broken homes, petty theft, shoplifting, alcoholism and deserted families. These are the earmarks and the results of chronic unemployment. From a financial point of view, business runs up accounts receivable and may go bankrupt. Taxes are unpaid; mortgages long overdue haunt the home-owner.

The Province of Saskatchewan, has worked on this problem, with a large winter works program by the construction of public buildings, by building the South Saskatchewan River Dam, the Squaw Rapids Dam; by entering into joint programs with the municipalities and with the Federal Government; by spending money on the development and expansion of the Power Corporation, and Government Telephones; by the introduction of a sewer and water program for the farms and smaller towns. The results are evident when you compare our position with other provinces.

But, I think it must be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that our total budget is approximately \$150 million, while the federal budget is approximately \$6,350,000. Our budget is about 1/40 of the federal budget. To suggest that we can solve unemployment by ourselves, with our budget and borrowing capacity, is unrealistic. It is like suggesting that a grocery clerk can afford a yacht, or that a carpenter's helper can afford a Cadillac.

To suggest that we can solve unemployment by ourselves, with our budget and borrowing capacity, is unrealistic. It is like suggesting that a grocery clerk can afford a yacht, or that a carpenter's helper can afford a Cadillac.

Suppose we did develop projects, and suppose we got them underway immediately, unless similar projects were undertaken in other parts of Canada, simultaneously, I suggest that there would be an influx of people, unemployed people, looking for work, and you can't blame them, from all parts of Canada.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a nation problem. It would have been impractical in 1939 that, face to face with world conflict, we had decided to develop nine war efforts, in nine provinces, with nine limited budgets. This is a national emergency now, and

I insist that it should be treated as such, that I should be met with all the resources of all of the people of Canada. Responsibility for unemployment is indicated, I suggest, and accepted by the Federal Government, by the mere fact that they administer and are responsible for the Unemployment Insurance Act.

The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, look to us for leadership at this time. They expect us to spell out to the people of Canada a solution to this pressing problem. The resolution on the order paper will put this Legislature on record to the Federal Government. Therefore, I anticipate unanimous support of the programs I will suggest for implementation. These programs will call for planning. They will call for joint participation and organization of our country to combat unemployment. Investment, public and private, should be directed immediately into development that will provide employment opportunities, and guarantee economic stability. Special concessions should be made to encourage industrial expansion. Credit should be channelled immediately to encourage consumer purchases in the fields which would provide maximum employment.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, sets out specifically, some programs that have been partially introduced to date, but have been limited in their scope. Their introduction proves, I think, that the Federal Government realizes its responsibility, but is reluctant to throttle-back.

I recommend that the Federal Government provide substantial contributions to the provinces, if not all-out cost, for a second Trans-Canada highway for the northern part of this country, through such centres as Timmins, Saskatoon and Edmonton. In addition to providing employment, this would open up tourist areas and make accessible rich mineral deposits. To encourage development of the north, the roads to resources program should be stepped up, expanded, and more money provided by the Government of Ottawa. North-south roads are essential to our development, and they should be built as part of a federal highway system.

At the present time the Federal Government contributes 80% of the cost of underpasses and overpasses, on the Trans-Canada Highway. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Federal government, in order to provide employment in this emergency, in order to save lives because of traffic accidents, to institute a program whereby all costs of underpasses and overpasses on the Trans-Canada Highway would be borne by the Federal Government. In addition, I would like to see an arrangement whereby a large percentage

February 28, 1961

of the cost of overpasses and underpasses, on certain provincial highways, would be undertaken by the Ottawa Government.

We are grateful to the Federal Government for participation in the cost of construction of technical schools, but why stop at technical schools. Through the provincial Department of Education, funds could be made available to provide for university expansion, secondary schools, schools for mentally retarded, agricultural extension and business schools. This money, Mr. Speaker, would be a good investment in our future.

Power plants and power lines are necessary if we are going to have industry. This resolution suggests that large loans should be made available, on a long-term basis, at a fixed and negotiated rate of interest.

Mr. Speaker, there is a precedent for this.

The Federal Government is making a contribution through the Northern Canada Power Corporation, in other parts of this country, providing capital advances on a thirty to forty year basis, without matching payments being required from the provinces. Money is made available at the same rates as advances to Federal Crown Corporations. Why not expand and develop this program to meet the unemployment crisis. With a guarantee of reasonable and comparable power costs, industry, Mr. Speaker, would be on an equal footing in this respect, in all parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, every rural resident in Canada would like a telephone. It is not feasible, is it not practicable, for the Federal Government to assist and encourage this development across Canada, particularly at a time when our fellow citizens are looking for work? There is a need for conservation programs, Mr. Speaker, picnic grounds, and public parks. In areas of Canada water conservation programs have been undertaken jointly. The Federal Government has provided grants for the cost of water surveys, and paid part of the cost of dams constructed to conserve water. In Saskatchewan, we are faced with the prediction that we will have to locate water sources. I recommend this as a joint project that is needed, Mr. Speaker, and that will provide employment.

We need housing, Mr. Speaker, housing for people in all parts of Canada. In Regina City, it is estimated that 5,000 are either non-modern, partially modern, too small, or in desperate need of repair. Recently, under the National Housing Act, loans were made available to provide housing for university students. The need was

there, but even greater is the need for family groups wherever they may live. Why not federal loans for them? The Hon. Mr. Walker, Federal Minister of Public Works, and Minister in charge of the National Housing Act, is reported in the "Leader Post", of November 24, 1960, as saying:

"There is no greater way of creating employment, than by building houses," the Minister said. "Every unit keeps a total of five men occupied for six months."

It seems possible and really only a continuation of this program, to provide large sums of money at a reasonable rate of interest, to the provinces for the construction of low-cost, low-rental housing. According to the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, \$40 million would build more than 3,200 houses, and would provide year round employment for 8,000 workers. At the present time the National Housing Act can aid individuals, municipalities, provinces, and university research into housing and slum clearance. In the Act, specific responsibility for the Indian population is mentioned, regarding construction of housing on Indian reserves. This program is needed, and it would provide employment.

In the field of slum clearance alone, Mr. Speaker, there have been huge sums of money spent in cities like Toronto, Windsor, Montreal, St. John's – Newfoundland. Why not programs for all the cities in our country to provide employment? With the rapid increase in hospital services under the present Federal Government, with the medical care plan looming on the horizon – even the Members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, are still promising a medical car program – there is now a recognition of the need for new and more adequate hospital accommodation. New types of construction to provide facilities for programs such as patient self-care, research, a study of mental and other chronic illnesses, training facilities for doctors, nurses and technicians, could be developed if the money were provided by the Federal Government at Ottawa, on a long term basis, or in outright grants.

The last section of this resolution is the method we suggest as a long term solution:

"Long range economic planning to guarantee the maintenance of full employment in Canada."

Unemployment: it is indeed a serious national situation, when one in eight is unemployed. In January 1960, one year ago, unemployment in Canada was 12.5% of

February 28, 1961

the working force. Compare this with 11% in January 1956; 13.5% for January 1955; 12.8% in January 1954, or an average of 12.3% for January of the last three full years of the Liberal Government.

Under the Conservative Government, unemployment in January 1960, was 12.5%. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that unemployment has been the same, identical problem under both Liberal and Conservative Governments. What is the record regarding planned economy, of planning the future? On May 13, 1958, Hazen Argue moved an amendment in the House of Commons:

“That all the words after the word ‘requires’, be struck out and the following substituted therefore ‘firstly, planned economic policies to ensure an ever-rising standard of living for the people of Canada’” (Hansard, May 13, 1958, P. 45)

Prior to the vote, the Hon. Mr. Pickersgill, explaining the position of the Liberal Party said:

“I do not believe it will be possible for us to support that motion. I know it will not be possible for me to support it for two reasons. The first and most fundamental one is that we take the phrase planned economy to be, as I think it is intended to be, a polite synonym for socialism.” (Hansard, May 21, 1958, P. 316)

On the vote, all the Liberals in the House of Commons voted against the amendment, but, Mr. Speaker, with the failure of the present Federal Government to solve the unemployment problem, even though they have provided the people of Saskatchewan with assistance to build the South Saskatchewan River Dam, after it had been held out as a political carrot by the Federal Liberal party for many years, and even though the present Federal Government has provided money for hospitalization (a promise long made by never kept by the Federal Liberal party), and even though the Conservative Government has been more liberal with old age pensions, veteran’s pensions and contributions for housing, the unemployment picture remains dark and threatening.

Recently, federal Members of the party opposite in a modified way, suggested planning at their Ottawa rally. The vigorous Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, found that he wasn’t vigorous enough to attend the rally. The delegation from Saskatchewan was led by the hon.

Member from Moosomin, and when he spoke last Friday, I was pleased to see that he had returned to good health, Mr. Speaker. I knew that he had recovered his health in January, for he led the delegation to Ottawa when illness overtook the hon. Member for Morse. I should like to compliment the Liberal delegation for adopting the “synonym for socialism”, in January 1961, even though they opposed it as late as May 13, 1958.

Many stories were written, Mr. Speaker, about this planned economy when it was discussed at the rally.

The ‘Toronto Globe and Mail’, January 11, 1961, said, and I quote:

“The Liberal party proposed the creation of a national economic commission composed of representatives of governments, management, labour and agriculture, to provide a forum for consultation on economic planning in all sectors of the economy.”

We hope, Mr. Speaker, that their intentions would be to introduce planning in the interests of all of the people of Canada, particularly the unemployed and the farmers, and not in the interests of a specially chosen business group.

In planning the details for long range employment, Mr. Speaker, and a decent standard of living, I think that we should urge the Federal Government to control imports and exports. We should regulate Canadian trade whereby food surpluses could be sold on a long term commodity agreement. This would put purchasing power in the hands of the farmers for the purchase of farm machinery, and other equipment, lumber, paint, shingles, bathroom facilities, trucks, automobiles, and home appliances. The unemployed, Mr. Speaker, would go back to work to manufacture these articles. Long range planning to develop the exchange of goods between countries, on a barter basis, is also necessary. We should plan, Mr. Speaker, to expand and develop the program of long term loans to purchasers of Canadian farm produce and Canadian manufactured goods. To help people to help themselves, the program should include assistance to co-operatives and credit unions by the establishment of a federal ministry of co-operatives. Such a department could arrange long-term credit and supply research facilities, for the development of basic industries, such as the manufacture of drugs, chemicals and other consumer goods. These industries, Mr. Speaker, co-operatively owned, would provide jobs and also curtail consumer exploitation.

Subsidies and tax concessions to promote and develop the expansion of business, should be included in economic planning. Research and business advice should be made available to the small business man to guarantee his existence in the face of the challenge from monopoly-owned business.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that if we can find money for war, if we can find money for the Bomarc Missile, for Trans-Canada Pipelines, if through science we can develop the most modern conveniences and wonder drugs, then I beg to submit, Mr. Speaker, that through clear thinking and economic planning on behalf of all of the people of Canada, we should be able to solve the problem of unemployment.

Unemployment, Mr. Speaker, adds up to human waste and personal despair. These people, Mr. Speaker, are our fellow citizens and our neighbours. In a recent issue of MacLean's Magazine, McKenzie Porter wrote, (I believe that it is the current issue of this particular magazine) "How the Poor Stay Alive," I would recommend it for reading to all Members of the House in considering this unemployment problem, and I quote McKenzie Porter:

"But in times like these, there are many people on relief who have always considered themselves solid middle class citizens. Anyone meeting and talking with them may well say, 'There, but for the grace of God, go I.'"

The unemployed are important, they are important people, their welfare and their future should be our prime concern. The Federal Government, if it spent a billion dollars each year, and planned our future to remove this economic and social affliction, would be acting, Mr. Speaker, in the best interests of Canada.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. A.T. Stone, the hon. Member for Saskatoon, I am proud to move the following resolution:

"That this Assembly regrets unemployment in Canada has reached the highest level since the nineteen thirties, and urges the Federal Government to:

- (a) provide substantial contributions to assist in the construction of highways, schools, power plants and power lines, telephone facilities, and similar development projects;
- (b) provide credit at low interest rates to the provinces undertaking such projects as housing

- and hospital construction;
- (c) undertake long-range economic planning to guarantee the maintenance of full employment in Canada.

Mr. Gordon T. Snyder (Moose Jaw): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution, I would like, first of all to commend the previous speaker on a very able presentation. He has said many of the things that I would like to have said had I been moving this resolution myself. In view of the fact, I am sure we will make a concerted effort to avoid repetition when speaking on this resolution, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like perhaps to draw attention to the local scene, and perhaps have a tendency to generalize to a certain degree.

I believe that in supporting this resolution, Mr. Speaker, we should bear in mind, of course, that unemployment is of a seasonal nature no longer, and that we are in a position now where it is with us on a twelve-month basis. It is, of course, a chronic illness. This unemployment problem is making itself felt in no small way, in the form of increased cost to our social welfare department, and I believe that the associated need and the suffering can only be roughly estimated in that respect.

Saskatchewan fared somewhat better than some of our neighbouring provinces. At a time when unemployment was at its seasonal peak, a matter of almost one year ago, Saskatchewan had approximately 3% of that figure at her boundaries. Saskatchewan has at the present time, an alarming 28,000 people, in excess of 28,000 people, unemployed, and this is a matter for deep deliberation and concern for all Members seated here. Manitoba has at this time, I understand approximately 34,000 unemployed and Alberta has 49,500.

