

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fourteenth Legislature
36th Day

Thursday, March 30, 1961.

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

On the Orders of the Day:

CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of this House to page 2 of the Leader Post, which shows John Grant, and his grand champion Aberdeen Angus Bull, from northwestern Saskatchewan, Edam, Saskatchewan. On behalf of myself and the hon. Member for Redberry I would like to tender congratulations to this gentleman. The Premier will be pleased that both Mr. Grant, and the Aberdeen Angus are products originally from Scotland. The family came from Scotland and settled in Northwestern Saskatchewan, in the Edam area, many years ago and have been raising Aberdeen Angus for some forty years, and I think, besides bringing honour to Saskatchewan last year at Toronto Royal, young John Grant certainly deserves a great deal of congratulation for his most recent success. It is a pleasure, I know, to buy a grand champion, but it doesn't happen too often in a stockman's life, where he actually brings forth a grand champion of his own in one of our major shows, and we heartily congratulate him on his efforts in this industry.

TRIBUTE TO TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):

Mr. Speaker, as this is a special month in a special year for many people of Ukrainian origin, I would ask the indulgence of the House to perform a

March 30, 1961

duty by honouring and remembering Taras Shevchenko, the great artist, poet, and champion of freedom, beloved by over 45 million people of Ukrainian origin now living in many countries of the world, including Canada and the United States. Taras Shevchenko was born in 1814, in a village near Kiev in the Ukraine, and he died in a foreign country, in St. Petersburg, in 1861. This year is the centenary of his death.

He was born a serf slave on a Polish estate near Kiev and he was orphaned as a child. He began painting while still a youth, and as a young man of twenty-four attracted the attention of a celebrated artist by the name of Brylov, who agreed to paint and raffle a portrait which the Czar's family bought for the sum, I think, of 2500 rubles, and which was turned over to Shevchenko's master, Englehardt, thus freeing this poet-artist from bondage.

Shevchenko was first of all an artist, whose some six hundred paintings, etchings, and engravings have enriched the art galleries of Europe and are considered as the beginning of critical realism in Ukrainian art. Yet, more important, his ideas of life and protest against the Czar's persecution is depicted in his art works. I think probably, the picture, "The Parable of the Prodigal Son," is the summit of this art. Secondly, this brilliant, creative artist-poet brought the expressive and rich Ukrainian language back into the family of contemporary languages by his literary works. But Taras Shevchenko is known best for his poems, and his struggle for emancipation of enslaved people, and particularly the Ukrainian people who had completely lost their liberty and national independence shortly after the uprisings at Poltava, referred to in our history books by Ivan Mozeppa.

I can say this, Mr. Speaker, that he was a spark and a hope of a proud but underprivileged people. Having been a slave, he spoke a language that all who

were enslaved could understand. Having been arrested, exiled, and persecuted in Siberia by the Czarist police, his understanding of democracy and freedom reached the heart of ordinary men, and he dedicated himself throughout his very short life to rouse the people from lethargy, and he encouraged them to fight for freedom and independence. The Czar feared him; the Government banished him to a far province in Siberia; they refused him pen and paper; they destroyed his physical body, but they never broke the spirit or the power in his songs which spread like a prairie fire over the steppes from the Caucasus to the Don, and from the Don to the Carpathians, and even beyond the borders of the Ukraine.

His purged poems were secretly printed and every word memorized. They became the vibrant songs of freedom, until in 1917, part of Shevchenko's prophesies came true. I have a few excerpts here from his works and while it is difficult to do the poet justice in translation from the native language, these might indicate some of the things which I cannot explain in words. I would like to quote a short excerpt from a poem written when he was reaching the age of thirteen. Here is what he says, and I would like the hon. Members to note the feeling of the young lad:

“I look upon the lands I tend,
those lands I do not own,
I eye the hut wherein I dwell,
I do not have a home.
God gave me nothing, not at all,
I bowed my head and wept
such bitter tears, and then a lass

March 30, 1961

Who had been sorting hemp
Down by the path, heard my lament
And came across the field to comfort me.
She spoke a soothing phrase,
And gently dried my weeping eyes,
And kissed my tear-wet face.
It was as though the sun had smiled,
As though all things on earth were mine,
My all.”

He loved his people, Mr. Speaker, but he hated immoral people, people who were traitors, and in his poem “Each Person’s Fate” I would like to just read a few lines, excerpts, he says this:

“This one, right in his neighbor’s home, his host cleans out in cards,
Another in a corner hones a knife for a brother’s heart,
And that one there — sound citizen,
The worthy pious kind,
Will creep up like a cat
And then bide patiently his time,
Until hard luck hits your affairs
Then pounce! Don’t plead your case
Nor wife’s appeals nor children’s tears
Will save you from his claws.”

Not only did he consider intelligent people and morality but he hated the intelligentsia who betrayed the people and who set themselves up as superior to the rank and file. In his poem “Caucasus”, the whole poem is very well worth reading, but I can only in my short time, with your permission Mr. Speaker, read a few excerpts. He talks about these people and he says:

“Just look at us! What don’t we know?
We count the stars, and flax we grow,
And curse the French. We sell or trade
Or lose in card games as the stake
People . . . not negroes . . . our own stock,
And Christians too . . . but common folk.
We don’t steal slaves,
No, God forbid,
We do not trade in stolen goods
We act according to the rules . . . !”

