

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session – Fourteenth Legislature**  
**16th Day**

**Thursday, March 2, 1961**

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

On the Orders of the Day:

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** – Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a fine group of students in the Speaker's Gallery, who are the Grade VII and VIII students of Milestone Public School, who are accompanied by their instructor Mr. Owerko. I am sure that the hon. Members will join with me in expressing the hope that this afternoon will be a pleasant and also a profitable one.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mrs. J.E. Cooper:** — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to draw the attention of the Members of the Assembly, to a group of students up in the Gallery over her. They are the students from Argyle School, Grade VII, with their teacher. We are delighted to have them here. We want to welcome them, and we hope that they will want to welcome them, and we hope that they will find it a very pleasant and educational opportunity.

**RE AMENDMENT**

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the hon. Members will excuse me, when this motion was last before us there was an amendment submitted by Mr. McDonald and Mr. Thatcher: that all the words after "that" be deleted, and the following substituted therefore:

Thursday, March 2, 1961

“this Assembly deplores the heavy and rapidly increasing public debt, the failure of the Government adequately to reduce excessive administration costs, and regrets the proposal to increase heavily taxes and exactions.”

I have been able to give this amendment a good deal of consideration, and I am prepared at this time to rule that it is in order. The amendment, being one in which all the words after “that” are deleted, and others substituted therefore, gives the House an alternative, and therefore both the motion and the amendment may be debated at this time.

### **BUDGET DEBATE**

The Assembly resumed from Wednesday, March 1st, 1961, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Lloyd:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (the House to go into Committee of Supply)

**Mrs. J.E. Cooper:** — Mr. Speaker, before I adjourned the debate yesterday, I had had the opportunity of congratulating you on your elevation to the high position of Speaker of the Assembly. I had congratulated the Provincial Treasurer on his budget and on the fine knowledge that he has shown on the financial affairs of this province, and of the Dominion.

This is my first opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to thank the citizens of Regina for returning me to the legislature for the third successive time with such a gratifying majority. I am very proud to be a representative of the City of Regina, the Queen City of the West. It’s a very rapidly expanding city: we are suffering from growing pains; we have outgrown our transportation system; we have found difficulties in finding enough water; we are having a hard time keeping up with building schools to house the growing school population, but I think that Regina is making a magnificent effort, a very creditable effort, and I am very proud to be one of its representatives.

Of course, in the City of Regina, we are very grateful for the assistance that we have had from this Provincial Government for the new Court House that is being completed, and the citizens of Regina are more

than pleased with the announcement of the power building. It will mean a very great deal in matters of employment, and not only for the people who are going to work on that power building, but also, it will stimulate many other industries in the city, and certainly it is very greatly welcomed by the people of Regina.

We do face, as I said, serious financial problems, but I think that the city is going ahead rapidly, and as soon as funds are available we shall look to the Provincial Government for further assistance in some fields.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I had congratulated the Provincial Treasurer on the budget which he has brought in and which is before us now, but today I would like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer not only on the job which he is doing as Provincial Treasurer, but on the magnificent job he did for sixteen years as Minister of Education in this province. I know there are thousands of people throughout this province who share my view. We have heard some very fine tributes, Mr. Speaker, from the former president of the University of Saskatchewan, Dr. W.P. Thompson, and from the present president of the University, Dr. Spinks. We have also heard some very fine tributes from the Trustees Association, but I think one of the finest tributes to the present Provincial Treasurer for his work as Minister of Education, comes from the Teachers Federation, and you will find that tribute in the 'Saskatchewan Teachers Federation Bulletin', of October 1960. For those of you who haven't had the opportunity of reading this article, I should like to read it this afternoon:

“Woodrow S. Lloyd has retired as Minister of Education after holding this office for sixteen years, longer than any other Minister of Education in any province of Canada. He has been moved, presumably upward, in government ranks, to become the Minister of Finance. It is with some regret that we congratulate him on his promotion, for we know we shall miss him.

As Minister of Education, Woodrow Lloyd has built an enviable reputation. Regardless of their personal political affiliation, teachers have never questioned his sincerity, teachers have never questioned his sincerity, earnestness, and ability. Nor are teachers alone in their regard for this man, who has done so much for education in Saskatchewan.

His influence is felt far beyond the teaching profession, and his sincerity, integrity, and ability have been recognized throughout the nation.

Although his influence has been wide-spread, there is no doubt that we, as teachers, have been more directly affected, and more particularly influenced, than any other group of people. Woodrow, as he is known affectionately by so many teachers, was President of the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation in 1944, when he was first elected and named Minister of Education. Perhaps, because of his teacher background, and because of his vital concern for the professional organization of the teachers, Woodrow has maintained close contact with the Teachers Federation, and properly, the Teachers Federation has honoured him by presenting him with a life membership.

Through this close contact between the Minister and the teachers' professional organization, we teachers have had a voice in practically every educational development in the past sixteen years. Sometimes we couldn't agree with his decisions, but we could always respect his view point. Mr. Gib Eamer, has said, 'We couldn't always persuade him, but we could always discuss with him, any educational problem.'

At the risk of missing some significant development, we will venture to list some of the things for which Saskatchewan teachers are grateful. During Woodrow's term of office, our Federation Act was extended to include disciplinary powers. The Teacher Tenure Act came into being. The Salary Negotiations Act became law, and created orderly bargaining where there had been confusion and chaos. The Larger Unit Act made centralization and vastly improved facility, feasible. There were many improvements in the Superannuation Act, including the extension to take care of dependants, and beginning September 1st, the inauguration of a contributory scheme of group insurance for teachers marks another milestone in the teacher-welfare legislation. Now, while teachers are grateful for these improvements to their working conditions, Woodrow Lloyd will probably be remembered

longest for the wisdom and wide vision which he brought to the advancement of education in this province, and for his willingness at all times, to share the responsibility for educational change.

Through Woodrow's influence, teaching in Saskatchewan has truly risen to the status of one of the great professions, and perhaps even more important, tens of thousands of Saskatchewan's boys and girls have reached higher levels of education, have achieved higher ambitions, and have learned not only to make a better living, but to live better, fuller lives than they could have done under the educational conditions that existed before Woodrow Lloyd became Minister of Education. For these things Woodrow, accept our thanks."

On behalf of the Members on this side of the Legislature, and I hope on behalf of all the Members of the House, we echo these sentiments.

Now, coming to the budget, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this is a courageous budget, it's a progressive budget, and it's also a very realistic budget when we are facing a period of recession. There has been a very searching appraisal of all the Departments of Government, and cuts were made where they felt that the expenditures was the least necessary to be continued at this present time. In the cuts that were made, there was always an eye kept to the question of employment and, and the Government has tried to keep as many employment-creating projects going as financially possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, although this budget is not balance, deficit financing under such conditions as we have today is good economic practice, and, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we have been able to keep tax increases to a minimum and still carry out such a large an ambitious program, reflects a good deal of credit on this Government. It has been due to the fact that the finance of this province has been so well handled, that they have been kept in such a healthy condition, that we have set up proper sinking funds, it is due to these things, Mr. Speaker, that we have earned the confidence of the people who lend money to governments, and it is precisely this reason, Mr. Speaker, that at this time we are able to engage in some deficit financing and

Thursday, March 2, 1961

still carry out such a dynamic program in the field of power and telephones, and to borrow money at rates that are comparable to other provinces, and better than many provinces, and for this I believe the Government deserves congratulations.

Now, with the Provincial Treasurer, I also regret the federal fiscal policy of high interest rates and all those things that have made financing for the provinces and for the municipalities so very difficult. I also feel that the abandonment by the Federal Government, of the tax rental system was a retrograde step; it was an abandonment of a good principle. Once again it has made things more difficult for the province of Saskatchewan, and in the light of the recent actions of the Federal Government, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister, should no longer expect to get any support either personally, or for his party in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, it is a matter of gratification to me, Mr. Speaker, that our Crown Corporations, in spite of a recession, have had a good year and every one of them has come out in the black. The net earnings of these Crown Corporations are \$1,290,000, and the value of these Crown Corporations cannot be over-emphasized. The volume of business was \$90 million last year; salaries and wages paid out in Saskatchewan was \$26 million; employees of these Crown Corporations numbered 5,800. What boost to the economy, Mr. Speaker, and also to employment in the province of Saskatchewan!

Now it is stated in the budget, that a budget is a reflection of the social and economic philosophy of the Government, and once again, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see that this budget stresses human welfare. I'm pleased to see that 57.36% of the budget goes for health, education and welfare, and that we are now going to pay 70% of the construction costs for new hospitals, after we have deducted the federal contribution. I am pleased also, Mr. Speaker, that more money is being put into the student loan fund, and that the capital from this fund is to be raised from \$1 million to \$3 million. Already more than 8,000 students in Saskatchewan have benefitted from our student aid fund, and that I think is something we can be justly proud of, Mr. Speaker. I do approve of the policy of the Government of extending these scholarships to all areas of the province, so that in every area there will be young people who share the benefits of these scholarships, but I would like to

suggest to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to these scholarships, we should try to provide three or four large continuous scholarships that will carry on through the full university training. The reason I suggest that, Mr. Speaker, is, that we lose some of our most brilliant students to McGill or to Toronto, or to Queen's, because of the very large scholarships that are offered there, and scholarships that are continuous, and I feel that if we could retain some of these brilliant people in Saskatchewan, it would benefit Saskatchewan, and they would be more apt to stay here when they have completed their degree, and I hope that the Minister will consider this suggestion.

Of course, as a Member for the City of Regina, we certainly do welcome the announcement that we are to have a new full-scale university here. It's going to be a great asset to our city, and of course it has only been made possible by the very generous university grants given by the Provincial Government, and I'm pleased also, at the large increase in grants for vocational training, this is a great need in an age of automation, and I'm pleased that the technical institute is now in operation and serving some 1,400 students of the province, I know, Mr. Speaker, that school boards are going to welcome another \$3 million in grants, or a gross expenditure on education this year of \$42 million. Our extended provincial aid to education has been rising steadily and rapidly, and this is the implementation of the promise that we made to the electorate some time ago.

I'm also glad to see that health and welfare expenditures will rise by \$2 million, and I know many people in the province will welcome the announcement that there is to be a new training school for retarded children in Prince Albert. This also fills a great need. Here, I would like to suggest to the Minister of Health that when this school is completed he could perhaps transfer one hundred and twenty mental defectives who are still in Weyburn either to Moose Jaw or Prince Albert, because by doing this it would leave two large wards in Weyburn for pre-discharge patients, and this would be a great assistance. Those who are interested in the care of the mentally ill, I think all agree that it is not good practice for the mentally ill and the mentally defective to be trained together, or to be treated together. Their problems are different and the kind of treatment they need are different, and are not too good for each other, because the mentally ill see some of

Thursday, March 2, 1961

the gravest of the mental defective, and although it won't happen to them, they get distressed and fear that they will degenerate in a like manner, and so if they could be removed I would think it would be a great help.

I am also glad to see, Mr. Speaker, the increased facilities at the Regina Jail which will relieve a dangerously overcrowded situation there. Here I would like to pay tribute to the staff at the Regina Jail, I think they have no peers anywhere in the Dominion of Canada. They have carried on under difficult situations and have done a good job, and I know they are going to welcome these additional facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I do look forward to the day when this province can put more emphasis on probation and parole, because in the long run I think this may be a more effective policy, and certainly more economical too.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that I have noticed a marked tendency, among the Members of the Opposition, to blame all the ills, real or imaginary, on what they call the socialist policies of this Government. They continually try to hold up socialism as a bogey or a scare word. We have become used to these tactics by now and they haven't done them very much good. The Leader of the Opposition has stated frequently that he spent several years of his life trying to build socialism and he is going to spend the rest of his life trying to destroy it. Well, let's look at what this thing is that he is dedicating the rest of his life to try to destroy.

What is democratic socialism? Now we have some pretty weird definitions of socialism from the Members of the Opposition, in this Legislature, trying to link it with totalitarianism and all sorts of nonsense like that, but I have found what I think is a very fine and a very simple definition of socialism. It's a definition by Max Webber, a Swiss economist and financier, and he speaks this way. He says:

“The basic aims of democratic socialism are, equality of rights, just distribution of material and cultural goods, within a free and democratic state.”



Spelt out more fully, he states full employment, fair remuneration for all, social security, the replacement of the predominant power of capital by a system which gives all sections of the people, the democratic right to a voice in the economic life and allows the individual to develop his capacity and partake in the cultural value. These aims he said, must be attained by democratic means, with the participation of trade unions and co-operatives being of great importance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is there anything unworthy or sinister in these aims? I would like to direct the attention of the House just for a few minutes to some of the socialist measures which over the years have worked for the good and the welfare of mankind. In fact I will go further, Mr. Speaker, and say that the measures that have benefitted the average person most in this country and in other countries are socialistic measures. I would first like to turn to the field of education.