I believe I would be amiss at this time, Mr. Speaker, if I did not pay tribute to the present administration, for their careful planning of winter works programs, of public works projects, for by this

February 28, 1961

process they have indeed softened the blow considerably in our province of Saskatchewan. Although we recognize that this is something of a stop-gap measure, we also recognize that this does not solve the over-all problem of unemployment, which can be solved only, and I believe that we all recognize that it can be solved only by a concerted action on a national level.

It has been mentioned that it is impossible to live next door to a giant without falling within his shadow. I believe by the same token it is impossible for any provincial administration to escape for any great length of time the effects of unsound policies on the federal level. However, I would add also, Mr. Speaker, that no Provincial Government and no local government, can rest on their laurels without doing those things which are possible within the bounds of their own administration.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the hardship and the suffering, which are associated with the problem of unemployment, another undesirable feature has made itself felt over the past number of months. I refer specifically to the fact that with a surplus of labour on the market as there is at the present time and has been over the past number of months, that it has in many instances placed management in a position of advantage, where they have been able to sell jobs to the lowest bidder. I believe that we in Saskatchewan are fortunate in view of the fact in other provinces in our Dominion, this practice does seem to go on unheeded, and I refer specifically at this time to an article which relates incidents in and around St. John's Newfoundland. It is related in an article in the February 11th, issue of "Labour", Washington, D.C., in which it states:

"Some 2,000 workers, in and around St. John's Newfoundland are getting rates of pay ranging from \$14.00 to \$20.00 a week, according to a minimum wage survey. Only full time employees are included in these figures, which are being compiled to support demands for higher minimum wages, which are now set at 35 cents an hour for women and 50 cents for men. It was found in some

cases that rates were actually below the minimum, and that hours worked were much longer than permitted by law. In one of the Government's new industries, the textile mill, the highest wage paid on the assembly line, was \$17.00 a week."

The article goes on to say:

"Some workers live as far away as Fox Trap, twenty miles from the plant, and had to commute by bus at a cost of \$4.00 a week, leaving them net earnings of \$13.00 a week before deductions. Out of this they buy their noon-day meal at the company canteen.

Many service stations employ men for \$20.00 a week, and even lower. In one service station the average rate worked out to 44 cents an hour, with some employees working up to sixty hours a week, not only without overtime, but even without straight time for extra hours."

The article concludes by saying:

"Restaurant workers are even worse off. They regularly work forty to forty-eight hours a week, for wages ranging from \$14.00 to \$18.00 a week."

Very recently, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just left, who posed his question some time ago, and the question was asked in this House, "What good are good labour laws if you are unemployed?" Now I think, the hon. Gentleman who has just vacated should agree that the Province of Newfoundland has more than her share of unemployment.

I would like to suggest at this time, Mr. Speaker, that at a time when we have a volume of unemployment, that is specifically the time when we need good labour laws.

February 28, 1961

Mr. Speaker, the problem of unemployment is one which I feel deeply, particularly in view of the fact that it has affected a number of my personal friends, and a great number of my acquaintances. Automation and applied technology have affected the people of my Constituency to a very large degree. In my own Constituency of Moose Jaw, the largest single industry the Canadian Pacific Railway had on its payroll in 1955-56, some 1,700 persons, and it has on its payroll at the present time less than 800. A shop staff of 202 persons in 1956 has been reduced to 42. Many of these people had been permanently employed since 1939, and for the first time in their lives they are finding themselves without work, and they also find themselves in a nation which makes it very awkward, and often at times impossible to find work elsewhere. Many other industries are also affected, Mr. Speaker, I have recognized that the railroad industry is only a small cog in the wheel. Other industries such as the automotive industry and packing house workers, have lent themselves to automation and applied technology to a very great degree.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this process of automation instead of being welcomed as a step forward on a road to more adequate, more abundant and leisurely living has become regarded as a scourge perhaps to those who sell their labour.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that all intelligent people recognize the fact that an unemployed person is not a good customer for farm or industrial products. I believe this is being recognized by the people regardless of their political complexion. I would refer, Mr. Speaker, to a statement which was made by Walter E. Gordon, to the Canadian Manufacturers Associates annual conference on management, at which time Mr. Gordon stated:

“Unemployment may well be our main domestic problem in the years immediately ahead. I suggest that it should not be your sole preoccupation and responsibility to safeguard the capital investment in your companies, and to increase your

profits every year. It is more important that you preserve the jobs of your employees and provide jobs for those who are seeking work and cannot find any.”

Now, to what extent the recommendations of Mr. Walter E. Gordon, are being acted upon, Mr. Speaker, is something of which I have little knowledge. It is apparent to me, Mr. Speaker, the old-line parties are not prepared to do the things that are necessary to eliminate the existing conditions and the evils in this country. I suggest and I submit at this time, Mr. Speaker, that that will be the task of the New Party. In the intervening time between now and the founding convention I think that we can recognize the fact that a concerted effort will continue to discredit those portions, those segments which are making up this particular political group which we will refer to as the New Party. A concerted effort has been made to discredit labour, and I believe that those persons who are in touch with the situation, who understand the problems, can regard this behaviour as being deliberately mischievous.

It has been claimed, Mr. Speaker, in this process of discrimination if you wish, it has been claimed that labour unions are not sufficiently democratic. It has been pointed out on various occasions that conclusions are come too, and decisions are made by labour leaders, and they are accepted only reluctantly by members of their organization. I would like to state categorically, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the case, and in many more instances the opposite of this is true. However, in view of the evidence available, I consider it rather strange that labour unions were singled out for special mention in this particular instance. I would refer to an editorial in the publication “Labour”, Washington, D.C., of January 14th, 1961, which is entitled “Corporate Democracy.” It shows that the Coca-Cola Company, with more than 26,000 stock-holders had fewer than thirty individuals at its 1960 stock-holders meeting. Southern Pacific Railway with more than 70,000 stock-holders, had exactly six. McGraw Edison with 12,000 stock-holders attracted eleven to its stock-holders meeting. Burlington Industries with

February 28, 1961

30,000, attracted one stock-holder, an elderly lady. Servel Incorporated with 8,000 stock-holders, succeeded in getting no stock-holders to its annual policy making conclave.

I believe at the same time, Mr. Speaker, concerted effort is being made to indicate at this same time, that the interests of farmer and labourer are opposed. I think that by developing this line of reasoning, it can be shown that the interests of the farmer and the interests of the rancher are opposed, and the interest of the fruit grower are opposed to both. By extending this line of reasoning, Mr. Speaker, it can be shown that interests of the worker in the hat factories are opposed to those of the worker in the shoe factory, for if any one of these particular groups receives and increase in their living, in their allowance for the product which they produce, it could conceivably raise the cost of the items which the others must buy. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that these tactics are evidently intended to confuse and mislead, rather than to enlighten, and to me they seem to resemble the antics of certain wild fowl that will feign a broken wing in order to direct attention away from a nest of eggs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the farmer and the labourer have a community of interest, a community of interest which is not shared by those persons who maintain vast public relations systems for the purpose of directing attention away from their own nest-egg. The activities of this latter group are not confined to efforts in discriminating and distorting the facts regarding labour. They extend into the field of social welfare, or in effect to any portion of our economy which might disturb in some way the accumulation of profits. I believe, Mr. Speaker, some evidence of this can be found in an address, which was made by Mr. Charles Luckman, who as President of Lever Bros., addressed the ninth annual convention of the supermarket institute, November 7th, 1946, at which time he asked:

“Why is it that during the last twenty years, American big business has been identified in the public mid as opposed to everything that spells greater security, well-being and peace of mind for the little guy?”

He answered his own question and he said:

“Well we got the reputation we have because by and large we earned it. How? Well, we declared war on collective bargaining; we naturally opposed increased taxes for education; we fought health and safety ordinances; the record proved that we battled child labour legislation; we yipped and yelled against minimum wage laws; we struggled against unemployment insurance; we decried social security and currently we are kicking the h-e-ll out of legislative proposals to provide universal sick and accident insurance. Where on the record is there a single instance”, (he goes on to say)

“to show where big business ever initiated the legislative program of benefits for the workers? Is it not clear that we have always waited until we are asked or forced to do something?”

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would be hardly necessary to point out to the Members of this Assembly that very recently we in this province have been told that if we had a medical care plan, administered at cost, it will be too expensive. We have also been assured today that a depression would be less severe, and unemployment would have less of a sting than it would in years gone by, because of the built-in welfare measures, and the shock absorbers, and the stabilizers which have been introduced over the past number of years.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that to whatever extent this is true, some credit must be given to the efforts of labour. Efforts which were opposed by those who would now take credit for victories that were won in battles which they lost.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with unemployment as I have, in a rather round-about fashion this afternoon, unemployment, agricultural surpluses and various other problems with which we are confronted today, we are doing so with one main objective, we are doing so with one idea. We are doing it with the idea that we do have a

February 28, 1961

future. To what extent this is to, Mr. Speaker, I believe will depend to a very large degree on whether we attack and deal with another problem which is in the forefront at this particular time.

I suggest, that never before has mankind been in a position where he has the choice between a better and a fuller life, or the utter destruction of mankind. Now, in view of the general agreement among the prominent scientists, Mr. Speaker, regarding the effects of atomic bomb tests carried out, and nuclear war, I believe the time has surely come for us to face the realities around us. It is estimated that the bomb tests carried out so far, about 150 megatons, including 1958, will ultimately produce about one million seriously defective children.

Mrs. Batten: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, which resolution is the hon. Member speaking on?

Mr. Speaker: — I believe he is speaking on a resolution concerning unemployment. It is a little hard to speak concerning labour, without speaking about unemployment, but I wish he would come to the point as quickly as possible.

Mrs. Batten: — I thought he was speaking on nuclear warfare.

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, my point is precisely this, I have attempted to indicate that is if the problem of nuclear warfare is not solved, then of course, this problem of unemployment will resolve itself. That is the precise point that I have endeavoured to make on this particular instance. We have a solution for our unemployment problem; we have a solution for our agricultural surpluses, by carrying on in the same fashion as we are carrying on today.

Now, I did not phrase my words for the purpose of making them palatable to the Opposition. If the Speaker will permit, I would like to continue. I feel that there is a very definite connection here, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue. I merely want to state at this time, Mr.

Speaker, that for obvious reasons the evacuation programs have been more or less disbanded, and in their place, of course, we are having recommended to us fall-out shelters and various other programs of this description. I suggest, that perhaps these fall-out shelters may in some way give our economy a shot in the arm. They may in some way also alleviate the unemployment problem as it stands. I understand that these shelters can be very simple in construction, and they can be built by anyone who is handy with money. However, I believe that the best and the worst that can be said about them, Mr. Speaker, is that they may give our people an illusion of security.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in dealing with this question, we must bear in mind also the fact that many of these troubled spots on the face of the globe where world conflict could be ignited are portions of the globe where the annual income of the people in some oil rich areas, such as the Persian Gulf and the Middle East, is in the vicinity of \$50.00 per capita.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should consider increasing the foreign aid that we were giving these people, and I want to also suggest that the trickle of wealth that perhaps flows in by that process would not in any great way materially affect the well being of these people.

I am about to conclude, Mr. Speaker. We have heard complains, Mr. Speaker, from the Opposition side of the House, to the effect that conditions which are general across Canada are very unpalatable to these Members opposite.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these conditions which they condemn are merely the uncontrolled fruits of a free enterprise system which they themselves support. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest in closing, that no provincial administration can ignore their responsibility in doing whatever is necessary to alleviate existing conditions. I suggest, also, it will take a course of action along the lines described in the resolution which I rose to support.

I want to thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, and for allowing the latitude which you have on this resolution.

February 28, 1961

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — As I am on my feet for the first time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you, and say I approve whole-heartedly of your appointment to the post as Speaker of this Legislature.

Now, the previous speakers have placed the seriousness of the unemployment picture pretty well before us today, and I intend to spend a few minutes in assessing what has been done, or should I say what has not been done to meet the unemployment crisis in the past. I think, as Canadians, Mr. Speaker, we ought to hang our heads in shame to know that in a country where we have untold wealth we have not been able adequately to look after a population of a mere eighteen million people. Experience, they say, is our best teacher, but it often happens that we do a thing so long the wrong way that we finally come to believe that it is the right way, and the only way. Since entering the labour field in 1913, I have gone through many degrees of unemployment. Two of them which you may remember, Mr. Speaker, we were saved by the bell, I mean by two wars. But there have been various degrees in between which have brought suffering to many of our wage earners. We did have during the last great war some kind of a planned economy. Now you hear people say, “Well he had a war to win, and we can’t have a kind of a planned economy in peace.” Well, how do we know we can’t have a planned economy? We have never tried it.

As soon as the war ended, the Conservative Opposition at that time pushed very strongly for the removal of controls, corporation taxes, excess profits tax, and what have you. Finally the Liberal Government at that time conceded, and they conceded after a great deal of protest from farmers, consumers, and labour groups. Mass meetings were held all across Canada, and I would like just to quote from the Gallup Poll. Now we know that the Gallup Poll is not always too accurate, but if we allow for a little inaccuracy, surely these figures are quite convincing. October 11th, 1950 the Gallup Poll was taken and it showed that 75% of the people were in favour of controls, 14% were against, 7% gave qualified answers, while 4% had no opinion on the question at all. So, Mr. Speaker, we removed controls, we removed excess profits tax, we cut corporation tax, we said to

industry, 'Go ahead, you have the green light, go ahead, expand your industries, create full employment, charge, whatever the traffic will bear, and produce.' There is no doubt, nobody will argue that they haven't produced, Mr. Speaker. They've produced so well that today we have approximately 700,000 men and women looking for jobs. The old trickle-down policy that was tried in the days of Disraeli, and has proved a failure ever since. You see, Mr. Speaker, somebody has pinched off the trickle and it hasn't got down to those 700,000 people.