Taras Shevchenko talks about this kind of people, and he says:

“You love your brother, as is writ
Down in the Golden Rule!
Oh damned by God, Oh hypocrites,
Oh sacrilegious ghouls!
Not for your brother’s soul you care, but for your brother’s hide,
And off your brother’s back you’d tear
Furs for your daughter’s pride,
A dowry for your bastard child, and slippers for your spouse,
And for yourself things that your wife,
Won’t even know about.”

He talks about the civilization of that time, and of course, it hasn’t changed in many respects in some countries at this time. It is noted again in the same poem “The Caucasus” which is dedicated to a friend who had given his life for the people. Shevchenko goes on in the same poem to say:

“We’re civilized! and we set forth
To civilize others,
To make them see the son of truth,
Our blind childlike brothers!!
We’ll show you everything!
If but yourselves to us you’ll yield,
The grimmest prisons, how to build,
And shackles forged of steel
And how to wear them! How to pleat
The cruellest knouts! Oh yes, we’ll teach you everything — if but to us
Your mountains blue you’ll cede
The last . . . because your seas and fields
We have already seized.”

And he commanded the people of the Ukraine and the people of the world who were persecuted, and he commanded those who had betrayed the people, and he said this to the gentry:

“Come to your senses, become men,
Else evil you awaits!
The common folks who are enchained
Right soon will break their chains.
Then you’ll be judged, and then will speak
The Dneiper and the hills!
Your children’s blood into the seas
Will flow in crimson rills.”

Those who are interested will find here an idea of some of the wonderful works of Shevchenko. I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that the bard of the Ukraine is not only a poet, but a prophet and a national hero.

March 30, 1961

He was the light, the hope, and the voice of freedom for the serf and of the Ukrainian nation. He was in every sense a humanist and an opponent of oppression and slavery. His poems were burning torches that lit up the fires of hope of the enslaved people ruled by the Romanovs and the Hapsburgs. His impassioned appeals to his beloved people when he said "Rise and break your chains," and his prophetic vision of a free and democratic Ukraine inflamed the hearts and minds of every one of its sons.

Shevchenko believed in the federation of the Slavonic nations and fought against colonialism. One of the reasons why he was banished to Siberia for some ten years was because he was a member of the St. Cyril and Methodius brotherhood.

There are, Mr. Speaker, 100,000 Ukrainians in Saskatchewan, more or less, and several millions, as I have said, who have settled in the United States, Argentina, and Brazil, as well as Canada. When these immigrants came to the new land in search of freedom and social justice, they brought Shevchenko with them. He wept with them in their homesickness; he gave them courage in their hard life; he made them love each other and his command to learn and respect education was obeyed. Above all, he gave them hope and faith in the future, and because of him the Ukrainians in exile found a dignity among indignities and a new Ukraine in these new lands.

The Scottish people, Mr. Speaker, have their Burns; the English have Shakespeare; the Ukrainians have Shevchenko. A Canadian Ukrainian, like myself, has all of them, and in our fight for justice and freedom we respect them all, but above all we honour the bard, Taras Shevchenko, who dedicated his short life to the purpose of freedom and justice and his only request was, that he be remembered in his "Testament," and today this is being proudly carried out in all parts of the World.

And, we too, in this House, Mr. Speaker, share the pride of being permitted to remember this great man in this free country of Canada.

Mr. Martin Semchuk (Meadow Lake):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the hon. Member for Cumberland who has just spoken bringing to the attention of the Members of this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan the 100th anniversary of the death of Taras Shevchenko.

As the hon. Member mentioned, he was a poet, a writer, a painter, and humanitarian to the Ukrainian people. Although Taras Shevchenko died one hundred years ago, the spirit of his love, and understanding of the needs of people, I think, will live forever. Out of the pain, the tears, the suffering, and the hunger for freedom, that was in his heart, came the cries for social and democratic justice that have not been stilled, Mr. Speaker, but have grown, and grown in force and in volume as the years go by. The spirit of Taras Shevchenko will not die. He is honoured and remembered by freedom loving people wherever they may be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I refer to the last verse of a translation by Padaris Breslin of Taras Shevchenko's Testament. He says in the last verse:

“O bury me, then rise and break the chains in which ye lie,
And as you spill the tyrant's blood, your freedom sanctify.
And in this family, grand and free,
The family that will be,
Do not fail to speak, a kindly and gentle word of me.”

Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt):

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great pleasure to be able to associate myself with the people who have spoken on your right. This is one of the times I can do it wholeheartedly, and I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that you allow the Irish to do this every year, the Ukrainians only do it once every hundred years, therefore, it is to be presumed that we are going to be much more long-winded about it.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible for one of Ukrainian descent to try to explain to foreigners, such as the rest of you here, what Shevchenko means to us. I think almost every Ukrainian in the world is brought up with his words. When the child grows up, almost at its mother's knees, his poetry is taught almost synonymously with prayers, and being dispossessed, as we are, Mr. Speaker, having no political entity of our own, I think Shevchenko and his works is one of the things that has kept us Ukrainians together in culture and in soul. We get very spirited when we start talking about the Ukrainian language, because it is only the spirit that

March 30, 1961

has sustained us. We have had very little else, Mr. Speaker.