Universal education is a prime example of socialism at work, Mr. Speaker. Time was when only the children of the rich could get an education. They were educated by private tutors or went to private schools financed by the wealthy for the children of the wealthy. Gradually the concept grew that society couldn't progress with uneducated people, and this idea came to the fore particularly after the Industrial Revolution, and the demand grew in the enlightened countries of the world for universal education, compulsory education, state controlled education, supported by the taxes of the people, paid by all, in other words education was socialized. The realization has grown since then, that education is not only an economic necessity, but a basic right. Mr. Speaker, where this concept of education has not materialized, is where we find the undeveloped, impoverished country, where we find civil war and seething unrest, and who, Mr. Speaker, would go back to the day when education was just for the rich? In fact, the growing progressive concept of education is for more equality, more loans and scholarships, so that every child will get a chance to develop his capacity to the fullest, and in Saskatchewan we have moved ahead a long way in this direction, by equalization grants, larger school units, bus transportation, better high school facilities so people can get their education without leaving home. In other words, more socialization, and it's been a benefit to education, Mr. Speaker.

Let us turn to the field of public health. As you will notice, the state is taking a more and more active part in the preservation of the health of its people, realizing that a healthy people is one of the great assets that any country can have. We have seen state hospitals, socialized hospitals, where people through government and by taxation work together to provide facilities for the sick, and everybody benefits either directly as patients or indirectly through the better health of the nation.

Our C.C.F. hospitalization scheme, Mr. Speaker, was a socialist scheme, inaugurated in Saskatchewan, copied by other provinces and now we have a national hospital scheme all across Canada. Rank socialism you say! Does the Leader of the Opposition disapprove of this? Would he destroy our socialized cancer services? Does he object to the fact that we removed the financial barrier from treatment of the mentally ill, or for the patients of polio? What about the proposed medical plan, Mr. Speaker? Socialistic, certainly! We fought the battle for this medical plan in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and we won that battle, and we won it not only for Saskatchewan, but we will win it for Canada as a whole. Already the old line parties are putting a medical plan in their platforms. Now certainly the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, should have been down at the Liberal Convention, even if he had to go on a stretcher to fight this extreme socialist plank in the Liberal platform. Medical care, provided by the state, supported by taxation, geared to ability to pay, is socialistic, to the nth degree, Mr. Speaker, and amazingly, no plebiscite suggested!

Mr. Speaker, look at the field of housing. Private enterprise flatly stated that it cannot provide housing for the lowest income group, and should not be expected to do so. You can find this statement in the Bruce Report. Now, is the answer to this, for people to continue to live in slums? It's decent housing not a basic necessity in life? It's only by socialist measures that we can solve this problem. Already we have some such measures, not enough, but what about these tri-partite agreements, subsidized housing, where the three levels of government, with differing political philosophies, have entered into this scheme where 75% is financed by Federal Government, 20% by the province and 5% by the municipalities. In these cases, Mr. Speaker, the size is determined, not by the size of the pocket-book, but by the size of the family, and the

rent is determine by ability to pay, not by the kind of house you get. Now what could be more socialistic than this? But was a god-send it is to the people who get this kind of housing?

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, with more socialistic measures such as universal old age pensions. Of course we all know that the Leader of the Opposition opposed this, and we should never let the people of Saskatchewan forget it. Family Allowances, public libraries, unemployment insurance, and in spite of some abuses, where would we be today without unemployment insurance? One reason that this recession of ours has not developed into a depression is because of these socialist measures that have spread purchasing power, and if the farmers could get their fair share of the purchasing power we wouldn't have so many people walking the streets unemployed today.

Mr. Speaker, I can cite the CBC, and the CBC is the greatest safeguard to freedom of expression that we have in this country, and particularly in view of the growing and frightening monopolies of the media of newspaper, radio, and television. Would the Leader of the Opposition destroy this? What about the TCA, it's a Government Agency, one that we can be very proud of, but it is being badly sabotaged now by the Conservative Government. I could look at the Bank of Canada, Mr. Speaker. Here we have a certain degree at least of control in fiscal policy by a Government Agency rather than unregulated control by private interest. Socialistic yes, but what we need is not less control here, but more control, so that we can divert available capital into socially useful projects like schools and hospitals and sewer and water projects and homes and so on.

You can look at the Saskatchewan Government Insurance. Now of course we know the opinion that the Leader of the Opposition has here. He wanted to put in his platform a promise to get rid of Government Insurance, but he wasn't allowed to do so, because the Liberals opposite knew that they could never win an election if they put that in their platform, and so he was forced to pipe down on that.

Speaking of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Mr. Speaker, doesn't anyone really believe that if private enterprise had been distributing power in this province, many of the isolated areas such as Turtleford, Meadow Lake and around there, would have had power today, or do they believe that gas would have been distributed in so many small centres in the province? They know perfectly well it couldn't, Mr.

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Speaker. You could look at our telephone system, our municipal transport systems, and I could go on and on citing socialist measures here and in other countries that have benefitted the people of the world. Of course, many of these have been enacted by old line parties, parties that would get up and try to frighten you with the word socialism.

We also should remember that they were enacted only after years of pressure, and at the insistent voice of the C.C.F. Party here and left wing parties and labour Governments, and other Governments with a socialist philosophy in other parts of the world. I would like to restate what I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, that the measure that have benefitted mankind most, are socialist measures, in fact, Mr. Speaker, no true democracy can exist without a large measure of socialism, and it is not less we can have a true democracy and get our economy back in an even keel. This cliché, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals have developed, "social security without socialism," it's utterly meaningless. It's a fraud and a delusion, these kinds of measures certainly are socialistic, whether the Opposition likes the name or not.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron:** — When are you coming to the budget?

**Mrs. Cooper:** — I've spoken on the budget, Sir.

Now, I would like to go a little bit further and state some of the socialist measures that we still need to assist this economy. Look at our transportation system. What a chaos we have there, and again it's only by government action, by eliminating duplication, by good long-range planning that we can solve this problem which is so vexing and which cripples the provinces like the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. MacDougal:** — Tell Gainsborough about that one.

**Mrs. Cooper:** — I would say also that we have a long way to go yet, before we get a national health insurance plan, and I would say this, Mr. Speaker, we will never get a satisfactory plan until we get a party with C.C.F. principles in power in Ottawa. I say this because we've had forty years of Liberal promises.

We have had a Royal Commission set up by the Conservatives, and we don't know where that will lead to, but does anyone on either side of this House doubt for one minute that if a New Party gets in power in Ottawa, we will get a comprehensive medical and hospital care program, during its first term of office?

There are so many areas, Mr. Speaker, where we need new and progressive thought. Saint Simone once said that the main function of society is the betterment of the moral and physical existence of the poorest class, and what a long distance we still have to go. We will have too many old age pensioners living on substandard allowances; we have too many people making wages that do not supply a decent standard of living; we have too many slums in our country and too many families deprived of the necessities of life, because of the high cost of housing; we have too many unemployed with the loss of human dignity, and loss of independence and a loss of production, and of course, the only answer to these problems is long-range social and economic planning.

After all, Mr. Speaker, what is government and why do we need it? If you think through these matters, the whole concept of government itself is socialistic. Listening to some of the Members of the Opposition, and some spokesmen for big business, you would think that government was a horrible monster, reaching out to destroy our freedoms, and that private enterprise was dedicated to the preservation of freedom. What utter nonsense! It's a ridiculous concept. The proper role of government is to preserve the economic and social freedom of all people by providing an equality of opportunities and fair distribution of wealth to the people who create that wealth, Mr. Speaker. Now, no one on this side of the House objects to reasonable profit, but, Mr. Speaker, is profit the highest motive, the highest ideal of mankind? Is the concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands, healthy for our economy? It is only through government and by long-range planning, and socialist measures that freedom and equality can be maintained, and if a government is truly democratic it's the bulwark of freedom not its enemy. Where governments have refused to accept this concept, where private capitalist interests have been uncontrolled, and have had free range to exploit people, to skim off the cream, to leave people

Thursday, March 2, 1961

poverty-stricken and ignorant, these are the troubled spots of the world, and these are the very things that created Communism in the world today.

In the larger sphere, Mr. Speaker, let's look again, look at the world situation that we face today, and here again, the only answer is democratic socialist measures, not just in Canada, but throughout the world.

Let's go back to the definition of our aims – equality of rights, just distribution of the material and cultural goods, within a free democratic state. We can't go on, Mr. Speaker, in this western world piling up embarrassing surpluses so that a good crop becomes an economic catastrophe. How foolish can you be? Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the answer is not something like this, and it has been suggested by members of the Federal Government, is nothing short of criminal; it's short-sighted and negative, and it's completely unworthy of a nation that calls itself Christian. You can't tell me, Mr. Speaker, that a nation that has the brilliance to produce and send satellites into orbit around the moon and around the sun, and probe the secrets of the atom, you can't tell me that we haven't the brilliance to solve the problem of distribution. It's human greed, Mr. Speaker, human selfishness, unwillingness to plan and to share, and to think in new terms and in a new world. These are the stumbling blocks in the way.

What are the alternatives, Mr. Speaker, to the adoption of the democratic socialist approach in facing today's world problems of continued unrest, fear, jealousy, hate, starvation for the many, affluence for the few, and eventually war, and if that comes what is left? We will have lost everything worthwhile living for. We will have lost our freedom, lost our democracy, and end with a dictatorship of the right or the left. This fact is becoming more evident to thinking people all over the world today. Mr. Speaker, if we were to remove all these socialist measures that have benefitted mankind, these measures that people have struggled for over the ages, if we were to go back to the caveman, and we would, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't like to be guilty of spending the rest of my life trying to destroy socialism, and I think that the Leader of the Opposition had a finer, broader, healthier and more progressive vision when he started out as a young man to build socialism, just a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I earlier had an opportunity to compliment you upon your elevation to the high office of Speaker of this House, but on that occasion I did not have an opportunity to thank the citizens of Regina for electing me in the election in June as one of their representatives in this Legislature. I need hardly say, Mr. Speaker, that I am proud to represent the City of Regina and its citizens, and particularly proud to be a colleague of the Hon. Mr. Williams, Mrs. Cooper and Mr. Whelan.

Mr. Speaker, as Mrs. Cooper has already said, our city is facing some considerable difficulties, but I feel that these difficulties are being met in a forthright manner by the civic officials of this city, by Mayor Baker and his Council, and I look forward, along with the other Members for Regina, to working with those city officials in solving some of the problem which face our city. I look forward in particular to working with them cooperatively to solve some of the problems which can be solved by joint provincial-municipal participation, and of course I think particularly of the problem already mentioned by Mrs. Cooper, the problem of low cost housing.

I will, Mr. Speaker, have more to say about some of the other things in the budget address which are of interest and benefit to the city of Regina. More particularly I will have something to say about the power building and about the university.

Now, turning to the budget, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to compliment the Provincial Treasurer, on the competence and facility which he displayed in delivering the budget speech, and the complete mastery of the financial affairs of this province which he has so obviously achieved in the difficult role of Provincial Treasurer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before turning to the budget itself, I would like to make some general comment on the stand of the Opposition on a number of issues which have come before this legislature and which are either covered by the address of the Provincial Treasurer or foretold in the budget which he presented. Mr. Speaker, it's the duty of an Opposition to oppose, as Members opposite have said, but it is also the duty of an Opposition to put forward alternative programs.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Some Hon. Members:** — No! No!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I am very much gratified for that view of their duties in a parliamentary democracy. They apparently take the view that it is not the duty of an Opposition to put forward alternative programs for the electorates.

**An Hon. Member:** — Once in four years.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of an Opposition in a Legislature, not only to criticize the governmental program but also to put forward the alternatives which they would advance if they were in office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not, in listening to the addresses of the Members opposite, detected any statement of the position they would take on a number of the vital issues which face this province, and, Mr. Speaker, I intend to contribute my little bit to clarifying some of the positions which are taken on this side of the House and on the other side of the House with reference to some of the issues which face, not only this House, but the people of Saskatchewan. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan will be interested in knowing, not only what the Government thinks, but what the Opposition thinks about major issues of the day.

I turn, Mr. Speaker, firstly to the issue of a Government-sponsored, universal, prepaid medical plan. Now the position of the Government is that it is for this plan. The position of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is that it is against this plan. Mr. Speaker, I hear some suggestion on the other side of the House that they are not against this plan.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What plan?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the principle of a Government sponsored, universal, prepaid medical plan was placed before the electorate of this province in the last election. In an earlier debate in this House, the Leader of the Opposition has said . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — In other places, Mr. Speaker, and other times,



Mr. Speaker, it has been said . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — By whom?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . that a vote for the C.C.F. in the last provincial election was vote for the medical plan, and it was further said, Mr. Speaker, and at other times, by the Leader of the Opposition, that 59% of the people in this province voted against the medical plan.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Voted against the Government I said.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — No, Mr. Speaker. On another occasion, Mr. Speaker, and I'll refer the hon. Member to the particular time and place in which he said this, and, Mr. Speaker, this statement can make sense only — only — I will read it if the Members ask. Am I permitted, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. Minister would like to be fair. Would he permit me to ask a question?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Read it, read it.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of Members opposite, I am quoting what the Leader of the Opposition has said.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Where? Where? Where?