In spite of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that our economy has expanded terrifically during the last decade, it has only been a privileged few that have amassed great wealth. On the other side, the income of our wage earner has increased much less than the total wealth, in fact I think somebody in the House mentioned that one-third of the labour force, almost two million of our labour people, do not earn enough to pay income tax. Now farm income has actually declined. Whole sections of our society have not benefitted at all from our industrial expansion. We make no adequate provision for those who, because of sickness, are unable to provide for themselves. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that under the profit motive system, we have to get rid of our surpluses, that is our production over what our own people can use. If we don't get rid of those, wheels of industry get bogged down, and our markets are getting thinner and thinner day by day.

It is interesting to look and see how the United States, our neighbours to the south, tried to combat this over-production. In 1958 when there was what looked to be a pretty severe depression, they went out to make their people, buy, buy, buy. In order to be a good, true American you had to buy, regardless of whether you mortgaged yourself for the rest of your life. Many people there have two homes. A big percentage of the people have two cars. Your social prestige doesn't go down any if you own a compact car, as long as it's parked alongside a bigger, standard car outside your home. They have different colour tissues to match every room in the home. There is a deodorant for the male and one for the female. All kinds of products come in squirt cans

February 28, 1961

which can be thrown away when you're through, and incidentally, you throw quite a bit of the product away with it. Cans galore, thrown all over the place. Manufacturers began to find that their products were standing up too long, and they deliberately are manufacturing now certain products, such as appliances, electrical appliances, to last just a certain time and have to be replaced. In fact, we're finding out now that most of these appliances have to be serviced, and new parts bought, hardly before they leave the dealer's hands.

Advertising – billions of dollars in advertising conditioning people to buy, buy, buy. Even the little toddlers are conditioned and the teen-agers, form quite a lucrative field, for after all the teen-agers are going to be the next newly-weds who have to start out with a brand new home, and all the trimmings that go with it. In spite of all this waste, Mr. Speaker, terrific wastes, scientists are quite concerned down there with the waste of the natural resources. It is estimated that in twenty years they'll be out of fuel oil; they have no copper; in spite of all that waste, and the tragic part is the other countries where they have investments, the natural resources are being wasted too in countries like Canada. In spite of all they have done in the States, they still cannot solve the unemployment situation. They have more unemployed today, than they have had since the 1930's.

We in Canada have aped the United States to a big degree. We are trying to get our people to buy, buy. If you are living in an old house, you have to pull this wall down and put a picture window in, and a rumpus room, and so on. While the appliances are put out to catch the females' eye with built-in features, and plastic knobs which fall off, the minute you touch them. I had an occasion this week, a little example of my own, where my own T.V. set went on the bumner. It's an old set, I've had it six or seven years, and most of the original tubes were in it, and I called a service man. He said most of the tubes were not too good, and by the time I repair this, perhaps, it might be a better idea if you put I on a trade-in on a new set, that is if you can get a dealer who can give you a trade-in. "Well", I said, "that might be an idea, can you give me any guarantee that I can get a set that will last longer than this

set, if I have it repaired?" Well I knew the young fellow, quite well, and he said "Well, to tell the truth, I can't, we're having a real hey-dey on these new T.V. sets." So I thought in the way of economics, it would be better for me to spend \$50 or \$60 on the old set, which would last just as well as one that I would pay over \$300 for.

I wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, though we have given these people the green light to go ahead, and charge whatever traffic will bear, they've also reaped a lot of benefits through automation. Just a small example, I take this because it's close to home, I read in the Star Phoenix on February 14th. It says,

"Bakeries consolidated – one plant to close here." Two bakeries serving the Saskatoon area announced plans to consolidate their manufacturing facilities as a necessary move in the face of rising production and distribution costs. As a consequence, Canadian Bakeries plant, will close, and all breads and cakes manufactured for the Canadian Bakeries, will be made in the plant of the McGavins bakeries, which will be expanded."

Down here, Mr. Gillis, who is speaking for the company said,

"Rising costs have put some of our operations in the red, diminishing returns, and the prospect of heavy expenditures to enlarge and replace production facilities, in some of our plants, face us with a very bleak future."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't buy that. I want to make it perfectly plain that I'm not opposed to automation, or anything that will help production, but I can't buy this idea that they're going in the red, because these people who at no time have failed to put the cost on their produce when they find that they need to, and they don't have to go to the collective bargaining to do it, so they'll put a cent

on a loaf or five cents on a cake or whatever you have. What I am complaining about, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that these savings have (no doubt, there will be considerable savings here) – because it says further on:

“in all 20 plants owned by the two companies from Victoria to Fort William, are involved with 5 of these to close down.”

Mr. Gillis says, that one result of the change will be that cakes and sweet goods formerly manufactured in Calgary would now be made here. The plan would also supply such goods for Prince Albert. So undoubtedly, there will be a considerable saving, Mr. Speaker. I am complaining that not one cent of these savings will go to the consumer, in the way of cheaper produce. Not one cent of this will go to the employees, or neither will one cent of this go to the men and women that they will put out on the street. This is a small example of what automation has done all across Canada. They've not only been able to charge whatever the traffic will bear, but they've got an extra bit of the pie, through the savings by automation and technical advances.

We sort of kid ourselves, Mr. Speaker, that we live in a democracy, I sometimes wonder if we haven't lost our economic democracy. Sure it's true that I say that, because we have no say in what we will pay for our consumer goods. There isn't any competition any longer. Cartels set these prices, and we have to buy at the prices as they set them. We do have political democracy, it is true. If we don't like a Government, and we usually blame most Governments for what happens, if we don't like a Government, we can turn them out. But I'm going to ask you, Mr. Speaker, what possible change will we make, if we kick “John” out and put “Mike” in?

Mrs. Batten: — Or Tommy.

Mr. Stone: — I think most of us followed the big Liberal Rally in Ottawa, and I spoke to some who were down there, and it was impossible to find whether they knew anything about the unemployment situation, or if they knew anything about the farm problems, the problems that face the

farmer. Certainly, they had no solution to meet either. I was interested in reading an editorial from the "Country Guide". Just one man's opinion, but I'm sure it is shared by thousands who know the agriculture situation. He says,

"From an agricultural standpoint, the Liberal Rally seemed to be completely bewildered and without inspiration. Mr. Pearson accused the Diefenbaker Government of failure to produce any kind of a solution for agricultural problems."

Well, if the Liberals think what came out of the rally resolutions is a better guide to success than what is currently being offered, they are badly mistaken. The agricultural resolutions, as far as we can make out, are devoid of any promising or imaginative proposals. They in no way adequately deal with the two most urgent fields requiring policy decision, namely grain and dairying. That was their opinion on agricultural paths.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if Governments are to have the responsibility of finding markets, they have to have the responsibility of taking care of unemployment, of bringing about a farm stabilization policy, then Governments must have control of our economy. Organized labour as I pointed out, in the first place, was the most persistent, the strongest in their opposition to the removal of controls. They pointed out to the Government, at that time, just exactly what would happen, and what did happen – that group to suffer would be those on fixed incomes, the old age pensioner, the fellow getting a little pension from his job, those who had put away small savings for their old age. They were the first, and they have been the group who have suffered ever since that day. The next group of course, was the low income group workers, who have suffered too, and many of them have been organized. Many small business men have been forced out, and many thousands more now have their backs to the wall. Of course, we know what has happened to the farmers, Mr. Speaker.

Now, we hear the story today, and it has

February 28, 1961

been subtle and a very effective propaganda, in press, T.V. and by noted columnists on economy, who will have you believe, of course, that labour is the cause of this inflation. It's very effective I'll agree, and I think that is what the Minister of Mineral Resources had reference to in the Calgary Seminar. It is very effective, and they are appealing, of course, to the consumer. Now, who are the consumers? Organized labour are amongst the consumers, farmers, low paid workers, these on fixed incomes. Now, Mr. Speaker, is we manage to get labour to take a reduction in wages, do we believe that any of these other groups are going to get the benefits of that reduction? I was interested in a little piece, in one of the back pages of the "Star-Phoenix." I thought it was of such interest that it should have been on the front page, but it was way back in one of the back pages, and it says,

"Government fears tax savings wouldn't benefit consumer. Economist H.A. Hansen (this is on Wednesday, January 25th) of Toronto, said Monday, the Federal Government gave serious consideration "to reducing corporate taxes in its mind, because it feared the savings would not be passed on to the consumer."

He said that he had been informed that the Government had considered reducing corporate taxes by considerable amounts. He added that Canadian business men had given the Government reason to believe that the reduced costs, resulting from a tax cut, would not go to the consumers. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite sure, that knowing the Government in Ottawa they did consider this very, very seriously, and I say this is a frank admission by the Government that they have no control over our economy. If they, the Government, can't rust these people, how can labour trust management to pass the savings on to the consumer group? I think the day has come when these groups will get together with labour to try and raise themselves up, to give themselves more purchasing power, to buy the goods and services they need, rather than to pull labour down to their level.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest

an immediate to step to be taken to put men and women back to work immediately. I think most of the ideas in the motion are long-term, and will possibly take quite a little while to get blueprint plans into action, but I'm going to make a suggestion that the terms of the winter works program should be extended all year round. I don't expect, I don't think that the Federal Government will ever make cheap money available to provinces or municipalities. The winter works program hasn't done the job that we hoped it would, and many of our municipalities are putting off work that has to be done, work that will be done in the ordinary way, are putting it off to the winter so that they can share in the labour cost, and get some of the money from the other Governments. I'm suggesting that if these terms were made available all year round, I'm sure that municipalities have a back-log of work that could be advanced and done all year round. I know in my own city, we have many things such as bridges, and subways, and highways, and sewer and water, schools and so on. In fact our Commissioner at the present time is busy working on a five-year plan for future projects. I am sure that many of these could be advanced and the savings to the city in this kind of share-labour costs, would be considerable. I believe the senior governments, would get back a great deal of this money, through the savings in Social Aid. I don't need to argue the benefits of having a man gainfully employed, surely, than receiving social aid.

I say that the recommendations in the motion must be proceeded with immediately as a long-time program for unemployment. I suppose there will be the question, Mr. Speaker, of where we're going to get the money. Of course, we heard that in the 1930's; couldn't find a nickel, but somehow, somebody turned the tap on awfully quick, and we got all the money we needed. I would suggest too, that a very, very careful study be made of the waste spending in our defence program. I am sure, and I think most people are satisfied that there is a considerable amount of waste in our defence program. Now, we all know that if we didn't have the cold war, if we didn't spend this money on defence, if we took it out of our economy tomorrow, our economy would fall flat on its face. So we have to make a very careful

February 28, 1961

study; we can't do as we did in the Avro schmozzle, we have to make a very careful study. That should be done, and a study of the waste spending used for careful planning, and put into productive use.

Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that I'm rather a pessimist. From my experience, I feel there are many, and as long as we have the kind of governments that we've had in the past, I feel that there are many who are unemployed at the present time, especially those who are over 45, who will never have any hope of permanent employment in the future I think the situation looks very, very dim for millions of our war babies who are just about going to come into our labour force in the next few years. We have to do something different than we've done in the past. I think we've got to give people a chance to elect the kind of Government that will take hold of the controls of our economy, take it out of the hands of the few who have it now, and put it back into the hands of the masses of the people, through their elected representatives. This may not happen in my time, Mr. Speaker, but I think we've got to give people that opportunity and until we do, I don't think we're going to solve unemployment, and I don't think we're going to give farmers a stabilization policy.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the Motion.

Mr. Bernard D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, on the motion of the Member from Regina City: I wouldn't have been surprised to see us come out of the House this afternoon with a medical plan or something.

I think before he started to speak he just took it for granted that all the Members on this side of the House were going to oppose the motion. I'll surprise him now, and tell him that I, along with most of the others, I believe, if not all, will be supporting the motion.

We realize, even though we are Liberals, that unemployment is a very serious thing, and that something should be done about it. Our friends across the way do the same thing that they've always done, they cry to Ottawa for help. They find since they've got a Conservative Government to cry to that it doesn't bail them out as well as the Liberal Government did in the years gone by.

Now, as much as I agree with the mover that the Federal Government should take steps to alleviate unemployment, I might mention that this Government in the province also has a responsibility to the people who are unemployed in this country. We realize that since our Conservative friends have been in power in Ottawa, as I said a moment ago, it's harder for the Provincial Government to get help than it was before.

I would like to remind my friends opposite that unemployment in this province, at least in part, is due to the fact that we have in this province, a Government that's antagonistic to free enterprise. Without free enterprise coming into this province to invest money, we cannot possibly have people employed. We know that with the technological changes that have taken place in agriculture many people in this province have left the farms to find employment in the cities. Some of these people have even left the province to find employment in industrial centres in other parts of Canada. May I remind them that part of the cause of unemployment in this province is due to their policies, and I will deal with some of the results of their policies a little bit later on.

The motion suggested that the Federal Government provide a low rate of interest to the province. Well, we're in full agreement with this, but let me remind the gentlemen opposite, that they should practice what they preach. I notice that they're loaning farmers money at 6 ½ % interest to pay for farms. The federal borrowing agency loans money at 5%. As much as we realize that some definite long-range planning should be considered, I suggest we do not have the kind of planned that goes into a socialist planned economy – this would just mean more of the taxpayer's hard earned dollars spent foolishly.

I believe that the Member from Moose Jaw mentioned something about labour laws. Good labour laws, he said, were more necessary when there's unemployment than when there is not unemployment. I fully agree that we do need good labour laws. I would be one of the first to say so, but we also need good Government policy to create jobs for the workers in this province, and I don't think that we're getting good Government policy from the CCF Government.

Just to show you what has happened, I'm going

February 28, 1961

to give you a few figures of what the manufacturing industries show. In Manitoba in 1959 new investments were \$7.1 million; 1960 — \$58.8 million. In Saskatchewan \$30.3 million in 1959 and \$22.8 million in 1960. Alberta 1959 — \$90 million — in 1960 — \$117.9 million. So Saskatchewan got a little better than a third of what Manitoba got in 1960, and about a little less than a fifth of what Alberta got. Surely members of this Government don't think that Saskatchewan has nothing here. The fact that we have a socialist Government here keeps people who would be investing their money to develop the resources of this province out of this province. I think it is understood by all the manufacturing interests in this country, and that's why they haven't got investments in this province.

Another example: these people seem very concerned about jobs, and this suggestion that we have more low rental housing came from the unemployed today. I fully agree with them, I think that there should be. What about Saskatchewan last year on housing? New investments in Manitoba in 1960 were \$149 million, in Alberta \$204 million, and in Saskatchewan \$76.5 million. Quite a record for a Government that is concerned about the unemployed. I have another set of figures here that I will read out to you. The value of manufactured products in Manitoba in 1958 (the last figure that I could get) \$674,759,000; Alberta \$794,101,000; Saskatchewan \$318,786,000 — just about half of Manitoba, less than half of Alberta.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would think that if the hon. Gentlemen opposite are so concerned about the unemployed people of this province, they should take another look at their policies. Their policies are part of the cause of unemployment in this province. Not only in this province, but there are people who have left this province, Mr. Speaker, and gone into the industrial centres of this country, and created more unemployment in Ontario and B.C.

I am also going to read a news release, Mr. Speaker, just to show you how well our socialist friends have done.

“Ottawa — Department store sales in the 3 prairie provinces were down for the first 9 months of this year compared with last year.”

The Bureau of Statistics in Ottawa says the prairie situation contrasts with the national picture, where department store sales have been up 1.4%. Manitoba showed the smallest drop with sale of \$85,271,000 compared with \$85,423,000, in the first nine months of 1959. In Alberta sales of \$109,312,000 were down \$1,183,000 from the first nine months of 1959. But in Saskatchewan, with the socialist Government, department store sales to the end of September totalled \$43,989,000, a decline of \$2,723,000 from last year. Now, Mr. Speaker, it should be quite clear to the gentlemen opposite, that there must be something wrong with this province, and I suggest that the main thing wrong, is that the Government of this province is trying to plan the economy of this province, and when you try to plan the economy of the province, you're not going to provide jobs for the working people.

One of the gentlemen opposite was talking about price controls. He didn't suggest wage control. I'd suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he go down to an industrial part of this country, and then talk about price control, and when he's asked whether it includes wage controls, he should tell the truth. I heard a CCF Member of Parliament questioned on a platform, as to whether or not price control would include wage control. When he was put on the spot he said, "Yes, we'd have to have wage control with price control." These gentlemen can talk about price control here in an agricultural province where they think it appeals to the farmer, but they dare not go down to Windsor or Hamilton and talk about price control, because they might be questioned on it. However, Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak for all members of the Opposition, when I say that I'm going to support the motion.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of this motion, and with the problems that we have in employment in Saskatchewan, I should like to take this opportunity to say a few words. I believe that after the speech that was given by the Member for Moose Jaw, and his wonderful method of delivering — I believe his method was excellent — but I believe he created more confusion as to whether he was actually speaking on the motion, for sometimes his speech was

February 28, 1961

like something you might expect to be delivered somewhere behind the iron curtain. It was such a violent attack on free enterprise. It was been very difficult to find out whether the motion was being discussed, or anything added to the motion.

I agree most whole-heartedly, Mr. Speaker, with the mover of the resolution, in many respects, I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Government failed to provide, in times of plenty, for the needs in times of want, and of which we are now at the door, and probably in the door. In view of this resolution, and some of the possible changes that may be needed in order to embrace the problem properly, I beg leave, Mr. Speaker, at this moment to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. Member from Gravelbourg has asked leave to adjourn the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — No.

Mr. Speaker: — I am afraid that I cannot form a verdict of your opinion in that regard. Those who are in favour of the motion will please say yes.

Some Hon. Members: — Yes.

Mr. Speaker: — Those who are opposed will please say no.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

Mr. Speaker: — The motion is lost.

Some Hon. Members: — It means a lack of preparation.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Well certainly I'll speak, I'll speak right up to 5:30.

Mr. Speaker, since when have the hon. Members opposite taken upon themselves to institute closure without the benefit of standing orders, or anything in the constitution of the rules governing behaviour in this House?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think a motion to adjourn can be defeated, or can be accepted, I don't think there is anything in the standing order against it.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, this is the first time this motion has come up. The mover and the seconder spoke on this motion, and usually it is a matter of courtesy that the other Members, particularly those on the opposite side of the House, should have the opportunity to peruse the words of wisdom that are torn out the mouths of the mover and seconder, and then have time to reply to them. At the moment I have nothing before me, as has no other Member in this House any material whatsoever, to indicate what they have said. I had a great deal of difficulty following at least some of the speakers on the other side of the House, and certainly we are not in a very fair position when we are asked to go on and debate a motion at this time.

Mr. Speaker, a motion of this great important, without any type of preparation, this is not only being unfair to the Opposition, this, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not blaming you in any way, and of course I understand, Mr. Speaker, you have no alternative by to accept the vote of the Members of the Government and the back-benchers who vote the same way, and deny us this adjournment, but by so voting certainly they are taking advantage of their position, and certainly they are stopping the hon. Members who wish to speak from preparing to speak on this motion.

Now, I can't remember off hand which of the Members on the other side of the House went into detail on nuclear warfare, and I certainly would like to have a copy of that speech to tie up what it has to do with the motion before the House, before I try to reply to him. It certainly would take a written speech in order to follow the sarcasms that were heaped, not only upon all other political parties, but upon any other institution that didn't conform with the socialist concept of how world, local, national, and provincial affairs should be run. I heard very little, although I did try to listen to find out what this Government, and the hon. Members opposite intended to do for the unemployed of this province. I heard about how we should be ashamed to

be a Canadian and I don't think anybody else on this side of the House is.

Mr. Speaker, this Canadian system of economics that was so bitterly derided by the Members opposite has given the people of this country the second highest standard of living in the world. Mr. Speaker, let me ask you, what is a planned economy? Is it a polite term (as the Liberals believe) used by socialists instead of the expression socialism, which is distasteful even to the socialists? Let me tell you what this socialism and this planned economy did in another country. If you listened to the news this morning, Mr. Speaker, you heard that Japan was offering to send food over to Communist China, because their planned economy has failed so miserably that not only do they not have unemployment, but worse they have starving people.

If there are people starving in Saskatchewan today, Mr. Speaker, and if there are unemployed in Saskatchewan, surely, this socialist Government with its wonderful means of planning economies, can look after the situation without going crying and begging, as the always do, to the Federal Government. Just for once, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to see the hon. Members opposite give some concrete suggestions for solving our own problems. Just once, I'd like to see them stand up on their feet and take some responsibility for the conditions in which we find ourselves today.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, this motion shouldn't be a vehicle for petty politics, the kind that we have listened to since the mover of the motion got up on his feet and read his well-prepared speech. Surely, this is not a time to play politics. I'm not so worried about statistics; it sounds bad to talk about 28,000 people unemployed, but I'm more worried about the actual people who are unemployed, I'm worried about husbands who haven't got a job to go to, about the wives who haven't got a pay-cheque to depend on, the children who have to go to school without having

adequate food and clothing. Surely, this is the time to come to grips with this problem. Surely this is the time to start from the ground, right here in this Chamber. This is one motion that should have been handled with some type of constructive thought. Surely, this is not a motion to bandy about and then start talking about what we should do for the poor of the world. I'm so sick and tired, Mr. Speaker, of these grandiose, these sentimental notions of love, towards those who are so far away, and the hatred that we hear expressed here, for those that are close to us – those who are our responsibility. It's very easy to talk about loving your neighbour when he's in China or Japan, or behind the iron curtain. Let's try and love the people that we have to work with here – the people who are today suffering, and let's do something concrete about their needs.

Not so many days ago we heard boasts about the number of people that the hon. Attorney-General managed to put off the unemployment roll. He was very proud of this. He was saving money, and no doubt this Government will go on saving money by closing down court houses and land titles offices throughout this province. This is a way of saving Government money; this is the way of making more people unemployed, and yet we can hear another Member get up and complain because some company is installing some other machines, or installing automation and putting people out of work. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Government has more responsibility for employment than some corporation – cold-blooded and vicious as these socialists call them. Surely, it is up to the members of the Government and back-benchers, who sit there today to call to the attention of the Government the fact that we have a problem here, today, before us – a problem that these people in the Government should have foreseen, as the Opposition has foreseen, and has warned them.

Mr. Speaker, I am sick and tired, and I'm sure the people of this province are, of hearing these snide insinuations about Canada only having prosperity because of war. We were saved by the war these people actually believe that. This is the type of patriotism that they would preach. Isn't war a terrible

February 28, 1961

thing, and how they talk against it, until some of their friends are involved. As soon as Russia entered the war, there was a lot less talk about . . .

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, war is a horrid and an ugly thing, and it's ugly to everyone. Surely, there is no human being who would be in favour of war. But to blame war on the capitalist system, and say that war is necessary for free enterprise, or to leave that impression, surely is a very despicable way of bringing about this so-called brotherly love, that we hear preached by the socialists.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, today, we are in the midst of war. It's not nuclear war, not a conventional arms war, but certainly it's a war.

Government Member: — Mr. Speaker, who's out of order now?

Opposition Member: — You are.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, I'm replying to the things that were brought out by the Members speaking on this motion.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I'm very sorry, I realize that possibly I have not been as strict this afternoon, as I should have been, but I have had a great deal of difficulty all afternoon in recognizing that we are talking about unemployment, and I do wish that the Member would come to that point as quickly as she can.

Mrs. Batten: — I'm glad, Mr. Speaker, that you at least agree with me that war and unemployment don't go hand in hand the way that these people seem to suggest they do. According to them, and I'm merely repeating what one of the speakers said, I don't wish to infringe or to be out of order, but one of the speakers, speaking on this motion, I believe it was the seconder to the motion who said that he was saved from unemployment on two occasions by war. I am merely replying to this statement.

Mr. Speaker: — That does have a bearing on unemployment.

Mrs. Batten: — Yes, I'm not suggesting for one moment . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mrs. Batten: — I'm quite willing to yield the floor to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who is now going to solve the problem of war in a one minute speech, but if I'm allowed to go on to speak on this resolution, or to this motion — I would like again to draw to the attention of the Members the fact that this is a problem that is before us today. This isn't only a problem in Canada, this is a problem in Saskatchewan.

One of the reasons that we have this problem in Saskatchewan today, is because of the way that this Government has treated the rural areas of this province. This is perfectly true. It may sound funny to some of the farmers sitting in the back row there, but if they looked around their own homestead, and they looked around their own Constituencies, they would find out exactly what has happened to the young people of those Constituencies and those small towns and villages. There isn't one that hasn't been robbed of the very richest natural resource it has, and we have heard this cliché often enough, that hasn't been robbed of its young men and women because this Government, by committee, by commission, by its ministers, has said over and over again that we must go with the trend, and the trend is this, and over and over again they have told us that farms are going to become larger and that farmers are going to become fewer, and that prices are going to go down, that there is no planned economy, and that there is no hope except in the socialist paradise which is being built in the cities of Saskatoon and Region, (I beg your pardon), Moose Jaw too, where industry is going to sprout and where we are going to see the Pittsburghs of the Prairies. Well, the people believed all this charm and this enthusiasm that was heaped upon them. They believed these people who went from little school house to little school house and told them, "You won't have to worry about surpluses, you won't have to worry

February 28, 1961

about anything because we have technology, that is the answer". We are going to convert all these surplus products; we are going to manufacture; we are going to build an industrial empire, because we have a planned economy. It takes socialism to bring prosperity, industry and employment.

These young boys and girls, believing this story, believing that there was no future on their father's farm, there was no future in agriculture, moved to the cities. If you look at the unemployed, those young men and women who today are looking for work and who cannot find work in Saskatchewan, you will find that many of them have rural origins. If this Government really has assisted them to plan, they might have found work, employment, made their home in smaller towns, and had built up a different type of economy, an economy that is more self-sufficient than the one to which these people have led us.

I was very interested this year, hearing the Premier boasting, and he should boast, I am not decrying that, that because of the position than most provinces. Well, Mr. Speaker, isn't this a far cry from other years, when we forgot all about agriculture, there was nothing in agriculture anymore, we boasted, or at least the Premier and the Government boasted, that industry had given us a diversified income, that we no longer had to worry about agriculture because with the tremendous development of the industrial potential of Saskatchewan, we now had a more balanced economy. Those were fine words, but when unemployment strikes and when a Government which has for years boasted about its ability to plan, finds that it has no plan to meet this problem the same old cry arises; "Let's go to Ottawa; let's blame Ottawa." Speaker after speaker gets up and says because of national economy, blame the whole thing on Ottawa, but when we had a slight increase of any kind, Ottawa was never given any thanks, the national economy never contributed, it was all a question of what the socialists did in Saskatchewan until we run into a hitch, and then we go back to Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, that doesn't seem quite fair to me, or logical.