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, surely the House is entitled to know from what he is reading, and where this was said and when it was said.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — He will do so if the hon. Members will keep quiet.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I will either read this or not read it. I cannot read it over the demand of Members opposite to the effect: (a) that I should not read it — the

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Member for Humboldt; and (b) that I should read it – the Member for Arm River. Mr. Speaker, it was said by the Leader of the Opposition, “Well I know that 41% is a mandate. As a matter of fact . . .”

**Mrs. Batten:** — On a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — What is the point of order?

**Mrs. Batten:** — The point of order is that before he reads this the House is entitled to know from what he is reading, when this was said, and where it was said.

**Premier Douglas:** — If the hon. Member will just be patient, he is about to give that information.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. Member will give that information as soon as possible.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, I am going to read this and then I will tell you where it came from.

**Mrs. Batten:** — No, that is not the point at all, and it is certainly not worthy of the hon. Member.

**Mr. Snedker:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is the same argument that developed when I was speaking, and I gave the source of my information when the hon. Members asked for it.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I didn't catch the Member's point of Order, Mr. Speaker, but I will carry on. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said, in the Throne Speech Debate . . . now then . . . Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Member from Arm River kindly sit down? I am not out of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, two or three times in the last day or two you have brought up a rule that you cannot interrupt another speaker, and now you are quoting the Leader of the Opposition in the Speech from the Throne debate.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** It is perfectly obvious that Members opposite want to repudiate the statement which was made earlier. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will carry on and I will make no further reference to this speech which is obviously embarrassing to Members opposite. It is perfectly obvious, Mr. Speaker, that there is an attempt by Members opposite to squirm on this issue, to dodge on this issue, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that it has been said time and time again, that a vote against the Government on this issue was a vote against the medical plan.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister to state when that statement was made by Liberals.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Do you have a question to address? Will you accept it?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Members opposite, with considerable facility, have already used some ten minutes of my radio time, and I propose, Mr. Speaker, to continue. I will answer questions put by the hon. Members after I leave the air.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Members opposite, since they apparently are reticent on the point, are for the medical plan or against the medical plan . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We are against the socialist medical plan.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . or if they have any position. Now, Mr. Speaker, no responsible Opposition takes the view that they do not have a position on a major issue.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The people at Turtleford like our position too.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I will leave

this matter which is obviously of considerable embarrassment to the Members opposite, since they are taking every opportunity to interrupt me in my remarks, and move on to something which was most unquestionably mentioned in the budget, Mr. Speaker, and that is the borrowing for the power program.

Mr. Speaker, the budget that has earlier been outlined in this House, set out a very substantial program of borrowing for the power corporation. This is necessary, Mr. Speaker, in order that the large program which the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has carried out in the last ten years, shall be continued and expanded. Mr. Speaker, we are for this program, and, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite are against this program. They have, Mr. Speaker, made it perfectly clear – the Member for Moosomin yesterday made it perfectly clear that he opposed the borrowing, which is not only desirable program. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Moosomin was very exercised, he purported at least to be very exercised, about the increase in gross debt in this province during the past sixteen years has been some \$150 million, and, Mr. Speaker, every penny of that can be attributed to the power program, and he who opposes the increase in gross debt opposes the power program.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It can't be otherwise, you know.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, if I had \$3,000 and I proposed to go out and buy a house for \$10,000, and assume a \$7,000 mortgage, it is perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that I could either keep my \$3,000, and not have the house, or buy the house and assume the mortgage. But what I can't do, Mr. Speaker, is but the house and not assume the mortgage, and anyone who says, "I'm all in favour of you having the house but don't borrow the money", then, Mr. Speaker, this man is talking childish nonsense. Mr. Speaker, when Members opposite say "Oh we want the power program, but we don't want any of the borrowing associated with it", they are talking childish nonsense.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well you won't let any private companies come in . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I am very gratified for that interruption. The hon. Member for Morse has said we will not let any private companies come in. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am gratified indeed to have this statement of policy on the part of the Liberal Party . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I'm speaking of your policy.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . that they would like private power companies to come into this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I take it that not every Member opposite would deny that a great power program was necessary. Without meaning any particular word of criticism, Mr. Speaker, when this Government assumed office in 1944, the province had just passed through a period of depression and a period of war, and there was virtually no power system. This I take and acknowledge by all. I take it further that it will be acknowledged by all that such a power system was necessary, Mr. Speaker, necessary for modernizing agriculture, necessary to provide for our growing cities, and necessary to provide for our industries. Now, Mr. Speaker, if it is true that this power system was necessary, there would be only two ways to provide for it. Either it would be provided publicly, which would involve, necessarily, huge borrowings, which has involved huge borrowings, and which hon. Members opposite have steadfastly said they opposed, or it could be provided privately or by both.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Or by both.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — But, Mr. Speaker, if it were provided privately as it was provided in the province of British Columbia or Alberta, then, Mr. Speaker, the users of this power facility would pay for the power facility in the same manner as they would pay for it if it were publicly provided. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Moosomin, yesterday was very forthright in saying that when this Government borrows for power, it is mortgaging the future of generations yet unborn. Now let me, Mr. Speaker, look at this statement. If we agree that the power utility is necessary, then we can provide it either our way or their way — our way as it was provided in Saskatchewan — their way as it was provided in Alberta.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in Alberta and in Saskatchewan,

Thursday, March 2, 1961

this utility will be paid for by the users. Make no mistake of that. But what is the difference, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — They get cheaper rates.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — In Alberta, Mr. Speaker, regardless of how much the users pay, they will never own this utility. They are destined to pay in perpetuity and never own. Now, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan, when this utility is paid for by the users, it will be owned by them.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Who the, Mr. Speaker, is mortgaging the future of generations yet unborn?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to move on to another topic, and that is the topic of unemployment. The budget speech has painted for us a sombre picture of unemployment in Canada. It painted for us a picture in Saskatchewan which certainly was not rosy, but I may say incidentally, was very much brighter than that which exists in any other province in this country, governed by a Liberal Government.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You haven't got any industry here, how could there be unemployment.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I really don't know that the hon. Member for Morse is saying, but I am saying that unemployment is worse in the provinces that are governed by a Liberal Government, therefore I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that the policies of those Governments are less effective than ours. Because, Mr. Speaker, we have been taking steps to alleviate the unemployment problem in this province. Mr. Speaker, we are a small province, but I think we have in our province perhaps the largest construction project in Canada going on at the present time. I refer to the South Saskatchewan River project. We have also, at Squaw Rapids, one of the largest construction projects in Canada, and the budget speech, and earlier references in this House, made clear that a power building would be proceeded with in Regina.

Now, Mr. Speaker, each of these projects

will generate a very substantial amount of employment. The Squaw Rapids project and the South Saskatchewan River project are already generating substantial amounts of employment. Right here in the city of Regina, Mr. Speaker, employees are working at the cement plant, employees are working at the steel plant to provide the material for these projects, and in a very few months, Mr. Speaker, a large number of people will be employed in providing the material and in engaging in the actual construction of the power building here in Regina. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what a Provincial Government can do. Traditionally, a Provincial Government can, in a period of recession, proceed with a program of public works. This, Mr. Speaker, is the policy of the Government, and this, Mr. Speaker, is the policy which is vigorously opposed by the Opposition.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Opposition will not now say that they are in favour of the South Saskatchewan River project and the Squaw Rapids project and the power building, and at the same time advise us they are against the province borrowing any of the money necessary to proceed with these projects. I take it that the hon. Member for Morse will not come into this House and say that he is in favour of the South Saskatchewan River project, when he sat in the House and supported the St. Laurent Government in its refusal, its obstinate refusal, its obdurate refusal, to proceed with this project. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal stand on these things is perfectly clear — they are opposed to any reasonable and sensible measures proposed in the Throne Speech to alleviate unemployment in this province.

I want now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to some of the remarks of the hon. Member for Moosomin. I regret that he is not in his seat now, but I do want to comment on one or two of the things which he said. You may remember that one of his first statements when he rose and first spoke in this debate was to criticize some increases in telephone rates, in long distance telephone rates, and he made merry with an example that in one particular place it was cheaper to go by bus than it was to telephone. Well now, Mr. Speaker, it may well be that the telephone rates are high, but I can tell you this, they are among the lowest in Canada, and they are substantially lower than those that prevail

in any other province with a Liberal government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I can tell you something else, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when the hon. Member for Moosomin said this, I detected in the faces of the Opposition an immediate solution would be, “Well that’s simple, let’s sell the bus company and raise the bus rates”. Mr. Speaker, this would be thoroughly consistent with their view of Crown Corporations.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to inform my friend . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the Liberals in this House have, any number of times, expressed their view of Crown Corporations.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Many times.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes indeed, I can recall the former Member for the Battlefords, in a flush of honesty some years ago, suggesting that he would “throw them out the window”. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the hon. Member for Moosomin said similar things – he was casting aspersions on the financial statements of the Crown Corporations. Now, from time to time, Mr. Speaker, Members opposite have gone on record, as they say, in support of this particular Crown Corporation or that, but, Mr. Speaker, what is it worth for the Members of the Opposition to go upon record. I think the Members of this House, and many people in Saskatchewan, are well aware of the value of assurances given by Members opposite. In particular, Mr. Speaker, last year’s leader was not this year’s leader. This year’s leader may not be next year’s leader.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That may be true over your way too.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, it may well be true that Members of this side of the House will be called upon to choose a new Leader, and if this is done – and I say if, Mr.



Speaker – I can tell you this, we will choose a leader from our ranks, from the ranks of this party. Mr. Speaker, we will not choose someone who was a member of another party, and who having not satisfied his ambitions in that other party, has come to us professing a new-found devotion to the principles of our party. Mr. Speaker, it may well be that this will limit our choice. We will not be able to choose from the new converts, but, Mr. Speaker, I think we will be none the poorer for that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the Liberal record on Crown Corporations? Well now, Members in this House and the people of Saskatchewan will be familiar with their record in Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — All except you.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I would like to turn for a moment to the other provinces of Canada. I think it is generally recognized that almost the pure monopoly is the telephone system, and if any Government believes in Crown Corporations, surely it believes in a publicly-owned telephone system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, excluding Saskatchewan for a moment, the Liberal Party has been in power during the last twenty-five years in every province of this country except Alberta. Mr. Speaker, in how many of those provinces did they set up a public telephone utility? Answer – none.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We did in Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, in how many of those provinces did a public telephone utility operate? Answer – one. Was it set up by a Liberal Government? Answer – no. Mr. Speaker, what did they do about Crown Corporations in their twenty-five years in the other provinces? Answer – nothing. And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that when they give assurances that this or that Crown Corporations will not be molested, those assurances are worth precisely what they did in the other provinces. They did nothing, and their assurances are worth nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for

Moosomin, paid handsome tributes to this Government yesterday.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Surely not.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — He complimented us on the very splendid hospital which is at Moosomin, on the senior citizens home, on the fact that Broadview, Grenfell, and Moosomin are supplied with gas, and we, Mr. Speaker, thank him for those kind words. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that some of his other comments must really have been intended for comic relief. I think he has been seeing too much of our much maligned Sergeant Bilko, please . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — You're sure a character.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, he said when this province received money from Ottawa, all of the money was received pursuant to policies introduced by a Liberal Government in Ottawa. Well, I have not had an opportunity to make a comprehensive list of the sources by which this province receives money from Ottawa, under programs which were not initiated by a Liberal Government, but a very quick list suggests that the roads to resources program is one; forest access roads is another; winter municipal works programs is a third; aerial surveys is a fourth; the South Saskatchewan River Development Program is a fifth — and I trust Members opposite are not claiming that for St. Laurent Government — and the sixth is the hospital plan, Mr. Speaker, under which we received from the Liberal Government not a ten cent piece. These, Mr. Speaker, surely were not intended as serious assertions in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Moosomin had a number of other things to say about the burden of the public debt, how it was going up, and how this was a load upon the people of Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's look at what the taxpayers of this province have paid interest on the public debt during the past number of years. Mr. Speaker, in 1944 there was provided in the estimates about four and one-half million dollars for interest on the public debt. In the budget which is before you, and the estimates which are before you, the figure is about one and one-half million dollars. This is the extent by which the burden of the public debt has not been increase, but has been decreased by the policies of this Government. I don't really understand the difficulty of Members opposite in

getting the idea clear in their minds, that when people borrow money for a power utility or a telephone utility, and when it is perfectly obvious that the money is going to be paid off by this utility, it does not represent a burden on the taxpayer. It is true of course, that the utility user and he's going to be a taxpayer both, regardless of whether the utility is publicly owned or privately owned. He is going to pay for the utility and he's going to pay his taxes, and if he pays for the utility in his utility rates, he does not pay them in his taxes. It is really quite a simple concept, Mr. Speaker, and I venture to think that after a couple of Sessions the Members opposite will appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to the estimates as they relate to the Department of Education. The budget contained three or four things of particular interest to those interested in the Department of Education. Firstly, it provided for an increase in gross spending of almost \$4 million on education. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it provided for a very substantial increase in school grants. Thirdly, it provided for a greatly expanded program for technical education and training of the unemployed. Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, it provided for increased grants to the university, indicating a robust growth and in particular providing capital funds which will make a start on the Regina campus of the University of Saskatchewan.