I'm not saying that unemployment is a problem that one province can handle by itself, of course not. Let us recognize through that the number of people employed in Saskatchewan did not rise in the same way that it did in other provinces, but year after year the increase in our employed people was less than it was in other provinces. Therefore, it is in no sense amazing that the number of unemployed in Saskatchewan is less than it is in other provinces. How are we handling this situation? Other Government members have said that some word will be given during the course of the Session. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm very anxious to hear what word will be given, what reply this Government is going to give to the demands of the unemployed, and certainly they have a right to make demands. I heard no reply from the people who spoke today, I don't know, it seems to me that if I were hungry, and I think that maybe it would be a good thing if all the Members of this House went on a voluntary fast for a couple of days to see what it's like to be hungry, (we are pretty well fed here), if we just saw what it's like to be unemployed and not know where your next meal is coming from, maybe we could sit down and consider the problem of unemployment a little more realistically and in a less partisan manner. Are you going to call 5:30? I'm running out. I can go on.

Government Member: — Silence is a wonderful way to get applause.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, I admire tremendously the people who appeared before us today, I am sure that the Members on your right did too. The people who realize that they are seeking not only for themselves individually, but who came here on behalf of the unemployed of this province to seek some help. I think this in a sad way is progress, because at least these people realize that they have a common problem. I think we could follow their example, and realize that this is a common problem for us. We have heard a lot about how no one can be happy unless everyone is happy, and no one can be prosperous unless all segments of our society are prosperous. This is true. I think that the saddest

February 28, 1961

segment of society is that which wants to work, which want to contribute to the common good, but is denied that opportunity. It's a fine thing to boast about cutting down the budget, about cutting down unnecessary building, but when this cutting down takes away employment from people who want it, when this cutting down takes groceries out of the homes of families who need them, it's not such a fine thing. These people today, —

Government Member: — You'd better get your stories straight.

Mrs. Batten: — . . . came and they asked us for a few things, such as the assurance by this Government that this Government would be prepared to look after their hospitalization, so that they would be covered. Surely that wasn't asking very much, Mr. Speaker. But I have heard no word from any of the speakers on your right saying that they were going to be in favour of this, that they were going to urge the Government to do this.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! It now being 5:30 o'clock I will leave the Chair until 7:30 o'clock.

The Assembly met at 7:30 p.m.

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): — A friend of mine was here on day when my hon. friend, the Attorney-General was speaking and he was telling me afterwards that in primitive tribes they have a procedure whereby, if one of the people in council finds out that they have nothing much to say or are confused about the issue that is at stake, they then proceed to jump up and down very violently and that is called a harangue. He thought, that the hon. Attorney-General was doing that. This is not my opinion, it was his. But I fear that perhaps I indulged in the same kind of antic, and if I did anything that was against the dignity of this House, I certainly apologize. I have only one thing to say in justification, Mr. Speaker: everything that I said was true even if it was not charitable; I certainly did it in the heat of the moment, not after due and written preparations such as my friends across the way.

Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to listen to the solution to unemployment offered by the speakers opposite. It was interesting, because they made it sound so very simple and truly it takes simple minds to see a simple solution for as complex a problem as the economic well-being of an entire nation and the situation of unemployment in which Canada and Saskatchewan in particular finds itself today.

Their solution of course was, or the impression they left was that under capitalism or private enterprise or call it what you will, there is only one solution for unemployment and that is war. Of course this is now seconded by my friend from Kinistino who seems to feel that this is truly the only solution. I disagree of course very heartily with that. I think that that is simplifying something that sometimes happens historically. I think the reason, that we have employment during war is very complex. To try and simplify it to the people across the way so that they can understand it, I need only say that they should understand that during the war men are removed from the working force to go into the forces and people, feeling patriotic, feeling that their liberty is at stake, put their hands in their pockets and put out an all-out war effort. They contribute everything they have in the way of resources, materially and spiritually, and that is why there is little unemployment during periods of war, together with many other factors, but I think in a simple way that would explain it.

Mr. Speaker, this situation can of course take place in time of peace. The Liberal Government that was in power in Ottawa showed this. You will remember, and if the hon. Members across the way, would do their homework and read the gospel in which they believe of Messrs. Coldwell et al, they would know, that these people, the socialists in the House of Commons and elsewhere, prophesied in dire tones that immediately after the war there would be a terrible depression. There would be bread-lines forming, and people would only be able to eat if they went to a soup-kitchen, and their solution was that the Government should provide the soup-kitchens and the communal kitchens for everyone and live in a socialized economy and be happy ever after.

This of course, turned out to be untrue. There was a buoyant economy after the war. We reached a very high standard of life, a standard which, Mr. Speaker, incongruously enough, is deplored by my friends across the way. It is difficult to know what exactly they are complaining about. They are forced to buy T.V. sets, they are forced to buy new T.V. sets; you would think that they would be happy that they had the wherewithal to purchase these, buy no, they are decrying this. They are decrying these fins on cars. That seems to be such a popular point that Mr. Galbraith brought out. They are decrying all the luxury in advertisements that people have objected to. Maybe they don't believe that people have any willpower, that they have the power and the will to say I will buy or I will not buy and I will spend my money for this thing or I will spend my money for something else. Maybe they have come to believe to such an extent in their own propaganda that they believe that everybody else's propaganda is overpowering.

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to believe that. I think that the people of any nation are the masters of their own destiny. I think they can decide when they have had enough luxury, they can decide when they are going to drive the same car another year, or whether they are going to buy another one. I think they can decide, that too much advertising is obnoxious and in poor taste and that they won't put up with it. I think this is going to happen. It does not have to happen because of a depression or because of socialism. It can happen because the intelligent use of people's willpower can prevent this type of thing from going on.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there are several things that are needed in order to keep employment at a high level. The most important, I think, is optimism and buoyancy. It is a spiritual thing. This, Mr. Speaker, is something that is sadly lacking in Saskatchewan. There is money in Saskatchewan, obviously, or the hon. Provincial Treasurer would not be offering bonds for sale to the people of Saskatchewan. It is obvious that the people of Saskatchewan are not spending their money and I think one of the reasons they are not spending this money, is because they are afraid, because there is not a feeling of optimism, of buoyancy,

of economic expansion that should be present. Oh there is lot of expansion this way (sideways) in the Government side my hon. Provincial Treasurer, but a little more expansion this way (up) would be a very good thing.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that a Government has to have in order to assist us under the deplorable conditions that we are facing today, is first of all a conscience and second, intelligence. Let me speak for one moment about conscience. I spoke about this to the hon. Minister of Social Welfare the other day when he came over and asked me what I thought of the geriatric centre in Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, we could have employed a lot of people to build a new geriatric centre in Saskatoon. We could have helped a lot of families and what is more, we could have eased the troubled minds of a lot of relatives and the troubled backs of a lot of ill people, because surely those of you that have visited that centre cannot possibly think that this is a suitable place for people who need rehabilitation, who need care. I am not, Mr. Speaker, casting any aspersions whatsoever on the people who are working there. I think they are no doubt doing the best they can under the conditions that the Government has provided them with, this Government of humanity first. And certainly I would be very embarrassed to be a Member from Saskatoon and get up in this House and give speeches about humanity and loving our neighbours and not say one word about the need of a new building for those patients, in that geriatric centre, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I would ask the hon. Member from Humboldt if there is some relation between this and unemployment?

Mrs. Batten: — Yes.

Mr. Speaker: — Then if you will bring it out, I have suffered a lot this afternoon in regard to this matter.

Mrs. Batten: — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it clear, that this is one building that was vitally necessary

and should have been built. This building has been in use for a long number of years and although it is probably in worse condition now than it was a few years ago . . .

Government Member: — . . . Liberals were there.

Mrs. Batten: — Well, I don't know, if we had been elected we would have come around to it this year and I don't think you can beat that, you certainly have not started doing anything.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mrs. Batten: — Now, Mr. Speaker, no one wants to play politics with the lives of people, and particularly people who are sick, and these people have been spoken for by very numerous groups, by very vocal groups without any result whatsoever, and this time or any other time, because if this Government had seen fit to use its huge resources at the time when it had those resources, this would not have been necessary.

I want to introduce at this time an amendment, Mr. Speaker, to this motion, I suppose I should read the motion to amend first. I move, seconded by Mr. Gardiner, an amendment to this motion,

“That the word Government in the third line be deleted and the words ‘and Provincial Government’ be substituted, and that the words ‘and municipalities’ be inserted after the word ‘provinces’ in part (b) of the resolution.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, it might surprise our learned friends across the way, that we are quite willing to go along with subsection 3, which says “undertake long-range economic planning to guarantee the maintenance of full employment in Canada”, because as socialists they seem to take these words “planned economy” or “planning” as to be something exclusively socialistic. Of course this is a fallacy, not only in speech but also, Mr. Speaker, in thinking. There is no human being who can live without planning. The

place where the Liberals differ with the socialists, of course, is that we think there are proper spheres for Government planning, and proper spheres for individual planning, and we think that these are separate and apart, and the Government does not fulfil its function properly by interfering in the lives and destinies of individuals in fields where they can best control their own lives, but does fulfil its proper sphere when it plans for the good of the entire nation, or the entire society as the case may be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Government I submit, failed very miserably in living up to its own boast of being the Government of a planned economy, when they failed to plan and to be now prepared to meet this contingency of great unemployment. Where is their planning? They tried to plan for the rural municipalities and set up many commissions. They tried to plan for prepaid medicine. They tried to plan for liquor consumption. They planned for egg sales. They planned for almost everything but the thing that should concern them, the ability, the atmosphere, the right of every man and woman who is willing to work, to find employment. I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that any Government should provide every person in its society with employment, but certainly they should provide an atmosphere in which corporations, firms, and individuals will build and expand and provide employment where people can set up their own business, expand their own activities, make their own living. Where there is buoyancy, you don't have to be afraid of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, excessive taxation is no way to help unemployment. This puts money in the pockets of the Government, and as everyone knows that's quite a sieve, very little trickles through, as my hon. friend from Saskatoon was saying today, and I think that he was talking about a Government sieve when he was talking about that little trickle, because the hon. Provincial Treasurer can stop that trickle at any time, and anything that has trickled from the taxpayers' pocket to those who need help in this province, the sick, the poor, the widows, the old age people, has been a mighty thin trickle.

February 28, 1961

There has been more wasted in administration than there has been heaped upon those who need it.

Mr. Speaker, if money had not been wasted on administration, if money had gone directly to those consumers, they would have put that money into motion, and they would have helped ease this unemployment situation. Let me just give you a very small example. There are now being held all over this province gigantic conferences about the problems of the aged, and I have no doubt that before long there will be a committee sent to Australia, New Zealand or to Switzerland or someplace, to see how they treat their aged. All our aged need is sufficient money to live in dignity, and a conscience in the people in their society that would give them the respect and gratitude that is theirs of right.

Take our medical care. I live in a municipality that has long written lengthy letters to the hon. Minister of Health, asking for a little assistance in a program of medical care that I think is the best that there is in Canada, and I say this sincerely, but the hon. Minister isn't interested. The hon. Minister won't help us because we won't adhere strictly to what he thinks, and the regulations and methods of doing this. Even though the Order in Council says that he may use his discretion and give grants in other cases, and certainly if there was another case worthy of grants, ours is that case. If this money that is spent on a lot of these travelling commissions had been put into proper use, had gone to people who needed it and would spend it, we wouldn't have this case today. We would have more money to assist those who are unemployed today, if we weren't wasting money by stupid, and I use this word advisedly, regulations.

The hon. Attorney-General has no reason to be proud of the situation, because I think that instead of putting a few more people out of work by closing court houses and land titles offices, he paid a little attention to what is happening in this province, he could give assistance to a great many people. I don't think that there is one community in this province where wives and children are not being

supported by the taxpayers, where there is a perfectly able husband to support them, and they are receiving social aid, because in spite of the pleas of various organizations and private individuals, the Attorney-General has not seen fit to set up an agency that would act on behalf of the deserted wives and mothers, to reclaim and to enforce regulations and laws compelling the husband who has deserted them to pay for and look after them. After all those children and that wife are his responsibility, the husband's responsibility, not the taxpayers' responsibility. Because the mother hasn't got the financial wherewithal, these people become dependent, or tax money has to be spent on them, and of right, and therefore we do not have money when it comes to put in a program such as we have suggested here for the building of necessary buildings, for the providing of necessary employment.

This amendment takes in the Provincial Government, because surely after seeing the faces of the unemployed today, after being confronted by them, this Government is not going to shirk and shrug off its responsibility, and say this is up to the Federal Government.

All these things that are asked for, in this resolution, apply to the Provincial Government as well, and the Provincial Government is in a position to do something about providing employment, since they did not provide it by providing the type of atmosphere in which private enterprise would have looked after the unemployment situation in which wages could have been adequate and our people well fed. Our people would not have had to come and ask for charity, but they would have had wages which are theirs by right.

Mrs. Cooper: — Mr. Speaker —

Mr. Speaker: — Did you want to ask some questions?

Mrs. Cooper: — No, I was going to continue the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — Do you mind if I propose the

February 28, 1961

amendment first? Looking at this amendment, I am concerned with various aspects of the admissibility of amendments such as its relevancy, the fact that it cannot be a direct negative, and that it must not give rise to discussion on anything that is standing on the Order Paper, or yet refer to anything that we have already discussed in any previous debate. I am thinking of three of the main things which we have to consider in regard to amendments.