Let us turn first, Mr. Speaker, to the question of school grants. The increase for school grants provided for in this budget is over three million one hundred thousand dollars, bringing the total level of school grants to thirty-one million, six hundred thousand dollars. Now, in 1944-45, the total level of school grants was three million, one hundred and sixty thousand dollars. The level of school grants this year is thirty-one million, six hundred thousand dollars, a ten-fold increase in seventeen years. Let me put it another way, Mr. Speaker. For every one dollar paid out in school grants seventeen years ago, ten dollars will be paid out in the year coming. This, Mr. Speaker, will permit continuing increases in the standard of education in this province. The standard of education in this province has risen materially in each year since 1944-45, and we look forward in the forthcoming year to further substantial increases in the standard

of education which we are able to offer.

Mr. Speaker, I intend at a later time in my remarks to say a word or two about the manner in which we purpose to distribute the increase in school grants – the changes in the formula – but if I may be forgiven, I will pass this over for now and say something about the expanded program of technical education and training for the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, it will be known to all Members of this House, that just two months ago the Technical Institute at Moose jaw was officially opened, and this institution, valued at more than \$3 million, is designed to provide technical education for the young people of Saskatchewan. It is already doing a first rate job. In the academic year 1958-59, a comparatively small number of persons were provided with the technical education of the type provided in the Institute. During the current year, the number who will be served will be approximately 1,600, and we expect that in the next year the number will rise to 1,800. Mr. Speaker, I cannot overestimate the importance of technical education in all its aspects in this province and in this country. I need not repeat the many warnings which have been voiced about the need for technical education. His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, seeing the need, has suggested, and his suggestion has been adopted by governments all across the Commonwealth, that the Commonwealth set aside a week to be known as Commonwealth Technical Training Week, in which additional emphasis will be given to technical training and technical education. Mr. Speaker, we are told that in 1910, 37% of the jobs which a person could go to after finishing his schooling, could be held by someone who had no skills whatever. We are told that in 1957 the appropriate figure was 20%. We may confidently expect that by 1980 the number of jobs which could be held by such people will probably not exceed 10%, and by the year 2000, it is likely that the number will be under 10%. Now, Mr. Speaker, the year 2000 sounds a long way away, but anyone who leaves school now and goes out into the labour market will hope to continue his working life until after the year 2000. It is imperative therefore, that we devote a considerable part of our resources and energy to the training of our youth, and in particular to the technical training of those who do not wish to pursue academic subjects.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to an item which appears in the estimates which is dear to my heart, and that is the item which provides for capital grants to the University of Saskatchewan. Included in that figure, Mr. Speaker, is an amount which will provide the first sums to build a new building which will commence the construction of a new campus here in Regina for the University of Saskatchewan. We look forward, Mr. Speaker, to the day when, on the campus just east of these buildings, there will rise a great new university which will serve a growing city and the youth of this city. Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the Board of Governors that the University's proposals are that they will set up at this university, firstly, a college of arts and science, and that they will then examine the possibility of establishing colleges of commerce and law, either by transfer of those faculties from the campus at Saskatoon or by the establishment of second colleges here in Regina. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that every citizen of Regina would wish to join with me in complimenting and congratulating the Board of Governors on their decision to embark upon the construction of a new campus here in Regina, on their decision to provide at that campus instruction to the full degree level, and on their decision to continue to develop this campus as circumstances permit, and as the number of students offering themselves requires, until there is here in this city a university carrying on the same high standards which have been carried on by Regina College, but offering these services to a very much larger number of students from this city and from southern Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I would be turning back to the question of school grants, and I want, therefore, briefly to outline the proposals which the Government has for distributing some of the grant money. Members will know that when we distribute our school grants, we distribute them in two categories. There is one category which covers about 90% of the classrooms, and another category which covers about 10% of the classrooms. The 90% category is called the general formula. We, Mr. Speaker, hope to make some changes in this general formula which will be of considerable benefit to all units and jurisdictions which operate twenty classrooms or more. Mr. Speaker, I will not attempt a long explanation of the school grant formula, but I think I can state it fairly shortly when I say that it consists of three parts. Firstly, we attempt to assess the ability to pay of a particular

school authority by finding out how much assessment per classroom. Then we set up a sort of reasonable minimum budget, which we call assigned costs. Placed on that budget are the figures which we think are the reasonable minimums for operating school rooms, and we pay to the school jurisdiction a percentage of this reasonable minimum budget, depending upon whether they are a wealthy school district or a poor school district – depending upon whether they have a high assessment per classroom which they need to operate, or a low assessment per classroom which they need to operate. If they have a high assessment, they get a fairly modest grant. If they have a low assessment, they get a very large grant. The formula last year, Mr. Speaker, provided that for the wealthier unit we paid 32% of the assigned costs, and for the poorest we paid 81% of the assigned costs. We now propose, Mr. Speaker, to change that percentage so that the wealthiest will receive 35% of the assigned costs, and that the poorest will receive 82% of the assigned costs, everyone getting some more.

Mr. Speaker, we also intend to increase the amount of assigned costs, increase the amount which we will recognize as this reasonable minimum budget to which I referred. We intend, Mr. Speaker, to add \$100 to the amount which we will recognize as the budget, if I may use that word, for an elementary classroom, and \$250 for the budget for a secondary classroom. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that these will make very substantial improvements in the school grants in most areas. There are also some other changes, which I won't take the time of respect to conveyance, and also the formula which applies to the non-unit area. The change in formula which applies to the non-unit area or the areas which have less than twenty classrooms, is a change which we believe will give to those areas substantially the same amount as will be given under the general formula.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to the question of teacher supply and teacher training. We in the Department of Education, Mr. Speaker, are very gratified at the number people who are offering themselves for training as teachers, and at the qualifications that these entrants into the teaching profession are able to show. Mr. Speaker, there is still a teacher shortage. No longer is there a shortage, I think, in terms of the pure numbers of teachers who are offering themselves. There is,

however, still a shortage with respect to the number of teachers with professional qualifications who are offering themselves. I need hardly say, Mr. Speaker, that any school system is as good as its teachers, and accordingly, the Department of Education, during the past several years under the leadership of the Hon. Mr. Lloyd, has and will continue, to bend its efforts to improve the qualifications to teachers in this province.

On the question of numbers, Mr. Speaker, these figures are indeed encouraging. In 1956-57, we had enrolled at Teachers College some 650 people; now we have just under 1,000. During 1956-57, we had in the College of Education in Saskatoon some 319; now we have 846. These, Mr. Speaker, are most encouraging increases in the number people offering themselves as teachers. There has been a similar decrease in the number of study supervisors, there are now only 29 study supervisors in this entire province out of well over 8,500 teachers. Just over one-third of 1 of the classrooms, less than four classrooms in every thousand are staffed by study supervisors. All the others are staffed by teachers with certificates.

Not only is the number of teachers encouraging, but the people who are offering themselves are possessed with very high academic standing. The entrance requirements into the Teachers Colleges are substantially the same as those at the University of Saskatchewan. Now there may be a slight difference because of the difference in courses, but to the ultra-conservative, Mr. Speaker, I would say that well over 90% of the people who come to the Teachers Colleges in this province could gain entrance to the University of Saskatchewan on a regular basis. This, Mr. Speaker, is in sharp contrast to the condition which prevails in many other provinces in this country. We, Mr. Speaker, are getting our very fair share of the cream of the crop entering the teaching profession, and I think that our educational system here in this province is beginning to show the results of these very fine people going out into the classrooms.

Not only are we getting good people, but they are taking an increasing amount of training. Just about 50% of our teachers in Saskatchewan have two years of training or more, two years after Grade XIII, and this, Mr. Speaker, is the best showing in Canada. We have a greater percentage of our teachers who have Grade XII and two years following Grade XII, than any other province in Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker,

regrettably we do not have a large number of teachers who possess degrees or other professional qualifications. Only some 16% to 17% of our teachers have these qualifications, and it is going to be necessary for the Department, for school trustees, and for other people who possess advanced professional qualifications is greatly increased. It is perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that we in this province are going to face substantially increased enrolments in high schools, and if we are to give to these young people offering themselves a high level of education, for them, it will be absolutely imperative that we provide for them, teachers who have the maximum qualifications which we can provide.

Now, I don't think that this increase in the teacher supply is by any means accidental. I am pleased to say that I think there is a growing recognition on the part of trustees that good teachers are well worth trying to get, and well worth paying, and I must compliment the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association and its members on this recognition. I must also say that the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation has made a very real contribution in this field, They are a well-organized federation, emphasizing not only the professional interests of their members, but also espousing the cause of education generally.

We of the Provincial Government have made our contribution. I have already said that the increase in school grants has been some ten-fold in the last seventeen years. This has permitted the school trustees to pay the salaries which will attract competent and dedicated people into the classrooms. We have also made additional contributions. The group life insurance plan which was earlier alluded to by the lady Member for Regina, has not yet had one year of operation, but already it is covering some 8,700 teachers, and giving them insurance coverage in excess of \$47 million. As Members will recall, the premium on the first \$2,000 is paid by the Government of Saskatchewan, and the premium on the addition insurance by the teacher. These and other benefits, Mr. Speaker, have led teachers to believe that the teaching profession holds for them a future, so that they can plan to devote their working lives to this profession secure in the knowledge that they will receive from society a



recognition, which their training and devotions deserves.

Mr. Speaker, we will be suggesting a small change in the group life insurance act this year, and I will be introducing legislation to include under the coverage of the group life insurance act, secretaries of school units and other secretaries of school boards, who hold certificates from the Department. These people, Mr. Speaker, will not have the first \$2,000 paid for them. They will have to pay all their premiums, but they will be receiving the benefit of the low rate obtained by the teachers. I may say that the teachers are most happy to have the school secretaries in with them. I think this was a generous act on the part of the teachers, since it is almost certain that the school secretaries will have a higher average age than the teachers and accordingly there will be some small element of subsidy which the teachers were willing to make.

Mr. Speaker, there are other reasons why the increased numbers of teachers have found their way into the teaching profession. Last year a program was introduced whereby a teacher could obtain a \$1,000 scholarship in order to complete his professional qualifications. The Members are familiar with this program, and I am sure that the hon. Member for Biggar, who was the previous Minister of Education, has explained this program to the House a number of times. I know the lady member for Saskatoon has explained it and commented upon it. I can only say that it was a program which I thought was very wise and accordingly it is continued in this year's budget.

Mr. Speaker, the lady Member for Regina made reference to the student aid fund. I will not repeat the figures which she has mentioned whereby some 8,000 students have benefitted from this fund, but I would like to say that use of the fund is increasing sharply every year. For example, in 1953-54, the number of loans made was for some 411, and in the last year 1,128, an increase of three times, and the amount of money let out was over three times greater. This, Mr. Speaker, has assisted many people who otherwise would not have gone to university. They have been able to continue their studies. Incidentally it has meant that a good number of people who would not otherwise have entered the teaching profession have done so.

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Mr. Speaker, there was an announcement in the Speech from the Throne, to the effect that the Student Aid Fund would be increased from \$1 million to \$3 million, and we look forward, Mr. Speaker, to the time when even this amount of money will not be sufficient to provide the loans which will be necessary in order to enable to all our young people in Saskatchewan who wish to do so to pursue university education. Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with a number of aspects of the Department of Education and before resuming my seat, I just want to say a word or two about some of the problems which appear to be facing us, as a Department, but not only as a Department, but also as a province and as a country. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that one of the major problems which is facing us in the field of education is the problem of secondary education. Mr. Speaker, I know this is a subject which does not have a wide scope, but I want to recall to hon. Members minds some of the facts which does not have a wide scope, but which we perhaps do not always put into the same sort of focus.

I think all of us agree that education should be provided for all students up to perhaps age 13 or 14, at least up to the end of Grade VIII, and if the student is not getting along too well with the course which is provided, the public generally takes the view that it is up to the school authorities to provide a course from which this particular student can benefit. We say that everyone in that chronological age group, except anyone who may be severely retarded, has a right to an education, and it's the job of the state to provide this education to provide the facilities, and to provide the program. We recognize this in the fact that our School Attendance Act provides for attendance up to age 15 or completion of Grade VIII.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when we come to university, it seems to me that we all agree that it is not the function of the university to provide instruction for everyone in the age group, let us say from 18 to 25, and we say that a university is perfectly within its rights to impose entrance requirements which have the effect off excluding large numbers of people, and further to offer courses which cover only a narrow field of man's activities. It is perfectly clear that at the university level we say, "No this is a specialized course, for a specialized group of people, who have to meet entrance requirements before they can partake of it."