My reaction is that this amendment is in order; if we have any comments contrary, I will be very glad to hear it. If not, I am quite prepared to declare the amendment in order.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, as to the amendment being in order, it seems to me that there are one or two things that need to be considered. This motion as amended would urge the Federal and the Provincial Governments to provide contributions in these regards. It seems to me, obviously, that the policies of the Provincial Government to provide these cannot be discussed at this time without in fact, entering into the budget debate and I am just wondering if, because of this fact, the amendment is in order. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is an amendment that would ask the Provincial Government to do certain things, and these things to some extent are announced in the budget, which is now being debated in the House. I just wonder if there is not some contradiction.

Secondly, in terms of the wording of the amendment, it would urge the Federal and the Provincial Governments to provide credit at low interest rates to the Provinces. In other words, we are asking the Provincial Government to provide money at low interest rates to the Provincial Government. Somehow that does not seem quite correct.

Mrs. Batten: — That has to be “municipalities.”

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Yes, I know.

Mr. Speaker: — The amendment must be coherent; (it cannot) it poses rather a problem in this regard. I think that some of the points

the hon. Treasurer has brought up, are relevant.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the addition of the Provincial Governments to the Federal Government is not a substantial change. It has merely added one more party to the same thing. The contents are not changed by that. Therefore it is proper for an amendment. I think if it is read that way,

“urges the Provincial and the Federal Governments to provide credit to the provinces and municipalities”

it is quite clear what it means. There is no difficulty in getting the meaning of it that way, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Urging the province to provide credit to the province strikes me as rather ambiguous.

An Hon. Member: — That has to be “municipalities”.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I think the Hon. Provincial Treasurer has a point. All of these things in this resolution are certainly matters for the budget and if we are going to debate it fully in this and then fully in that budget debate, that is quite contrary to procedures; we would be duplicating things.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Snedker: — As for the budget, the hon. Member across the way never should have brought it in, in the first place.

Mr. Speaker: — Pardon me, I think that the reference in the first place, with regard to the federal matter, if we introduce a provincial question in regard to this thing, that changes it slightly, I would think.

Mr. A.C. Cameron: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the budget, there is no relationship to this motion. The motion was introduced some time ago. So far as this

February 28, 1961

debate is concerned we are not conscious of the budget having been brought in, and I presume that you could use the same argument with regard to the Federal Government. Before we ask for these things, let us see what the budget is. I cannot agree that there is any relationship to the budget, because the budget does not enter into this discussion or this motion. At least it should not do. It was introduced long before the budget was brought down. Therefore to say it should be tied in with the budget debate, there is no relationship to this.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, there is another point of order, in relation to the amendment that I would like to raise at this time. In this Legislature resolutions have been accepted for debate, and I believe without exception, resolutions from Private Members, (and I introduced a good many of them), when they had to do with money or the spending of money, or projects that take money, were always worded “urges the Provincial Government to give consideration to . . . ” and this one does not do that. This is the direct way and a direct way has always been considered to be out of order in this Legislature, because they are money questions. I would suggest that the amendment is out of order on that support.

Mrs. Batten: — The last point, Mr. Speaker, I was suggesting, with all respect, that if it is out of order on the amendment, it certainly was out of order in the first place, because what right have we to tell the Federal Government what to do and we simply have to urge this Government to give consideration to something. If one is out of order, then the other is too!

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. Members allow me a short conference with my Clerk?

Members: — Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: — These matters of controversy are always so hard to settle, but it does appear to me

that the inclusion of the words “Provincial Government” does put the thing into the category of requiring a direct expenditure of money. By making such an expenditure mandatory rather than recommending it to the consideration of the Provincial Government, the amendment is out of order. I believe that it is quite emphatic in our rules that such can only be done by the Government itself and I am afraid on that basis, I shall have to rule that the amendment is not in order.

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this debate, but I have decided to do so. First of all, I would like to congratulate the Member from Humboldt for slipping into the breach at a difficult time. I think that she deserves congratulations for that, although I am not going to agree with what she said. She slipped in at a time when the Member for Gravelbourg was not closed off, but decided that he wasn't prepared to continue his speech. Now, the reason for the reaction on this side of the House, I think, Mr. Speaker, was the despicable and disgusting McCarthyism, displayed by the Member from Gravelbourg, in his remarks about the Member from Moose Jaw. It takes only a small mind, not a lot more preparation, to make remarks of that kind, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — I have not had the opportunity to express myself all day in this debate. I have had no opportunity to defend myself in this debate in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Speaker: — Are you raising a point of order Sir?

Mr. Coderre: — Yes it is a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Please state the point of order.

Mr. Coderre: — The accusations that are being made against me.

I was quoting a statement that the Member from Moose Jaw had made. That is all that I have said . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I don't think that the Member for Regina has made any scurrilous remarks in regard to yourself. I didn't catch any. I don't think . . .

Mrs. Cooper: — Yes and the kind of McCarthyism he used in talking about the Member from Moose Jaw suggesting his remarks were such as might have come from behind iron curtains. Now, we have had too much McCarthyism in this House, from the Members of the Opposition suggesting a subversive motive, suggesting that there are Communists on this side of the House, seeking out civil servants and making snide remarks that they can't prove. I'm tired of McCarthyism in this House from the other side. It's cheap, and it's disgusting and it's unworthy of a Member of this Legislature, or of any decent citizen of Canada. The people on this side of the House are just as democratic, and just as patriotic as the people on the other side of the House, and it is just about time that this sort of nonsense stopped, and it was this reaction that made us feel as we did about the speech from the member from Gravelbourg.

Coming to the speech of the Member from Humboldt: She called us to task because it was stated on this side of the House, that war created employment. Now she has modified this a bit, but of course, it's ridiculous to say that war didn't create employment. I remember well when unemployment was at its greatest in the thirties before the war; I remember the march of the people from Vancouver towards Ottawa to bring their plight to the Federal Government. We had a Liberal Government here; we had a Conservative Government in Ottawa; they stopped the march here; and they talk about us being dictators. That was their solution, a riot in Regina, and that was their solution to unemployment in those days.

Certainly it's true that it was the war that created the employment, and that line of men that wanted to march to Ottawa, marched very shortly afterwards in khaki overseas. Factories sprang up

immediately, almost over-night, and employment was created, and that was the time when the people left this province. The farmers left this province by the hundreds. The people left this province because there weren't any industries then in Saskatchewan, and we had a Liberal Government here: We need industries in the west; they would have served us well today, but did we get and in Saskatchewan? No, we did not. Even from the viewpoint of defence we should have had full employment was during war, or immediately after war when we were trying to make good what had become scarce during the war.

Now this, was greatly misinterpreted, this statement of ours. We were not making an argument for war as Members on the opposite side know very well, but we were saying that if we had the same kind of good, socialist, economic planning that we had in war time, we wouldn't be having so many people walking the streets idle today.

Now, the Member from Humboldt said that she wasn't interested in statistics on unemployment, but in the suffering of unemployed families. So am I, and so are all of us, but, Mr. Speaker, when it was suggested in the Speech from the Throne, that Saskatchewan Power Corporation was going to build a building that would employ a great many people, the Leader of the Opposition, and his followers, one after another got up and opposed it. This was wasteful! This was extravagant! We didn't need it! But it will employ a lot of people.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, are we not referring to the Throne Speech Debate, is that permissible?

Mrs. Cooper: — Well, Mr. Speaker, when there was a slight raise in taxes so that we could have money to carry out some of these things, the Leader of the Opposition said no.

I'm on the motion on unemployment. I am answering the Speaker, and I have a perfect right to

February 28, 1961

answer the lady from Humboldt.

Now then, we have a huge power program, (and this creates a great deal of employment) continually being sniped at by the Opposition.

We have Crown Corporations in this province, employing 5,800 people. What do the Members of the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition say about our Crown Corporations? They would like to get rid of them. Today in this House we had a resolution asking to cut out the tax on purple gas for farm trucks. The result of such a policy would be a reduction of our highway program; we would have to reduce our highway program and have more unemployed. We have our people saying over and over again too many civil servants; they would rather see them unemployed.

Now, I would like, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Government because, in spite of reduced revenues, greatly reduced revenues, they have planned quite a vigorous program with an eye to employment, and I want to say another thing about the South Saskatchewan Dam, and this has something to do with employment.

Mr. Speaker: — I must beg the speakers who do take part in this debate, to endeavour to keep this debate to the motion in question in spite of what has gone before.

Mrs. Cooper: — Can I not answer the statements made in the process? I am coming to the South Saskatchewan River Dam, and that has something to do with employment, Mr. Speaker.

One of the reasons that we do not suffer more unemployment in Saskatchewan today is because of the big South Saskatchewan River Dam, and that was no thanks to the Liberals.

Mrs. Batten: — It's no thanks to the C.C.F.

Mrs. Cooper: — Now then, I think that you will agree that our Saskatchewan Government is not

responsible for interest rates. The high interest rates are crippling building, crippling housing, and other building programs, and these are the things that are making it difficult for the province to borrow, and for the municipalities to borrow so that we could carry out even more vigorous programs.

Now, I would like to look at the resolution here, and I'm coming to the resolution itself. It starts out, "That this Assembly regrets unemployment in Canada has reached the highest level since the 1930's." Who was the Government in 1930, in Ottawa and here?

Mr. McFarlane: — Brock was a Tory.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I must say that I never was.

Mrs. Cooper: — Who was the Government then, and did they look at that time to Ottawa for help, or did they consider that they could do it all themselves? You know very well they didn't consider, nor could they do it all themselves, nor did they do it all themselves, nor did they do it at all.

There are one or two other things that I think were pretty objectionable – to suggest that spiritual things are lacking in this province. I don't understand a statement like that. I think that that was a pretty unfair thing to say that spiritual things are lacking in this province, that we needed a conscience. I think that we have a conscience, and I think that there is a good deal of intelligence on this side of the House, even if you don't think so.

Now, in looking at this resolution itself, what are we really asking? We are asking the Federal Government to help us carry out a program. We are not asking them to do it all, you notice that, but we are asking them to provide substantial contributions, we are asking them to help us to carry out more vigorous programs, to provide substantial contributions to assist in the construction of highways, schools, power plants and power lines, telephone facilities and similar

development projects. We are asking them to help out with a few of them. Do you object to that? We are asking them to provide credit at low interest rates, for they can borrow much more cheaply than we can, to provinces undertaking such projects as housing and hospital construction. Certainly this Government has been urging the municipalities to go ahead with the tri-partite housing, and we are willing to assist them there. We are making very much larger grants to municipalities for hospital construction. These are some of the things we are doing, and now we are asking for a little additional help to do it. Is there anything wrong with that? We are asking them to undertake long-range economic planning to guarantee and maintain full employment in Canada.

I think that the Member from Humboldt said, that during the war we did all pull together, during the war we did have economic planning, with which she agreed. All we are saying is that during peace we ought to be able to do the same kind of a job, and that when we have half a million unemployed it is time to start. She said something about us decrying luxuries. We are not decrying luxuries because they are luxuries. What we are saying is that until the basic needs of our people are met, we should not be putting so much money into luxuries, but channelling it into the basic needs. That is what we mean by economic planning.

She says that all we need is optimism. That is what they said during the thirties. We need not only optimism, but we need action at all levels. This Government is asking to be able to take action, and we are asking for additional help so that we can take even more vigorous action than we are taking today.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this resolution should have the full support of the House.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have risen in the House, other than on a point of order or a point of privilege, and I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you

on the elevation to your position. I know that you are attempting, with a great deal of success, to set a standard of decorum that this House hasn't reached for some time.

I didn't intend to get into the debate this evening, because I figured I wasn't prepared to do so. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the delegation of unemployed who met with the Government this morning, and with the Opposition this afternoon. I didn't even have an opportunity to glance at the brief that they left on our desk in order to get my thinking clear in view of the presentation they made to us as to what contribution we in the provincial sphere may be able to make to meet this desperate situation.

Mr. Speaker, I was most amazed, and I was horrified to think after the discussion and the plight of the unemployed in this province, and after having presentations made to the Government and to the Opposition, that we should come into the House and on a motion dealing with unemployment, when the member from Gravelbourg rose to his feet and asked to adjourn the debate in order that he could give more thoughtful consideration to this serious matter, he was refused that privilege. As the lady Member from Regina said, it was only the goodness of the Lady Member from Humboldt who jumped into the breach in order to save our right to take part in this discussion here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, that was the answer to the unemployed delegation that arrived here this morning. It is all right for the Government to put up speaker after speaker with well prepared addresses, and present their point of view and then say to the Opposition, "Carry on, rise now or forfeit your right to speak." That is the attitude of this Government. Well, I have a few thoughts on unemployment, and probably a few things that I may be able to contribute in a small way, in looking at the problem of unemployment and what we may be able to do in its regard. I was amazed too, that this Government used this resolution as the C.C.F. charter for their remedy for unemployment in Canada and in Saskatchewan.