It is perfectly clear therefore, that somewhere between the ages of 14 and 18 we've changed our minds, we've said that up to the age 14 the state has the duty to provide education, the facilities, and the program for all the people in this chronological age group. As for university we say, "Oh no, merely because you're alive doesn't give you the right to go to the university – you must meet certain rigid requirements."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we as society for the last 15 or 2 years have been at the cross roads wondering where to draw the line between these two philosophies. Twenty-five or thirty years ago there was no doubt, Mr. Speaker. It was at the Grade VIII level or the Grade IX level. And we said above those grades we offer a course, only for those people who are thinking of going to university. Our course was fundamentally geared to university entrance. But, Mr. Speaker, we as a society are not going to accept this anymore. Many say, "Oh no – if I'm paying my taxes, I think my child has a right at least to carry on to age 17 or 18, and perhaps it is the job of the state to provide both the facilities and the program which will benefit my child, even if he cannot partake of a university entrance course." And the labour unions say, "No sir, it's not right to turn these people at age 14, out on the labour market. There's no place for them; they are not sufficiently trained to make their way, and it is somebody's job to provide them with additional training up until the age 17 or 18, so that they can go out into the labour market able to take their place in an industrialized society."

Mr. Speaker, it seems too that we are, here in Saskatchewan as elsewhere, struggling with this problem and we are slowly but surely adopting the view that everybody is entitled to eleven or twelve years of schooling regardless of his academic capabilities, and that it is up to the school authorities to design a program and provide facilities that will allow each student to benefit to the maximum from these years of schooling.

Now, if this is true, then we better face up to what it means. It means that we are going to have to provide schools, training programs, and courses of instructions such as we have not really contemplated before, Mr. Speaker, it's perfectly clear. I would suggest that if this program is to

Thursday, March 2, 1961

be adopted, and I'm suggesting that we as a society are adopting it, then we are going to have to nearly double our high school population from some segments of the population.

We in Saskatchewan have been moving toward that point of view and for ten years now. Hon. Members will know that composite high schools have been built which offered to a student an alternative course to the strictly university entrance four year course; and alternative course which offers shop work, which offers commercial courses, and which offers some academic instruction. I think Members will agree that if we are going ahead with this sort of a program, it is entirely likely that at least two and probably three separate courses of instruction will be necessary. It is undoubtedly true that we will have to continue and make more intensive, our academic course which is designed for university entrance. I'll call that the matriculation course. We're going to have to offer another academic course, at a level less intensive than the matriculation course for other people who want to go on, and who want to study academic courses but are not perhaps able to cope with a rigid, academic, university matriculation course. We're going to have to do something else. We're going to have to provide what is fundamentally a trade course for a good number of people who may not care, or may not have the ability, go on with the academic course up to the 12th grade. This, Mr. Speaker, is going to require very substantial school plants. This can't be done, I'm afraid, in the one-room high school; and I don't think it can be done in the three-room high school. The only way that we can offer this sort of course, if this is the goal we're going toward, is to have larger high schools which can cope with students who are following two of three different streams of academic courses, and who are perhaps jumping back and forth from one stream to the other.

Mr. Speaker, a good deal of progress has been made in coming to grips with the underlying basis of this sort of problem in the past ten years. I have here figures for high school students. They tell me that in 1956 some 4,000 high school students were conveyed, and in 1961 some 13,800 high school students were conveyed. Now this indicates that a good number of students are being

drawn in to these larger institutions of learning, but we still have a long way to go before we have our pupils concentrated sufficiently. Certainly no one wants to concentrate students more than is necessary for a variety of reasons. Firstly, it costs money, and secondly, there is no reason for pulling students over the country unless it's absolutely necessary. But, we're making progress in our schools, drawing our students into groups sufficiently large so that we can offer them at least a composite school program. In the larger cities there's also a technical program. This I suggest is the sort of problem with which we, over the next couple of decades will be faced. I think it is foolish for us to fail to acknowledge that this is going to require continued large outlays of public funds, not only to provide the school plant, but to provide the teachers who will be necessary to staff these schools, and to do an adequate job of giving to all of our young people of high school age the course from which they can derive the most benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I've taken a great deal of time of the House. I just want to say in closing that I believe that the budget which was presented by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer is one which recognizes the primary importance of education in the welfare of this province. I believe it is a forward-looking budget, which will provide for the people of this province a measure of well-being to the maximum extent permissible by the economic circumstances of this province at the present time. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will not support the amendment, and I will support the motion.

**Mr. Bernard D. Gallaher:** — Mr. Speaker, in joining in the debate this afternoon I realize that it is my duty, as the hon. Member who just sat down has said, as

Thursday, March 2, 1961

a Member of the Opposition, to try to give constructive criticism on the budget to this Government. I believe that it is my duty to try to show this Government where they are spending money which they should not spend, and where they are not spending it when I think it should be spent. Also it is my duty to try to show them just where the province is heading under their direction.

I do not agree with the hon. Member from Regina City, when he said that he did not get constructive criticism from the financial critic on this side of the House yesterday afternoon. I believe that he did everything that he should have done. He tried to show the Government that they were wasting money in some instances, where they had led this province into debt, and that they could not do today the things that they should have been able to do if they had had good financial management during the past sixteen years.

Before I go on to say anything about this budget, I'd just like to comment on a remark made yesterday by the lady Member for Regina City when she was speaking about the Liberal Convention held last fall in Saskatoon. I believe she was quoting some new report. I don't know whether or not this report was all quoted, or whether it was quoted right or not, Mr. Speaker, but I will say this, that I had a lot more to say than what the newspaper said, at least than on report I had read. Because of the fact that I may differ with some of the Members of this Party, I see nothing wrong with that. After all, Liberals are supposed to think for themselves; they are not herded along as a bunch of sheep as our CCF friends are.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, to the lady Member for Regina City, I wish to remind her, that when we hold conventions, we don't close the

doors on the press. That is the very thing that happened at a CCF Convention in Swift Current just a few months ago. This, Mr. Speaker, is a tactic that is only used behind the Iron Curtain.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — The budget address which we were forced to listen to the other day was a far cry from the budget speeches of the former Provincial Treasurer for the past many years. Rather than boasting about the accomplishments of this Government and predicting a glorious future for Saskatchewan, we heard a budget address that was rather gloomy. No doubt, the Members of the other side of this House must miss their former Provincial Treasurer, if for no other reason than he seemed to be able to borrow them out of their financial troubles.

It seems significant to me, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has finally come to realize the fact that they are responsible for the dilemma in which they find themselves today. If they don't think they are responsible, at least they finally admitted that you can't go along forever with your socialist planning and get away with it. They are now seeing the light I hope.

No longer have they got a Federal Government in Ottawa to bail them out of their economic problems. I believe today that those socialists who cry about economic recession and depressions are ready to admit that they'd be better off in financing their socialist planning in this province when there is prosperity under a Liberal Government in Ottawa than under a recession or a depression under a Tory Government.

The attempt that this Government has made to find their way out of their financial troubles seems to me a sorry mess. I am not going to criticize the Government or the Provincial Treasurer, when it was announced that there would be an increase in liquor profits. I believe that if the Government finds that it is hard to get money, then there is nothing wrong with taxing liquor.

Thursday, March 2, 1961

After all, it is not a necessity and anybody who can afford to buy liquor can afford to help pay the Provincial Government costs.

But I will not say that about the increase in tax, or about the 5 cents boost in the diesel fuel tax. It would seem that the Minister is going to try to put the truckers off the highways in this province. Besides, discriminating against the truckers with weight restrictions, this Government is now going to further penalize them just at a time when our transportation industry finds itself in trouble. With the threat of increases in railway freight rates and the closing down of rail lines, it would seem only fair for this Government to try to help the truckers rather than add insult to injury.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member would pull his paper up, he could read better.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Can you not hear me, sir If you can't I will lend you my hearing-aid.

As for the increase in the gasoline tax, it just seems that every person in this province who drives a car, whether he be a farmer, a business-man, or worker is going to pay more for some of the wastefulness of this socialist Government.

The Minister stated that there would be cuts in some of the Departments of the Government, where cuts were not going to be felt in loss of services. Among the Departments he suggested, was the Department of Agriculture. Now, surely, Mr. Speaker, this Government that is supposed to be a friend of the farmers and has never spent a fair share in the Department of Agriculture, would not see fit to make a cut in this Department. There is an item in the Department of Agriculture of \$1,300,000 listed as a payment on the South Saskatchewan River Dam Project. That should never even have been put in with the agriculture estimates. It was put in there to make it look as though the Minister of Agriculture had some influence on the Provincial Treasurer and if they took that one item out of the expenditures for the Department of Agriculture, this year we would have only 3.68% of the entire budget spent in the Department of Agriculture. Now this is a paltry effort for a Government is a province, that is predominately agricultural, and a



Government that consists of a good many farmer M.L.A.'s, and a Government that pretends to be such a friend of the farmers. I would rather think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture would hang his head in shame. This is just another example of how our socialist friends are going to help the farmer out of their cost-price squeeze.

I noticed also that assistance for market grid-roads has been cut down from \$4,750,000 to \$4,338,000. Assistance for municipal bridges has been cut from \$475,000 to \$383,000. Market roads in local improvement districts has been reduced from \$160,000 to \$70,000. Equalization grants have been cut from \$756,160 to \$669,000. In all, the estimates for the Municipal Road Assistance Authority has been cut from \$7,129,460 to \$6,732,630. Yes, and at a time when more people are unemployed than ever before, and at a time when land taxes have become more like a rental than a tax. This is the very type of work that we should be expanding and not cutting, if this Government wants to help to ease the tax burden of the rural people and try to help the unemployed.

The same thing could be said, Mr. Speaker, about the delay in building the mental hospital in Yorkton. If this Government really wanted to relieve human suffering and really wanted to put the unemployed to work, these are the kind of projects that should be taken into consideration and done at this time.

Finally, there is one Department of this Government that would reduce its expenditures and still give better service than the service it is giving today. Here, I am referring to the Department of Social Welfare. It seems to me, According to the estimates for 1961-62, that this Government feels that there are going to be more people on relief in Saskatchewan next year than there were last year.

In view of the fact that the Department of Social Welfare costs about three times as much to administer in this province than the same Departments in other provinces, it would be only sensible to cut the costs of administration in this Department and add this sum to increase benefits to the needy of the province.

I would like to spend a few moments, Mr. Speaker, speaking on the debt of this province. I think the Member from Moosomin gave us a pretty fair picture of where this province is heading when he addressed this House, yesterday. He told us that this province was trying to borrow itself out of debt, that we are actually in a precarious situation

today. Regardless of what some of the Members across the way may say about self-liquidating debt, I am going to say this: When you borrow money on behalf of somebody else you are still responsible for that debt. Supposing the other person does not pay. Now, for an example, some of the Members on the other side of the House who happen to be farmers might borrow \$10,000 and promise to pay back \$1,000 a year out of the proceeds of that farm until the farm was paid for. Now, suppose they have a crop failure. They are still going to have to pay the \$1,000 and it is going to have to be borrowed somewhere. Regardless of what the Provincial Treasurer and these socialist experts tell us, every debt that has been contracted by this Government on behalf of the Corporations has to be paid for by the people of this province. It was suggested by the Provincial Treasurer that some of the frills would be cut off the expenditures.

It was also mentioned yesterday by the Member for Moosomin, and I fully agree with him, that there should never be frills in this Government. The people of this province can't afford to pay for frills.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — What frills?

**Mr. Gallagher:** — I would hope that this Government, rather than cutting necessary services, would cut some of the high paid planners they employ to make policies which cost the people of this province much more than they can afford to pay. I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we fire half of the civil servants of the province. Oh, no, my suggestion is that some of the needless boards, commissions, committees, and planners that have been part of this social scheme for the last 17 years, he got rid of.

I believe that the first place to start cutting down is right at the top and I am going to make a suggestion right here, Mr. Speaker, that the first thing this Government should do to save money is to fire the Minister of Industry and Information, because he has not got any industry into this province and most of the Information he has was CCF propaganda. The next to be fired is the Minister of Co-operatives, because there were co-operatives in this country long before there was a CCF Government in this province. The co-operatives movement was built down in the Maritimes before there was a CCF Party, and they didn't have a Department of Co-operatives to promote. This Government has set up a Department of Co-operatives to try to promote their philosophy and they've tried to fool the people in this

province into thinking that they are the people who are co-operative, because their name was Co-operative Commonwealth Federation.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to cut expenditures, we should start from the top down and the first thing to do is to get rid of these two Departments. The Department of Agriculture could handle everything, that the Minister of Co-operatives has to do. The only reason this Government has created these Departments is a reward for some of their faithful servants.

Some of these people across the way are getting quite a kick out of this. The hon. Minister of Health got quite a bang out of it the other day when I suggested that he didn't need to drive a Mercury car. What I actually meant was, it was his business to drive a Mercury car if he felt like driving a Mercury car, but it was the people's business if he was going to pay with their money for that car. The Minister of Mineral Resources drives a compact car and I believe the Attorney-General drives a compact car. If the Minister of Health chooses to drive in a Mercury car, then I suggest he put up the difference between the price of a Ford, or a Chevrolet and the car he wants. If he wants to drive in a Cadillac, that is his business, but it is the public's business to spend money on the car he is going to drive.