February 28, 1961

All that they could do to meet this crisis was to come forward with a resolution, asking the Federal Government to do these things on their behalf. What are they asking the Federal Government to do? To provide substantial contributions to assist in the construction of highways, schools, power plants, power lines, and telephone facilities; to provide credit at low rates of interest and to undertake long-range economic plans. That is their solution to the unemployment situation in Canada. That is their charter by which they would solve the unemployment problem. To provide substantial grants or contributions to construction of schools, yes, to power lines, yes, and to telephone facilities, but, Mr. Speaker, last year in this Legislature we had a Bill brought in authorizing the telephone company to make loans and grants available to the rural telephone companies of Saskatchewan to assist them in their heavy burdens of construction and maintenance of rural telephone lines. That was to be the great charter of assistance to local government in the form of assistance in telephone maintenance and construction.

One year has gone by, we asked these questions in the Legislature: “How many rural telephone companies have been approved for receipt of maintenance grants?” – The answer: ten. “What was the total amount paid to date?” – The answer: nil.

Of four hundred rural telephone companies in this province they approved applications from the, and they haven't spent a nickel to assist them and help them in their problems. It would have helped to bring employment opportunity to these people in the rural areas, and now they ask the Federal Government to bring grants to assist in telephone facilities.

I listened with interest to the Minister of Agriculture when he was speaking on time, and if I took it down correctly, and I'm sure I did, he said “I know of no other way to overcome unemployment other than to supply jobs.”

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That was a matter in referring to a previous debate.

Mr. Speaker: — Was this quotation taken from a previous debate?

Mr. Cameron: — I have read it in the paper and I have heard it on the radio on numerous occasions, so to refresh the hon. Minister I want to read it again. He said I know of no other way to overcome unemployment, other than to supply jobs. That's his solution for unemployment. That's as far as his planning has gone.

I noticed that the Premier was talking about the loss of population in the rural areas, and these people trekking into the larger centres and cities. Speaking to the industrial development conference in 1956, he said we are producing more food stuffs on the farm today, then ever before, with less people. He then said this is not a thing to be decried, and to be deplored, the more that leave the farms the more there are to go to jobs elsewhere. That was his solution to the crowding of the rural people into the city centres in seeking employment. It's not to be deplored. Rather than come forward with some policy to assist rural boys and girls to find employment in their own locality, and if at all possible on their own farms his answer was let's not cry about going backward.

We hear a lot about re-imposition of price controls, massive public works. Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion this is not the answer to unemployment. Re-imposition of price controls is not the answer. Massive public works will ease the problem perhaps for the time being, but certainly that is not the answer to the unemployment problem. Assistance in the construction of power plants and hospitals and so forth, food as it is, its purpose is other than supplying jobs to people, and that is not the answer to unemployment.

I thought that this debate would have developed into something which would cause each and

February 28, 1961

every Member in the Legislature to do a little inner searching of his own, and to see what he could contribute in the whole total effort to find a solution to the unemployment problem. I think that there are many things, other than those mentioned in this resolution that we must turn our attention to if we are to attempt to find any permanent solution to this unemployment situation. I think that we must look at some of the basic facts that contribute to unemployment. We have so many unemployed who are unable to get work. I think that one of the basic things, or the first essential steps that we should do is to see why there are so many unemployed in the different categories. During the supper recess, I thought ill prepared as I am, I may be able to make some contribution. I put a few thoughts together, I went back to some of the notes that I had on unemployment statistics in 1955, that show that two out of three of every one of the unemployed people, had Grade VIII or less, and in 1951, the census of the working force, of the total working force at that, 50.4% had less than Grade VIII, and of the persons seeking work, 63.5% of those job seekers were people with less than Grade VIII education. People entering the labour force, with Grade VIII, in most instances can get only unskilled labour. I think there is a very strong relationship between education and unemployment. The unemployment rates for those who did not complete Grade VIII is more than twice the rate of those completing Grade VIII. The unemployment rates for those with Grade VIII is six times the rate for those who had gone forward and completed high school.

Today, while we have massive unemployment, we likewise have highly skilled jobs going begging because we haven't the trained and technical staff to fill those positions. I think that it's time that we began to look at some of the basic reasons. In the age in which we live with all the technical advances, and all the scientific methods that are being used today, we can no longer afford to turn out into the labour force our young people, so ill-equipped to find a position in life as these statistics point out.

I think that we should turn our attention

to this fact, that fewer than 1% of our youth today get to university, that 50% of the best brains of our children, leave school before they have graduated, seeking jobs where there are no jobs to be had for unskilled labour. Today we find ourselves in the position where we must provide university education for at least 25% of our generation, if we are to put them in the skilled category to compete for jobs in this highly complex society in which we live. There are many spheres that will require long planned efforts, planning for the future. I was amazed that with your economic planning board, with the number of advisers that you have on the staff here, that not once have I heard anyone on the Government side take into consideration the need of training our boys and girls to meet the challenge of this complex society. I think we must look at a better qualification for our youths. Is it any wonder that so many youths of the province point their fingers at us, accusing fingers, with a feeling that we have betrayed and failed them. If you look deep down into your own conscience you must admit that there is a great element of truth to that accusation. That is one of the basic reasons why we have unemployment, and it must receive attention. We must direct more energy, and a far greater sum of money into providing scholarships, into assisting these boys and girls to go on through university, into equipping them to take their place in the labour force and make their contribution to society.

In that regard my convictions are, and they are strong, that we must look to our whole educational system to the province, and assess what we are attempting to do and where we intend to go with it. The present philosophy that has been guiding our educational institutions, established by Dewey, is to give the youngsters a smattering of everything, and not raining in any particular thing. The lady Member from Regina took the lady Member from Humboldt to task, and she said it was a terrible thing that she should say that spiritual things are lacking in Saskatchewan, and yet anyone with half an eye to see will notice that one of the weaknesses of our present society is materialism. It is that same materialism that has been instilled from the parents

February 28, 1961

down into the youngsters, rather than the deeper conviction of making the contribution and leaving your place in life. All of this goes with good mental training, and with good spiritual convictions, thus I whole-heartedly agree with the lady Member from Humboldt. Materialism is rampant in our society to the detriment of the spiritual and the moral things of life. There are many other fields of activity that I think must be studied. For instance, the possibility of small factories in the remoter areas.

We heard the unemployed today talk about the inability of the cities to provide jobs for them – the need, perhaps, for a water development program. Yes, there are areas in the rural parts of the province that have huge reserves of water that would be suitable for small plants, and we perhaps should give attention to spreading out some of our smaller factories into the smaller areas rather than concentrating our full labour force into these larger centres.

The labour people today talked about the lack of low rental housing, and the agreement between the municipalities in the province and the Federal Government, where the Federal Government contributes 75% and the province 20%, and the municipalities 5%. This is not being done, and I don't know if it's the fault of the Provincial Government, or the fault of the municipalities, or the fault of the Federal Government, but surely the Government should take some responsibility to see where the fault lies, and take measures to correct it. I do this to show that in my humble way, I have some thoughts too, on unemployment and a contribution to make. I am greatly indebted to the lady Member from Humboldt that she preserved my right to speak.

Hon. W.G. Davies (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, in beginning tonight, I'd like to say, that I also was unprepared to take part in this debate, and therefore, I have no particular advantage

over the previous speaker. I thought that the mover and the seconder of the resolution had done an excellent job of making their presentation, and I was content to leave it at that. But, the subsequent debate, induced me to enter the discussion. Before doing so, Mr. Speaker, since this is the first occasion that I've risen in this House during this Session, may I also express my congratulations to you over your accession to the presiding and significant office of this House. I know that the duties that you will perform in the capacity of Speaker, will be done with sincerity, impartiality and with a desire to see the best traditions of this House upheld.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, in agreement with the hon. Member from Maple Creek, that I too believe that much more needs to be done, here and everywhere else, in Canada, with respect to educational opportunities for working people to improve their capacities for jobs. I want to point out that this particular problem is not one that is confined to the province, but it certainly is one that is known all over the Dominion of Canada. As a matter of fact, I believe that the figures that the hon. Member from Maple Creek was mentioning, were figures that were in the first instance garnered in the Province of Ontario. I do think though, that more can be done on these lines. But having said that, I must point out, that even if all of the persons who are now unemployed, had a Grade XII education, there would not be sufficient jobs for them. Of course, all you have to do to get the truth of that statement, is simply to examine the Department of Labour records for Saskatchewan to see how many jobs are available and how many unemployed there are. The latter outnumber the former considerably.

I've said I agree that much more needs to be done in the way of giving a better educational opportunity to unemployed people. I'd like however, to differ from the hon. Member from Maple Creek, in his intimation that the Government answer to the unemployed delegation that met the Government today is the resolution that we have before us this evening. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this is not the case. The resolution has been on the Order Paper for some time. The delegation that met the Government only left this

February 28, 1961

Chamber shortly after the hour of 1:00 o'clock this afternoon, and of course, the Government has had absolutely no opportunity whatsoever to consider the many proposals that were made by that large delegation.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think that delegation was an excellent one. During the two-hour hearing in which everyone who wanted had a full opportunity of expressing himself or herself, there were many suggestions made, not only for the alleviation of unemployment in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, but for federal action as well. I want to compliment those who were part of the delegation for the style and content of their submission, and the tone of their representation. I believe, speaking personally, not having had the opportunity of conferring with my colleagues, that there were many of the recommendations that were advanced, that could be implemented or at least given very serious consideration. I feel too, sincerely, that every one of the recommendations will be given the utmost of careful study.

I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to say a word of congratulations to the unemployed in this city, and the province, for having taken the trouble to form an organization. I think everybody in the House will agree that the unemployed people need an effectual body to concretely and carefully put their proposals before the governing bodies in this province, not only the Provincial Government but the municipalities. I am glad too, that they have joined with the organized labour movement of Saskatchewan, because I think that this will not simply strengthen the hand of the unemployed, but will weld a very effective bond of friendship between the unemployed and the employed members of the labour force. I point out, that this was not the case, during the years of the thirties, when the union movement was fragmented and did not join with unemployed people as has been done today.

I want to point out too, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition Members, in my view, can take little comfort from the submission that was made to the Government today in terms of its contents, because members of the delegation declared very forthrightly

against the failure of free enterprise in this country, and their satellite parties.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I think that it is the duty, and I'm speaking frankly, of this province to do everything that it can to alleviate unemployment, and I want to point out that it has already done considerable in this respect, with the investment and the expenditures that will be made by the Government. The Premier said to the delegation today that this should reach the figure of \$78 million spent on various types of projects. I feel that with additional study of the proposals that have been made today it should be possible to implement some of the many sound recommendations that were advanced.

Now, having said that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out that regardless of what we say, or what the province can do, unemployment remains basically a federal problem. I want to say too, that the provinces in Canada today, under the Social Credit, under the Liberal, and under the Conservative administrations, have certainly failed to do what the hon. Members opposite have urged us to do in terms of alleviating unemployment in their respective jurisdictions.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Davies: — As of January, 1961, Mr. Speaker, in the Liberal Province of Newfoundland there were 32,500 unplaced applicants for jobs, and this is 26% of the Newfoundland labour force.

Mr. Klein: — How much is it in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — In answer to the hon. Member, less than 10%. I say that with a figure like that it ill-behooves representatives of the same party as the administration of that province, to talk in terms of what little has been done in Saskatchewan. In the Province of Quebec, now under a Liberal administration, 80,000 people unemployed — 14.3% of the labour force. In Manitoba,

February 28, 1961

35,000 unemployed people, and 51,374 people unemployed in the Province of Alberta. If we want to talk, Mr. Speaker, in "non-partisan" terms, about unemployment, and I think that it would be a good thing if we could do so, then let's look the facts in the face as they pertain to the more sensitive areas politically.

I know that from time to time some of the Members of the Opposition have spoken about the lack of purchasing power in this province as evidenced by the minimum wage of \$32.00 a week. I want to point out again as I think was pointed out in part by my fellow M.L.A. from Moose Jaw this afternoon, that Newfoundland offered in 1960 the meagre wage of \$15 to \$22 a week on the basis of a 44 hour week. I would suggest that there is somewhat less purchasing power in that Liberal province. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan minimum wage is at its zenith. In my opinion, the minimum wage might possibly be higher, but it is positively munificent alongside Liberal Newfoundland. So, if we're talking about buying power, charity begins at home, in terms of the Liberal province that is represented by the party of the Members opposite me here this evening.

When you want to go back a few years, and I know that this again, Mr. Speaker, may be a rather sensitive point to some of the Members opposite, when the Liberal Party left power in the province in 1944, there were minimum wages as low as \$6.00 a week. At this time, dishwashers and restaurant workers, and chambermaids, had to work six months before they got the so-called "top" of the minimum wage at that time. I don't know whether this is humanitarianism or not; certainly it isn't the type of spiritual values, that were urged upon us by Liberals today in today's debate.

I believe it was the Member for Yorkton, Mr. Speaker, in his talk to us today who mentioned wage control. He derided the CCF position on wage control and he said, I notice, that this question is never raised in a populous centre like Windsor or Toronto (I'm not sure about the latter city, Windsor was one of them in any event). I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the case. Both labour congresses right from 1946 on constantly made representations to the Federal Government of this country, asking it not to lift wage

controls. They predicted the results that occurred afterwards. So it is not true, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that labour has supported the action that resulted in the lifting of price controls by the then Liberal Government of this country.

Now, it seemed to me that there was also some suggestion (I believe from the Member for Humboldt) that the reduction in the number of people in farms in Saskatchewan was rather unique in Canada. She charged the CCF and “socialism” for having brought this situation about. I point out, Mr. Speaker, that all reasonable people must understand that this is a trend everywhere in Canada. In 1939 there were 1,280,000 persons who were heads of families on farms. This figure has been reduced to 600,000 or very near that figure, as of this year.