These are some of the ways, Mr. Speaker, that this Government could save money.

Now I want to make a few comments on some of the statements that have been made by some of the Members opposite. I didn't hear all that the Minister of Education had to say this afternoon or else I would say a lot more than I am going to say.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — It is ridiculous for people to say . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — I have the advantage over most of the Members opposite if I don't want to listen to them.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — . . . wait 48 hours . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

Thursday, March 2, 1961

**Mr. Gallagher:** — I can just turn the volume down on my hearing aid. I don't have to hear all the noise on the other side of the House.

I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that we hear a great deal from the other side of this House about what we didn't have before 1944 and what we have accumulated since. One of the gentlemen was talking the other day about power and I believe that we heard quite a bit about it today too, I had my hearing-aid turned down and I didn't hear too much about it, but anyway, I am going to say this. How many of the farmers on the other side of this House, could have afforded to pay the power bill back in the 1930's, let alone the \$500 that this CCF Government charges the farmers of this province? Not too many, no. But they are going to take the credit for the farmers being able to afford to pay \$500 after the Government was elected in 1944. We had a Liberal Government in this province between 1934-38, and the hon. gentlemen across should know, and they talk about the terrible times we had in that time.

I agree, we had a depression, but the people of this province thought enough of the Liberal Government in 1938 for the job they had done in keeping the farmers on their farm, by providing them with feed for their livestock, seed for their grain drills, and food and clothing for their families. They re-elected that Government in 1938. That was what the people of the province thought of that Government that came through that depression.

**Government Member:** — What did they think about in 1944?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — And then, some of the Members opposite suggested, between 1939 and 1944 we should have built power lines in this province. I am going to say this. We had a war on at that time and every available man and all available material was used to defeat another form of socialism across the ocean. We couldn't build power lines at that time but at the same time, when we were defeating socialism across the ocean, these gentlemen were getting their foot in the door of this province to form the Government in 1944.

One of the gentlemen mentioned that before the CCF was elected, if you got sick you just automatically died. Well, I'd like to say this, Mr. Speaker: I suffered

from tuberculosis in 1932 and 1933 and I didn't have to pay 5 cents and I did not die as you can see.

**Government Member:** — You never can tell.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Furthermore, before the CCF Government ever was elected, if they had read the history of this province and surely some of the Members opposite have, the province of Saskatchewan led the Dominion of Canada in health services before there was ever a socialist elected in this House. I think that the Member from Melville spent two hours trying to get this through their thick skins a few years ago and they still don't realize it.

**Government Member:** — He also spent two hours saying nothing.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — Can't you make a better case than that?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Just be patient! Now I mentioned a moment ago that between 1938 and 1944 we could not get power lines built in this province. We all came through that depression and we had a Liberal Government elected in Ottawa all the time from 1935 until 1957 and this we are all aware of. After we came through those years of depression some of them don't seem still to realize that the Federal Government passed legislation for the Prairie Farmers Assistance Act, the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act. The Family Allowance Act, Universal Old-Age Pension, Unemployment Insurance. All this social legislation was passed to help soften the chock of an economic depression and the lady Member from Regina takes credit today for her getting all this legislation through, or the CCF getting it all through.

Now, surely, Mr. Speaker, these people are not that ridiculous. This legislation was passed by a Liberal Government in Ottawa. We had a CCF Government in this province in 1944 and they took advantage of the best 10 years that this province has ever known. Not only to get a foot-hold in this province, but to build up a bureaucracy in this province, and the reason why they had the best 10 years that this province has ever known is because of the legislation that was put on the statute books of this country by a Liberal Government in Ottawa.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That is why the farmers went to Ottawa.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — I heard the Minister of Mineral Resources state the other day that when the Liberals were in power they did not have the money and they did not know where to get it. I can tell you that this Provincial Treasurer knows where to get it. The last Provincial Treasurer knows where to get it too. The people of Saskatchewan have a chain of debt hanging around their necks and they are going to have it for the next hundred years.

I guess that it should be quite apparent by now that I am not going to support the motion. Actually, I believe that the people of this province cannot afford to see this Government spending money uselessly. I think that at a time like this they cannot afford to have money squandered on socialist plans. At a time like this they expect that the Provincial Treasurer should provide money for public works. I see in the estimates here, that the public works are cut down. They talk about unemployment. This is where they could help the unemployed. But, more than anything else, the reason why I am not going to support this motion is because it has mortgaged not only the younger generation of this province, it has mortgaged the future of people who are yet unborn.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Amen!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Mr. Speaker, I have read a good deal about socialism and I might have even been a socialist; it was a good thing that I was too young to vote in 1944 or I might have made the same mistake a lot of other people made. I have heard a lot of definitions of the word socialism in the last few days. In my way of thinking, a socialist is not only a person who has tried to be a capitalist and has failed, but first, to my way of thinking, after reading a good many socialist books, (one of them is this book that I showed you here a week or so ago, 'Left Turn Canada' by M.J. Coldwell), a socialist seems to be a person who is covetous of anything that anybody works for. He is the kind of person who does not want to provide for his own security.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — If you don't pervert the sense of understanding.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — I know that the truth does not appeal to a good many of those people across the way.

**An Hon. Member:** — That figures . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — When you read some of these socialist books, Mr. Speaker, you would really think that these socialist are interested in people and I believe they are interested in people, but they are not interested in individual people, because under socialism a person means no more than a number. They are interested in people as a body, or in the masses, and socialism has a far-reaching effect on the individual in a socialist state and it matters not whether it's CCF socialism, Fascism, Social Democrat, or Communism. Under socialism, private initiative is destroyed, ambition is killed, individualism is forgotten and people tend to lean on the Government for their very existence and that, Mr. Speaker, is why I am not a socialist.

I was taught, when I was a boy, that society does not owe me a living. Some of these people across the way seem to think that society does owe them a living. I believe that a Government's function is to provide the means to that a man can provide his own security for the under-privileged.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Come over here.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — But under socialism everybody becomes a ward of the state and I am going to read you a passage from an article that is written by a person who has been a socialist, one who has possibly gone a lot higher in socialism than some of the gentlemen across the way. Here's what he said . . . they way are getting quite a kick out of this. This man had guts enough to get up and get out of it, when he thought that he was doing the wrong thing.

I'm going to quote from a speech by Lord Melverdun at the time of his resignation as a socialist peer from the British Labour Party in the House of Lords of 1949 and he said this and I quote:

“I was born free, and have spent the bulk of my life in teaching what freedom means . . . I am very loth, at the time of my life, to reverse this process, and to try to sell the advantages of slavery to a people who were once free . . . The road on which this Socialist government are travelling leads to a precipice at the foot of which emerges the totalitarian state.

I speak for thousands of independent thinkers who voted socialist at the last election who had a keen desire to see social justice, but who are now beginning to think as I do, that such measures as the Steel Nationalization Bill would destroy the only possible basis of social justice.”

That, Mr. Speaker, is what the budget that was delivered the other day promises to the people of this province. As a Member of the Opposition I feel that it is my duty to let this Government know what the people of this province think, of what they are getting them into. They can talk all they like about security and the same goes for the Member for Regina City. I believe that the people of this province want more than the security that is offered to a dog or a Russian slave. I will not support the motion, I will support the amendment.

**Mr. Robert Perkins:** — Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that I have had occasion to rise in this Assembly. I would like to add my congratulations to those who have spoken before me on your appointment to the office of Speaker in this House. Also, at the same time, I would like to pledge you my co-operation in helping to carry on the high tone and decorum that you have been carrying on up until now.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, with your permission, belatedly to record sympathy to the Prime Minister of Canada and his family in the loss that they suffered last week in the death of the Prime Minister's mother. As you know, the Constituency of Nipawin comprises a large part of the Prime Minister's Constituency and I am sure that my constituents would wish me to mention this and to convey their sympathy to the Prime Minister.

I notice that it is the practice to thank the electorate of the Constituencies from which the different Members come, for their election to office. I would like to do this at this time and thank the constituents who saw fit to elect me to represent them here in Regina. I am one of the ones who, like the hon. Leader of the Opposition, just barely managed to squeeze through by a little over one hundred votes and I wish to say now, that we had a very substantial contest in that Constituency. We had



the sitting Member who represented the Social Credit in this House the last sitting, and also a Liberal candidate who is mayor of the largest town in the Constituency. Both excellent gentlemen, both put up a good, fair fight and I think the fact that I am here is a credit to the part that was done by the C.C.F. people in that Constituency and also by the people who showed their confidence in the administration of this Government.

I have to say, however, in this regard, that the opposition that was put up in the last few weeks of the campaign, one of the doctors to the proposed medical scheme and the other, a good many times untrue, and unfounded, charges that were made against this Government by the Opposition. I am not blaming either one of the local candidates for this.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to spend a few minutes, I see that I have only a few minutes, in support of the budget brought in by the Provincial Treasurer. I had made up my mind before I came down here, that I would try and refrain from mentioning a thing, that I think has been mentioned too often, that is the Opposition. I have sat back at home and listened to this radio broadcast for many years and I have thought that there was too much carping criticism, probably on both sides of the House, against individuals from the opposite side of the House. It seems to me that we sometimes on both sides, departed from criticism of policies and get down to things that were very nearly personal.

Now that I am here and have listened to the type of opposition that has come from across this Chamber, I must admit that it is exceptionally hard to refrain from being personal or being critical.

During the speech yesterday by the hon. Member from Moosomin, I made some notes. I would like to refer to a few of them and I will try not to do it in a personal way. It lines up with those who have spoken on the Government side this afternoon, and while all this criticism has been going on, there has been little or no suggestion of what the Opposition would do, if they were placed in the same position. Outside of one resolution that has come up regarding the burning of purple gas in the farmer's truck, outside of that and lopping off the few Ministers as proposed a short time ago, I have not found one suggestion. I have to agree with a lot of things which the Opposition have brought up especially the

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Member of Melville and one or two others, where they emphasized the seriousness of the drift of the farmers from the farms. I have to along with them, but I always have to ask myself the question, "What would you gentlemen do in the same position?" So far I am waiting to hear. There has been mention made of benefits that would be forthcoming, but in no case were we told where would the money come from.

The hon. Member from Moosomin, early in his speech made comparison with the Government in 1943, before the C.C.F. came into power in Saskatchewan. He mentioned the difference in the income to what it is now, but he made no mention of what we are getting for our money now and what we were getting for our money then. He made no mention of the public revenues tax then, that had been collected from the municipalities in the province and which under no manipulation of figures could it be shown that any, except for very small parts, was put back into the municipalities.

I have to say, that there is one statement in his talk, that was especially used during the election campaign and that was this thing of what the people would find out when they went to pay their taxes, giving the impression over the air, unfortunately, that people, when they come in to pay their taxes, into the town office of the municipality, are paying something to the provincial government. This is not only a half truth, it is a 100% wrong. No dollar of taxes, when we go in to pay the municipal taxes, is collected by the provincial government.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I have no desire to interrupt the hon. Member.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is this a point of privilege?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Yes, the statement he made is not true and if he will read it from the official record from the House, he will find that I never said that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If you care to make a correction . . .

**Mr. Perkins:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, what I was intending to say was that the inference is and was, that some of these taxes went to Regina.

**Mr. McDonald:** — There is no such a thing.

**Mr. Perkins:** — . . . some part of these taxes . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — This is a deliberate lie.

**Mr. Perkins:** — . . . I agree, it was a deliberate lie, you put the words in my mouth, the hon. Member . . . No part these taxes are paid to the Provincial Government.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — I ask the hon. Member to withdraw the statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Who was it concerning on a point of privilege? Some Member of the Legislature?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Myself.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Are you being quoted? Is the hon. Member quoting the Member from Moosomin?

**Mr. Perkins:** — I was maintaining that the inference given . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — By whom?

**Mr. Perkins:** — By the hon. Member, and by people during the election campaign, who belong to the same party. It is my opinion. These taxes that we pay when we go into the municipal office in the fall, are all used for municipal purposes.

The hon. Member from Moosomin also outlined the fact that when this Government came into power, they found \$7 million lying ready to spend. I don't know how true that figure is, but I know that in an organization that it could quite easily be, whenever a Government leaves power, that large sums of money could have come in during the two or three weeks, or two or three months preceding that date and it could run into millions. It could be that a week later the fund is gone. I think that the figure of \$7 million was used and if it was, it needed no explanation. He forgot to mention the fact that at the same time this Government came

Thursday, March 2, 1961

into power, they acquired the debt in payments of roads, public buildings and so on that had been built by the previous government.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Perkins:** — When I say this Government, I mean the Government, that was in power at that time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I might point out, that the hon. Member is making his maiden speech in the House and I think that all the House should support the hon. Member.

**Mr. Perkins:** — I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am a new Member and it is a fact that I have not much experience in public speaking of any kind and I think it would have been more fair in outlining this that there was a fair amount of money here for this Government to spend, when they came into power; there was also a gigantic debt, that has been incurred for an capital expenditures in this province by the preceding Government.

There was also mention made of the advertising that has been done in 'The Commonwealth'. This is quite likely a fact. I don't think it can be denied that service was given for the expenditures as much and the same as it was to the 'Leader-Post', the same as it was in the 'Western Producer'.

The Members who have spoken before me have referred also to this debt of the telephone and the power and the fact that it is a provincial debt. Of course it is a provincial debt. No one is trying to deny the fact that the telephone and the power bills must pay this debt, I think that is justified. What is the matter with that? What is the matter with the people, who are using the power, paying that debt?

The hon. Member for Moosomin also complained about the large sums of money that we have received from Ottawa and also neglected to mention the fact that before this money came from Ottawa, it had to be extracted from the pockets of the people of this province. There is nothing that the Federal Government is giving up. It was money that was first earned in this province, paid to eastern interests and collected from them by the Federal Government and this is our right, not a gift.

**Government Member:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — I feel that we on this side of the House have no right to criticize or to set up the rule of what the Opposition should be. Certainly I can myself sit back here quietly and welcome the criticism that appears to be aimed at what the hon. Members think is mis-spending money and putting money where they think it unwise, and pointing out that it would be better to spend it somewhere else. I think that is justifiable criticism, even if it is bitter, even if it is hard to swallow. I think myself, the rule of the Opposition should be, as far as possible, to search and criticize and look for figures under the carpet, or skeletons in the closet, I think that is their proper right and I want to say that the Member for Arm River, is an expert in this respect. Both in committees and in this House, he certainly is looking for something crooked on behalf of every Member of the Government.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — I read not long ago that a successful politician is one who can sit on the fence and keep both ears on the ground and judging by the nimble footwork of the Leader of the Opposition and some of the others, I have to say that they are successful politicians.

I just want to say a word or two, Mr. Speaker, in regard to three or four things in the budget, and I want to mention details as my colleagues just shortly before me have done.

I want to mention this from the standpoint of the farmers out in the country as well as the small towns and villages, their opinions and their feelings regarding some of the things that are proposed in this budget and also some of the things that this Government has accomplished during its term of office.

I wish to mention this accomplishment of the installation of power. I live in a Constituency that is only a little over a half improved farm land. The balance of it is timber country, homestead country recently, and good percentage of

leased land. Many farmers living out on the lonely hills and bush land are trying to make ends meet. I wish to record the transformation that has taken place in these outlying areas in these lonely farmsteads of the north by the installation of power in the country. You drive out through these miles and miles and you wouldn't think there was sufficient population to justify it and you see that one power wire, bringing to the people, if they can afford it, every convenience you have here in Regina. I think that if for no other thing, this Government deserves high praise for that accomplishment.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — I want to record the gratitude of the people of the two largest towns in my Constituency for the installation of natural gas last summer. I refer to the town of Nipawin, which has the largest number of installations found in the province in last summer's program and also the town of Carrot River. Even Members on this side of the House find that we have to hesitate when we come down here and see that we don't praise the Government too highly. Because most of us have plans in our minds, more small settlements, I wish to say that in those two towns where natural gas was installed during last summer the gratitude of the people in those two communities is apparent.

Another thing I want to refer to is the grid roads program, and the difference it has made in the rural living. When I am talking about rural living, I am pleading for it on the same basis that several of the Members of this side of the House have, and also several from the other side, and I try to accentuate the importance of building a solid base under our total economy. It is my pleasure that here I differ with one of the former speakers when they say that we cannot stand up and talk as individuals. I so far have not had my knuckles rapped and I have said it quite often and on this side of the House. There is no compulsion, none of this blanketing that the Members opposite seem to think, on our side.

This network of grid roads, that has been built across Saskatchewan in the last six or eight years, has transformed rural living. It has brought

people closer and closer to the modern conveniences which we all want to enjoy today. In the Constituency where I come from we already have a fair network of grid roads and with another three or four years of this program, we will have a network of roads in our Constituency that will allow every resident to be within at least three miles of a gravel-topped road. This is an amazing thing in a Constituency that even ten or twelve years ago, had little but clay roads. The one thing that I would like to mention just now, is a subject that has been talked about in committees, and that was the traffic counts that were made on the roads in this province. Some statement was made by one of the Members in that committee, that these traffic counts did not count anymore.

I thought that it should have been pointed out, and I wish to point it out now, that at one time, when this Government started assistance on grid road programs, these traffic counts did count and that is especially on the north and south roads. There were no blacktop roads to count, so the traffic couldn't go around 20 or 30 miles in order to get a blacktop road. I think that this system of these traffic counts to decide where to put either oil surface or blacktop surfaces, is one that gives a fair indication of where to spend the money to establish improvements.

I want to mention also the program that is mentioned in this budget, the installation of water and sewer on the farms in the small districts of this province. I know it has been mentioned a number of times, but it seems to me that with the installation of sewer and water in our farm homes, villages, and small towns which do not have these conveniences that we will have gone a long way to arrest the flow and the drainage of farm people from the farms. I certainly wish to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture on the program that he has set up whereby people can get assistance to bring these modern conveniences to the farmers' homes.

I want to mention just a word about health and welfare and especially I want to mention about a Government prepaid medical care plan. I think no more than mention is made in the budget. This plan, I think, has been kicked around to the detriment of the people of this province. These cries of regimentation, bureaucracy, socialism and doctor-patient relationship are all misnomers. They mean

Thursday, March 2, 1961

everything to every person.

To me, the people of my Constituency and the people of this province that this. They want a program, whereby they can go in at the first of the year and pay a fee, that will guarantee that their family, no matter what the nature of sickness, will be taken care of during the year. They want that for anyone in the province, regardless of the fact of whether he is rich or poor. They want something similar to what we have in the air ambulance scheme. Only once we needed this in our own family, (just a personal reference, Mr. Speaker) we needed this service and I cannot help but repeat here that we had a boy lying in the local hospital with a broken shoulder and the doctor thought that we should ring him to the hospital in Regina. The next day the plane landed picked up the boy, and one hour and twenty-five minutes from when the plane left Nipawin, it landed at the airport here in Regina. Ten minutes later the ambulance had him into the Grey Nuns' Hospital and a nurse was standing there, waiting. Not until that time did the people for whom the Government sent this plane to get this patent, not until that time, until about a month later, did they know whether I was a prince or a pauper. Money was not mentioned until we got out of the ambulance plane, I signed it and that was it. A month later I got a bill for \$35.00. I think that is a wonderful scheme.

Something the same it what we want in medical care. Forget about all these other things of forcing the doctors into this thing. What difference is it to my doctor when I walk into his office? ) By the way he agrees with it, he is one of the ones that sees our demands in this question). What does it matter to him if I call on the doctor and run a bill from \$10 or \$15, whether he sends the bill to me or to the Provincial Government?

This is all we want, this is the simple desire of the people of Saskatchewan. This is the reason why a lot of people who had formerly called themselves Liberals or Conservatives in this province, marked their ballots for a C.C.F. candidate, because they want some scheme of this kind.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — I think, that I have quite a few more notes



here and I was only informed at noon that I was supposed to talk for a short time and I know that I am not making a very good job at this . . .

**Government Members:** — Quite a good job.

**Mr. Perkins:** — These speeches that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member from Yorkton, regarding this thing called socialism. This, I think, like capitalism, is being mis-stated. What is the sense in you people across the House saying that we believe in Hitler's or Stalin's socialism. You know that that is wrong. None of us want this, none of us, true Canadian people, no one that I have ever seen, wants this form of secret police and all these things. What is the sense of talking like that? To me it seems ridiculous. The same thing is true of capitalism. We all admit that when a person opens a business, that he has to have a margin, which is called a profit, none of us denies that. I don't know if anybody did or not, but I certainly did not. We know that every person, when they get a job they want a job that will pay them enough to give them a living and if they are self-reliant people want to lay aside enough that they won't starve in their old age. We all agree on these things. It seems to me, that we should regard the human element in our society more important than the economic or the financial aspect.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — To put it more strictly, that people are more important than money. I think that states our attitude.

What a socialist has been asked in this House several times. I would like to think of it in the words that I believe came from the lips of the beloved founder of this movement, the late Hon. J.S. Woodsworth. What is a socialist? "A socialist is he who having ears to hear, and eyes to see, is neither blind nor deaf when he rough-shod treads down the privileges and rights which God means for all men!" I like to think that is the proper definition of socialism.

I would like to, just in closing, Mr. Speaker, move from there to the mention of this proposition of a New Party. I think that there is

Thursday, March 2, 1961

a place in Canada today for the formation or the continuation of a party, which will embrace people from all parts of life, who believe in the definition that I gave of socialism and this question of farmer-labour co-operation. We realize that there are problems to be solved. We realize that this idea has to be sold by labour to farmer, and by farmer to labour and we have strong grounds upon which to settle. While some of our differences may look at the present time to be great, we have to admit that we have the same objectives. I have yet to meet a farmer or a labourer, who will not agree to that statement.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would thank you for your kindness in allowing me to wander all over the place and I would also like again to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer and express the full confidence we have in him, in bringing in this budget and outline the affairs of this province, so that this province may continue to prosper at a reasonable and progressive rate.

**Mr. J.R. Barrie:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I have listened with interest to the various addresses made here this afternoon and particularly to the last speaker, the hon. Member from Nipawin. As this is his first speech in the House, and I went through that experience four years ago, I want to compliment him on the remarks he made, particularly in connection with socialism. This is only my personal opinion, but I can't conceive of the gentleman from Nipawin being a socialist, such as other socialist I know. I am afraid he is far removed from that area.

There seems to be quite a bit of confusion in this House in the interpretation of socialism. Everyone is entitled to his opinion, but as far as I am concerned, socialism and social services are two entirely different things.

The hon. lady Member from Regina apparently considered them the same thing. She is entitled to that opinion. But I want to say to the hon. Member from Nipawin who stated all socialists thought the same as he did, that during my acquaintance with certain individuals not too far removed from here, Mr. Speaker, I find their ideals and their actions

and their objectives are quite different to what he expressed as his. These are the type of socialists, that we as Liberals and free democrats fear, and it is with good reason we fear these people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention a few remarks that have been made by the hon. lady Member from Regina. I don't criticize her for making these remarks about the people of Regina, or the city of Regina receiving a new Court House, or receiving a \$6 million or more power building, but I noticed she said that when these large public buildings are completed, and I stand to be corrected if I am wrong, we will be looking for more of such assistance.

Now, I am from a rural seat, a representative of a rural Constituency in this province and I think this Government has fallen over backwards in building up the urban centres in the province, particularly the city of Regina.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — When we see the concentration of buildings, the concentration of employees, the concentration that has taken place, particularly in the city of Regina, it does not give much comfort to those people in the rural areas of the province and I, for one, take exception to the emphasis that has been placed by this Government on erecting buildings, luxurious buildings to say the least. I want to say something about this later on in my address, concentrating all this into this city. It is fine for the people of the city of Regina. I don't blame the hon. Member for congratulating the Government, because she said the same thing for the people who elected her. I want to say once again that I take exception to the concentration of power, employees and of building construction that has taken place to the detriment of the small rural centres and the rural parts of the province.

We, the people in the north-east section of the province, take particular exception to this, when a very small outlay compared to what the power building or new Court House cost, had to be shelved or put to one side. This would have given a great deal of comfort to relatives and at the same time provided the service to unfortunate people, who have mental illness. I refer to the mental hospital in

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Yorkton. If they can do this in one place, surely it was not so necessary to curtail the building in Yorkton.

I was very pleased that the hon. Member from Regina gave the Liberal Government a good deal of credit when she said the unemployment insurance was something which was a great assistance under current conditions as they exist. I congratulate her for giving us this credit, because so many times we hear people, particularly those on the opposite side, try to take credit for many of the things, which were brought down by a Liberal Government in the Federal House of Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The debate was adjourned on motion of Mr. Barrie.

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

The Assembly met at 7:30 o'clock p.m.

#### **STATEMENT BY SPEAKER**

Since assuming the office of Speaker of this Legislature I have become more and more convinced that one of my most important duties with regard to regulating debate, is to ensure to an hon. Member who has the floor his right to make an uninterrupted speech.

The authorities all agree on this point, and I would cite Beauchesne, Fourth Edition, citation 126 (1) which reads in part as follows:

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

However, if a Member speaking wishes to allow an interruption of this sort he signifies his consent by sitting down.

These practices in no way limit the right of any Member to interrupt a speech on a bona fide

point of order or privilege. Indeed, the rule is equally clear in requiring a question of privilege to be raised at the earliest possible opportunity.

It is obvious, then that Hon. Members should understand and accept what is and what is not a point of privilege. Campion, on pages 47-48 of his *An Introduction to the Procedure of the House of Commons*, First Edition, classifies privilege under three headings: (1) Disrespect to a Member such a attempts to threaten or intimidate him; (2) Disrespect to the House collectively, and (3) Disobedience to the Orders of the House or interference with their execution.