This has been a trend everywhere in Canada, and certainly it has been so in the United States where, of course, for all of the years they have enjoyed the sometimes doubtful benefits of a free enterprise administration. Forty years ago in the United States there were 32 million people on the farms, out of a population of 105 million. Today this figure has been reduced to 20 million out of 180 million people. Surely, in reason, let us admit that this trend of population on the farms has been universal everywhere, particularly in Canada and the United States.

You know, Mr. Speaker, on this question of unemployment in Saskatchewan, to hear some of the hon. Members opposite me talk, one would think that the entire loss of population had occurred from this province. I say that from 1901 to 1958 there were almost 2 ½ million Canadians who immigrated to the United States alone, let alone to other countries. I don't suppose any Member opposite me this evening, would want to argue that all these people came from the Province of Saskatchewan.

One of the subjects that seems to be bound up in the discussion of unemployment, Mr. Speaker, is blame being cast on the labour force of Canada for “unemployment”, for “decline in productivity”, “decline of gross national product” and so on. I think we should be clear on one thing, that any decline in gross national product has taken place basically for one

February 28, 1961

reason, and one reason alone, — growing unemployment that has taken place over the last half dozen years. I would think, on a personal estimate, and I don't think that this can be successfully challenged, that we are losing in wages alone in unemployment in Canada each month something like \$100 million. I suggest also that there is a figure of roughly three times that being lost in the production that would have resulted if the workers were not unavoidably idle.

You know, too, almost continuously, you see this refrain in many of the daily newspapers, and some of the periodicals, that it is the workers' high wages, with the inference that is usually the organized workers' wages, that are "pricing Canada out of the market", making it impossible to deal with other countries and, therefore, bringing unemployment to the home front. Here is what was said in one of the United Nations' monthly bulletins of last year. I don't have the month before me, but this bulletin said that wages had risen in the United Kingdom, in West Germany, (and some other countries were mentioned as well) at a rate almost twice that of the Canadian rate. We find that from 1953 to 1959 wages rose in West Germany 48.4%, by 42% in the United Kingdom, and by 26.5% in Canada. Again, I say to any person that wants to follow the logical sequences of thought, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that rather than there being a worsened situation for Canadian industry, trade wise, the situation in relation to the countries that I have referred to, should be much better. We should be able to sell many more goods than we sold six years ago!

I want to suggest in terms of the society that we are living in, that one of the things that is hurting us a great deal, is the loss of quality of materials that are produced. This has nothing to do whatsoever, with poor workmanship in these articles. It is a deliberate policy of so-called planned obsolescence, that has been deliberately followed by many persons who lead industry today.

Well I want to give the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, a number of citations in a minute or two, that may erase the smile from his face. Speaking first of all about Canada, we find that one of

our own commissions, the Royal Commission on Price Spreads, reported that the advertising costs on products, from 1949 to 1957 had increased from \$21 million to \$106 million, — just for advertising costs! The packing cost of goods also was up by 64%. In the last figure, Mr. Speaker, may be found one of the reasons why the farmer receipts for the products he has produced have declined, while the retail price of the things that are bought by consumers in Canada has gone up. This has been at a time, Mr. Speaker, when the five big chain stores in Canada, according to the same commission, averaged a return over the eight year period of 17.1%.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is it relevant?

Mr. Speaker: — I think that the hon. Member is intending to tie this in with unemployment. He will be doing that, I anticipate.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — I reply to the point of order in this way, that what I am doing is citing these costs as the reason why products have become expensive, and that this in turn is a cause of unemployment. It has nothing to do with the working people themselves.

Automation has been one of the matters mentioned very often in the discussions that we have had today. It is because of these trends that we are basically having the jobless problem that we encounter in both Canada and the United States today.

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I don't have the Canadian figures, but I can assure you that they are very like the ones that are given for the United States. Looking in the library this evening, like my hon. friend from Maple Creek, I searched for information for this debate. I found the "United States News and World Report" for February 27th. It refers there to certain figures for employment in key U.S. industries. It pointed out that in the steel industry, 250,000 employees are doing in the United States, the same work performed only a few years ago by 500,000 workers; that in the auto industry of Detroit alone there are 160,000 workers who won't be returning to the plants, who

were there just five years ago.

One machine, cited as an example, is now doing 500 operations. In the coal industry in the States 200,000 miners are now mining coal where there used to be 400,000, the volume being not dissimilar. In the field of radio, two men are now able to assemble 1,000 radio sets per day, where it used to take 200 men to assemble the same number of sets. In the chemical manufacturing industry, production has increased by 80% in the last seven years, although employment in the same industry has dropped by 13,000.

My colleague, (my fellow Member from Moose Jaw) referred to the railroad industry. "United States News" points out in this article that in the last twenty years, there has been eliminated one million jobs on American railroads. There has been nonetheless, a fairly marked increase in business, although jobs are continually dropping. In fact, in the last few years they have decreased by 40,000. In the oil industry, where there are now 8.4 million barrels per day being produced, only a few short years ago, the daily figure was 5.3 million barrels. Jobs have dropped in the oil industry by something like 10,000, all in a very brief period of years.

Again on this question of wages . . .

Mrs. Batten: — Will the hon. Member permit a question? Is the hon. Member suggesting that this motion will cure the problem of automation or is this the answer to automation, is there anything the Federal Government can do in this motion that will look after it?

Hon. Mr. Davies: — I am attempting to answer some of the fallacies that in part the hon. Member who has just spoken has contributed to.

I think it is the hon. Member from Humboldt, Mr. Speaker, who when she was addressing the House, told us how we should have more strength of character, to resist advertising and similar pressures that beset us to buy. I wondered about this because I suppose there wouldn't be advertising if people were able to resist as well as she pictures they should.

I happened to be reading the other day, the book by Vance Packard called "The Wastemakers". He points out that the average American family is exposed to 1,518 selling messages in the course of an average day. This doesn't include the material stuffed into mailboxes, reaching a total of sixteen billion pieces a year. Now, it seems to me that in the midst of a situation of that kind, one can be forgiven for not being able to resist as well as they should, the blandishments of that free enterprise industry, the hon. Member who originally referred to this matter, supports.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that there may be others who wish to talk on this resolution. As I say, I rose mainly because I wanted to contradict what I thought were a number of misstatements and misrepresentations on the part of some of the members who are opposite me. I say again that I do not believe that this resolution purports to suggest anything that could be done provincially, but properly suggests that something can be done by the Federal Government to help us help ourselves in the confines of this province.

I do think, that this Government will do its utmost to get at solutions that were suggested by the unemployed delegation that came before the Government today. I feel sure that if the merits of our sincerity are contrasted to that of the party of the hon. Members who sit opposite, that the working people of this province will give their answer decisively for the Government.

Mr. Karl F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate thus far with a great deal of interest and I have been particularly interested in the way the Government has handled the problems of unemployment this afternoon. It is indeed a revelation. First of all, the Government saw to it that the Member whose Constituents, I imagine, are the people who are the most concerned, was on the air to discuss the problem. He had a well prepared address, I presume to satisfy his Constituents and to make sure that they will not hound him too much in the future.

There have been many reminiscences made about

February 28, 1961

what has gone on in the past and what the Government is doing and patting itself on the back for what they have done, but we have yet to hear something they are going to do to help alleviate the situation. We have heard that they are doing what they believe to be almost everything physically possible. In reminiscing I would like to recall what those people so cock-surely said prior to taking office: they castigated the Government at the time when we suffered a depression for ten years; they decided the fact and said it was a terrible crime that people had to go and draw relief cheques and could not find employment and that it hurt his dignity and everything else, in the thirties.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that there may have been a lot of room for some of their suggestions and criticism. However, if it was a crime during the depression years, when we were operating on a budget less than \$28 million, the crime is today six-fold, because our budget is six times greater than it was in the thirties.

There are several areas and several things that have been mentioned. One that was mentioned in this debate was that after the World War the green light was given to industries to expand their operations. That was true in all provinces, except Saskatchewan. Here we had the red light. If not the red, then at least the amber light, which said "caution, hands off", because in 1944 or rather during the post-war boom, we still had in the Manifesto that they were prepared to pounce on any industry that would dare locate here and they would expropriate, and they had horrible terms for what they would do to industries locating here. That is perhaps one of the reasons why we are suffering from unemployment today.

There are two topics, that I didn't think this Government would ever dare mention in relation to expenditures by private enterprise. One is advertising. If anybody should hang their heads in shame about advertising, it is the Government to your right, Mr. Speaker. In the return that was tabled for all the Departments of Government, telling what they have spent in advertising, when added up comes close to a million dollars spent in advertising by Government

Departments and Crown Corporations: That includes, radio and T.V., and what have you. The "Saskatchewan News", in paper alone, as far as I can recall in my memory, cost the people of this province \$27,000 a year to publish, and where does it wind up? What does it do to help alleviate the unemployment situation?

The other thing I didn't think they would bring up anymore is the idea that price controls should have never been taken off. In reviewing history since World War II, one of the nations that maintained price control was Great Britain, under a Labour Government. In speaking to British and reading articles on what happened to the economy in Great Britain, because those price controls were retained, we find that was the reason for the destruction of the Labour Party in England. I am amazed at the C.C.F., who advocate that that should have been done here in Canada. Now, an economist, who was writing on retention of price controls in England said that had they retained them for a few more years, England would have been so far behind all the other nations in the world they would never have caught up and would have never been able to compete in any way for the world market of today, and yet they sit here glibly saying that we should have had price control from the war on.

To look at some of the reasons which have already been outlined, why this unemployment is such a great factor in Saskatchewan today, I submit, Mr. Speaker, it's because of the niggardly treatment of some our municipalities by this Government. At the time when the revenues of the province were unbelievably high, they saw to it that every municipality was broke when this crisis came on. We hear about the great difficulties you have in your city centres, and we in the country are finding that perhaps we may be a little more generous, but every effort in both communities must be made to see that those people that have jobs – where people in that community co-operate to see that jobs are made available, and I can think of dozens of cases where there's people in our community, who have got together and in their discussion said, "Well let's see if we cannot find some means of employment for our citizens, who we feel a great deal of responsibility towards." I know of several cases where housewives

February 28, 1961

took their mending to certain widows and others who were unemployed. They took their mending to them, and got it done for a reasonable fee. In that way they were able to assist in the condition these people found themselves in. I believe that's the true spirit of charity. Charity is man's individual responsibility and Governments must not replace this. Even though municipalities are willing to do all they can they would do a lot more if they had received a little more generous treatment from the Government, during the periods of plenty. As I said, when the crashes came on, the municipalities had found themselves broke. They have no money to undertake any projects of any description, even though they would like to do so. The main reason for them being in that condition is, as I said, the niggardly treatment they have received from the Government in the last sixteen years.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. Member a question, please?

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. Member is prepared to accept it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — In view of your statement about the municipalities, I would just like you to comment on this new item in . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! What is the question?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The question is, what does he think of the statement made by the hon. Member for Cannington last year, when said, "as a matter of fact, the rural municipalities had an over-all surplus of one and one-third million dollars last year, which is a wonderful showing" Mr. McCarthy said?

Mr. Klein: — . . . Oh, did he also read about the arrears of taxes, the same day, the arrears of taxes cancel out pretty near everything that is surplus.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Klein: — Now then, this has already

been mentioned. Nothing has been done by this Government, or no planning is in evidence by this Government from the development that has taken place in this province since the war. The Government hasn't done anything to see that, for example, a pulp mill be established in Saskatchewan. In fact, the Timber Board monopoly prevented even private operators from employing a few people, to make themselves a living and provide employment for others. The community would like to undertake such projects as building commercial playgrounds, rinks, parks, golf courses, and public places for vacation spots. None of these have been developed, and when we consider that, and in view of the claims that the CCF Party made, prior to taking office, that once they took office this would be a Utopia to live in. They would undertake these projects that were so needed; they'd have public improvement programs; they'd have wonderful playgrounds; they'd have wonderful tourist resorts. They promised everything. They promised a Utopia right here in Saskatchewan. Unfortunately, that Utopia was not forthcoming. Because this Government, to my mind, has not done everything that a Provincial Government could do – they have not taken a realistic assessment of the situation, nor have they investigated the fields where they could do a lot of good – I believe that they should have been included in the amendment to this motion, and I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Bolt in amendment thereto:

“That the word “Government” in the third line be deleted and the words “and Provincial Governments to take under consideration action” be substituted therefore; and the word “provinces” be deleted in part (b), and the words “junior governments” be substituted therefore.”

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved by Mr. Klein, seconded by Mr. Bolt, that in amendment thereto:

“That the word “Government” in the third line be deleted and the words “and Provincial Governments to take under consideration action” be substituted therefore; and the word “provinces” be deleted in part (b), and the words “junior governments” be substituted therefore.”

I shall try to read this motion with the

February 28, 1961

amendment included.

“That this Assembly regrets unemployment in Canada has reached the highest level since the 1930’s, and urges the Federal and Provincial Governments to:

- (a) take under consideration action to provide substantial contributions to assist in the construction of highways, schools, power plants, and power lines, telephone facilities and similar development projects,
- (b) provide credit at low interest rates to the junior governments undertaking such projects as housing, and hospital construction,
- (c) undertake long-range economic planning to guarantee the maintenance of full employment in Canada.”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Opposition Members: — No.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Now, Mr. Speaker, we are presented with an amendment, but not even a copy supplied to this side.

Mr. Speaker: — This motion is not debatable. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Motion carried. The debate is adjourned.

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

The Assembly adjourned at 9:19 o’clock p.m.