In addition, Beauchesne, Fourth Edition, citation 113, points out that many “so-called ‘questions of privilege’” are really personal explanations, and he goes on to say that “a dispute arising between two members as to allegations of facts, does not fulfil the conditions of parliamentary privilege.”

Again, Bourinot, Fourth Edition, p. 354, in discussing matters that may be raised on the Orders of the Day, points out that:

“It is a practice sanctioned by usage but not by any positive rule, for members – to make personal explanations – when the orders of the day are called. They make them in reference to an inaccurate report of their speeches in the official record, or in the newspapers; or in denial of certain charges made against them in the public prints; or in reference to certain remarks which have been misunderstood on a previous occasion, and which they had not before had an opportunity of explaining - . But these remarks are not allowable on the ground of privilege, unless the conduct of a member as such is attacked, and in that case a motion should be formally proposed.”

Further, on p. 304, Bourinot says:

“Members sometimes correct reports of their speeches, or inaccurate statements in the press on the ground of privilege, but these are personal explanations, not matters of privilege, and are allowed only by the indulgence of the House.”

Thursday, March 2, 1961

Thus we come to the rules regarding personal explanations. Bourinot's Fourth Edition, p. 350 ff., is again of some assistance here, for he points out that the House will generally allow a Member who has already spoke in a debate to make a personal explanation if he "conceives himself to have been misunderstood in some material part of his speech," but he goes on to say that "a member cannot for the purpose of explanation interrupt another member who has the floor."

Bourinot goes further and says on p. 351 that:

"The indulgence of the House will also be given to – ministers of the Crown when it is necessary to place the House in full possession of all the facts and arguments necessary to give a full understanding of a question or to explanations in refutation of statements injuriously affecting the conduct of important public functionaries."

Again, Bourinot points out that in the same place that:

"The House in all cases of personal explanation will frequently "Waive a rigid adherence to established usage" especially when the public conduct of a member is involved."

As to the proper time for such explanations I would like to quote May's Parliamentary Practice, Sixteenth Edition, pp. 448-9:

"The proper time for explanation is at the conclusion of the speech that calls for it; but it is common practice for the Member desiring to explain to rise immediately the statement is made to which his explanation is directed, when if the Member in possession of the House gives way and resumes his seat, the explanation is at once received, but the explanation cannot then be offered, if the Member who is speaking declines to give way."

It thus becomes clear that the rules and practice of the House allow certain corrections and explanations to be made, but these cannot be raised on questions of privilege and must not be raised so as to interrupt a Member speaking if he does not wish to give way, or so as to allow the Member

making the explanation to enter or re-enter the debate on a purely argumentative basis.

I might go on to express my opinion that the orderly refutation of argument in debate is far more effective, and much less time –consuming, than any number of disorderly interruptions.

I would assure the House that, with the help of hon. Members, I shall do all in my power first to protect the rights of Members speaking, second, to provide the opportunity to members to make orderly explanations, and third, to prevent such explanations from straying beyond the bounds of fact within the personal knowledge of the Member concerned.

Finally, I would remind all hon. Members that in the very best traditions of British parliaments, all rules and procedures function more effectively when applied with the understanding and co-operation of the individuals concerned, and I would add the hope that I shall be able to benefit from the experience of Members as occasion arises.

Thank you for your consideration.

#### **RE TURTLEFORD BY-ELECTION**

**Mr. W. Ross Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House, just for a second, I would like to ask the Premier whether it would be possible under the rules tonight to bring this Turtleford Bill in or do we have to wait until later? I am sure I am not acquainted with the rules, but we would hope it might come in tonight.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, once we get to Government Orders, then of course we can call any item on the Order Paper. This is Private Members' Day and as the hon. Members will understand, Private Members' resolutions have priority. Once we get to Government Orders, we can call anything we want, I had in mind to call Committee of the Whole sometime tonight.

#### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on

Thursday, March 2, 1961

the motion of Hon. Mr. Nollet, that **Bill No. 2 – An Act to amend the Water Rights Act** – be now read the second time.

**Mrs. Batten:** — I have several questions that I wanted to ask, and I think that this could probably be better done in committee, rather than have it done at this time.

The question being put it was agreed to.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Erb, that Bill No. 17 – An Act for the Protection of the Health of Persons exposed to Ionizing Radiation emitted by Certain Radiation Equipment – be now read the second time.

**Mr. W. Ross Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, since this Bill was last before the House, I had a chance to read it, that is about all, but I cannot find anything wrong with it. So as far as I am concerned, we are quite willing to see it proceeded with.

The question being put it was agreed to.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Willis, that Bill No. 18 – An Act respecting the Department of Highways and Transportation – be now read the second time.

**Mr. W. Ross Thatcher:** — The same, Mr. Speaker, would apply to this Bill, we would be glad to see second reading of this Bill tonight.

The question being put it was agreed to.



The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Douglas, that Bill No. 8 – An Act to amend the Liquor Act, 1960 – be now read the second time.

**Mr. W. Ross Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, on this Bill there are a few points, that we are not clear on, but once again we could get the information we want better in Committee.

The question being put it was agreed to.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Douglas, that Bill No. 9 – An Act to amend The Liquor Act, 1959 – be now read the second time.

**Mr. W. Ross Thatcher:** — The same would apply to this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

The question being put it was agreed to.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Walker, that Bill No. 14 – An Act to amend The Commercial Agents Act 1958 – be now read the second time.

**Mr. L.P. Coderre:** — Mr. Speaker, in looking that Bill over, I realized that the point I had to bring up, would be discussed better in third reading and amendments made thereto.

The question being put it was agreed to.

## SECOND READINGS

### **Bill No. 29 – An Act to amend The Pure Bred Sire Areas Act**

Thursday, March 2, 1961

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, the amendment made necessary as a result of The Horse Breeders Act and The Pure Bred Sire Areas Act would be with reference to the stallions enrolled under The Horse Breeders Act. With this explanation, Mr. Speaker, I now move second reading.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, would that mean, in the way I figure it, that this amendment would allow these farmers in the municipalities to keep an unregistered breed or an unregistered . . . ?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — No, the only requirement needed, would be with reference to stallions enrolled under The Horse Breeders Act. The Horse Breeders Act reveals and it is necessary to have those words in The Pure Bred Sire Areas Act, but stallions would still have to be registered under the Association.

The question being put it was agreed to.

Bill No. 30 – An Act to repeal The Horse Breeders Act.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, the explanation here is simple, it is the repeal of The Horse Breeders Act. It is found, that the Act does not serve any real purpose anymore. Alberta repealed their Horse Breeders Act about nine or ten years ago; Manitoba repealed theirs about two years ago. The repeal of this Act does not mean, however, that any programs will be dropped that are associated with horse improvements. We will still have the usual competition and prices and they will still be required to be registered to the Breeders Association involved. With this explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

**Mr. James E. Snedker:** — Mr. Speaker, in regard to the repeal of this Act I wish to say that while I agree with the Minister of Agriculture regarding the necessity of repealing certain sections in order to save the Government money, which I believe is the sum of \$2,358.21 annually; and while I agree with such sum can and should be saved, I would draw to the attention of Members of this House that there are certain sections in this Act, such as those which guarantee to the owner of a stallion the right of legal procedure which he may use in order to sue or to recover money that might be owing to him by reason of his ownership of such an animal, which should be retained.

I personally don't think that those sections of the Act should be repealed. I have here the Act in my hand and I would suggest that section 2, sub-section 2 to 0 be retained. The balance of the Act struck out with the exception of section 19, sub-section 1 and 2 and sections 20-30 inclusive, and I think the Minister will understand what I am referring to.

I don't think it is necessary for me to go into any length or detail. Those sections cover the necessary legal procedure, which the owner of a stallion may go through and gives him some general protection, rather more than is normally given to people of this province to whom money is owed in other businesses, such as a lien on a colt up to a certain age, right of seizure, right of sale and so on. I would suggest that those sections might be well retained, including sections 20, 21, 22 and 23. It is my suggestion that they be retained in the Act in order to give anybody who owns a stallion in the province the necessary protection which I think he deserves and should have. I would also draw to the attention of the hon. Members of this House that whereas horse breeding has been in a very serious decline over the past twenty years. It is now showing signs of renewed vigor and life. We have had numerous fresh animals brought into the province recently and some of us are very happy to see more well bred stock brought here.

I don't think that the time has come when we can entirely do without horses on all our farms. There has been a renewed interest during the last

Thursday, March 2, 1961

two years in the raising of colts, and I think we should continue to give protection to those people who invest their money and bring good, well-bred animals to the province and that we should accord to them the necessary protection implied in those sections of the Act which I have mentioned.

Now we can do that without it costing the Government a five-cent piece. All that is necessary is to repeal those sections of the act which will entail the expenditure of money by the Government and retain those sections of the Act which give protection and added legal rights to the owners of having retained are those which do not entail any expenditure of provincial funds. If the entire Act is thrown out holus bolus, it will save the province money. But it will also work a hardship on and be unfair to our stallioners and tend to discourage the import of fine horses into our province and the production of better and finer colts.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated my thoughts and suggestions in the matter. I will move the necessary amendments when the Bill goes into Committee.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the matter of an amendment naturally would be discussed in Committee, certainly I have no objectives at all to anyone proposing an amendment or retaining some provisions, but the question is this: Do we want to go through the trouble of having a particular Act just to cover a matter of relief? Perhaps we ought to think about this kind of provision in some other kind of legislation.

The same rights could be demanded by a person who owns a pure bred sire, a good animal, and this sort of thing. This has been discussed, but we will give consideration to it, but I think it ought to be in some other legislation. I don't think we should have a Horse Breeders Act, specifically for that alone.

**Premier Douglas:** — This is a matter of principle. The Committee may modify it and then he can put in some sections. This appeal has to be given consent by the Hon. Lieutenant Governor.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, do you have a question?

**Mr. Snedker:** — If I might direct a question to the hon. Member from Cutknife, I would like to ask him, I think he made the suggestion, if I heard him correctly, that the sections which I proposed, should be retained and might be incorporated in some other Act. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That is one possibility that we might consider when the Bill is in Committee.

**Mr. Snedker:** — And in what other Act might they be incorporated?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I could not suggest, there are a number of other Acts, that might be looked at in this regard.

The question being put it was agreed to.

### THIRD READING

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Douglas, that **Bill No. 32 – An Act respecting a Certain election in the Constituency of Turtleford** – be now read the third time.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to propose to the House at this time, and I would like to say that I am opposed to the passing of Bill No. 32, at this time, and I would like to give the reason therefore. Firstly, perusing the records of the legislature of this province since the inception of the Provincial Government, I find that there were only two cases where by-elections were held during the sitting of the House. One was that of the election of Howard McConnel on January 21st, 1927, in which the Session commenced . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Is the hon. Member discussing the principle of this Bill or is he discussing the contents of the Bill.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I just want to mention this

in leading up to why I am introducing this amendment. The other election was that of Hugh James Maynard, whose election is reported to have been February 8, 1950, under similar circumstances, Mr. Speaker. In neither case did they pass any special legislation to seat these Members and therefore it appears to me that the passing of Bill 32 at this time would be an unfortunate precedent.

It seems to me that we should be concerned not as to whether we should want to do or be courteous to the Opposition Members or to the Opposition, but that we should consider our duty or prerogative to the public, whom we are representing in this House. We should consider the purposes of a Government. This is a precedent and at no time in this province's history has it been necessary to make exceptions to the Election Act or any other Act in this way. Mr. Speaker, if this Legislature had intended that such a provision should be in the law books of this province, then there would have been some provision made, either in The Election Act or in the Legislative Assembly Act. This was not done in this province and for that matter. I'm not aware of such a Bill being passed elsewhere. I am sure that many Saskatchewan people will agree with me, even though they . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! It may be that the hon. Member is discussing the principle rather than the contents of this Bill, but it seems to me that he is discussing the principle. This is third reading the contents of this Bill . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that that may be so. But I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that there has been some misunderstanding and I thought — I just want to make my position clear at this time. I had desired to have spoken on second reading and I thought at this time I could submit the whole picture of why I submit this amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I realize, that it should have been on a second reading, but I cannot see any special privilege of a Member who desires —

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I think he should.

**Mr. Speaker:** — He has to stick to the contents of the Bill.

**Mr. Bereowsky:** — I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, as far as the contents of the Bill are concerned, it is my opinion, and the opinion of my seconder that this Bill is not very clear, it contravenes some of the other Acts, and I feel that there are provisions in The Election Act and in other Acts in the province, which could take care of situations like this and that is the reason for the objections, which I bring in.

However, it is very difficult not to discuss the principle you have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, and so I submit the motion, moved by myself and second by Mr. Thibault: That the word “new” be deleted and the words “this day six months” be added at the end of the question.

The question being put on the proposed amendment, it was negatived.

The Question put on the main motion it was agreed to.

The said Bill No. 32 was then read the third time and passed.

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