Shevchenko is a man who was able to put this in words, in words that have sustained millions of people, and I think literally he is the only poet, the only artist, who is truly an artist of the common man. He was the artist for whom the industrial workers laid down their work, and participated in a strike, because it was an anniversary of Taras Shevchenko, an anniversary that is celebrated by nobility, by aristocrats, by intelligentsia, by ordinary common illiterate people, because somehow or other he has managed to capture not only the Ukrainian soul, but the soul of all humanity.

I would just like to share what Alfred Jensen, the Swedish scholar and author says about him —

“He is not only a national poet, but he is also a universal genius, one of the lights of humanity.”

This man, who was an artist, this man who was a poet and writer gave us the greatest piece of art in his own life, and the way he lived it, and this in itself is a story of a genius, because many people have the vision, the ability and the talent to portray wonderful ideals, not many of us have the courage to live those ideals. This man only had nine years of freedom in his life, and in those few years he was able to pass on a literature and a spirit and a love that has sustained the rest of us, even now one hundred years later. This in itself is genius.

This man who was courted by nobility, who was admired by the aristocrats, who was invited to participate on the very highest levels of intellectual and artistic endeavours in Russia and in Europe, and didn't succumb to those temptations and after he was free, was bought out of serfdom and was returned to his native land to common ordinary people. He fought for the rights of those people. This man whose closest associates were intellectuals, noblemen, had the spirit of the ordinary person and he loved that spirit above all others. He was a nationalist above all else. He associated with radicals and with revolutionaries, and participated in many of their ideas, but he never forgot that the individual was the important thing.

He grew up with the romanticist tradition and his first poems are romantic poems along the lines of Byron and other contemporary English-speaking, French,

and German authors, and he romanticized the early lives of the Cossacks, the Sich, the early history of the Ukrainian people. This forms one part of his work. On his release from prisonment for participating in revolutionary activities in an organization which was set up to seek freedom for Slavic groups and was forced to go into the army, he became the proponent of the common man, of the democratic ideal. In speaking of serfs and peasants, and these were people, you'll remember, many of whom could not read or write, and many of whom had no contact outside of their own little village with any type of civilization or education, in speaking of them and fighting for them, and seeking to educate them, he didn't forget that they simply could not be lifted by their boot straps. He didn't try to idealize them. He saw them as they were, and this is a beginning of a realistic type of literature, and a realistic appraisal that is truly extraordinary in a man of his background. He saw the cruelty of the ordinary people. He saw their lack of education, and the fact that Ukrainians today read and treasure and know his poetry and accept this realistic appraisal of ordinary people, I think is something we should keep in mind.

I am very proud indeed, to be able to belong to a nation or a race, a national group, that had a man of this calibre as one of us. Mr. Speaker, when you have no political entity, such as we have not, when you have lost your country, when you are unable to point to a certain land in the world and say, that is the country of my forefathers, that is the government that governs the people from which I originate, to have a man, an artist of this calibre personify your aspirations is a truly wonderful and comforting thing.

I think most Ukrainians feel a unity that is past my power to express. I can tell you that when the hon. Member from Cumberland gets up and speaks alone on some issue, much as I disagree with him, in spirit I am right there beside him, because he is Ukrainian. This is something that Taras Shevchenko is able to inspire in us, something that transcends education, economic background, and gives us a spirit and love of freedom, and a desire to fight for that freedom that nothing can ever surpass. I don't think anything will ever be able to kill that spirit which he kindled in us, and it is sad indeed to think that after one hundred years after his death, his beloved country is again enslaved. His people are again under a heavy, oppressive yoke.

I just want to end with a few words, and there is no way of translating the Ukrainian language properly,

March 30, 1961

but we're very sentimental, Mr. Speaker, and if I say this in Ukrainian, Mr. Speaker, I am sure I would have all the Ukrainians here weeping, and I wouldn't want to do that, so I am going to keep it translated in English. There are just a few words that he wrote — he said:

“It makes no difference to me,
If I shall live or not in Ukraine,
Or whether anyone shall think of me,
Mid foreign snow and rain,
But, it makes great difference to me,
That evil folk and wicked men,
Attack our Ukraine, once so free,
And rob and plunder it at will,
That makes a great difference to me.”

Mr. Speaker, in the United States of America, a Bill of Congress was passed setting up a monument to Taras Shevchenko, Mr. Diefenbaker spoke in Ottawa commemorating this event. A monument is going to be put up in Manitoba personifying Taras Shevchenko, but these are as empty words — these ring hollow in the hearts of all Ukrainians, when 45 million of our people are living in slavery today.

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry):

Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to associate myself with the hon. Members who have spoken in tribute to commemorate the immortal bard of the Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko, who died in March a century ago.

Although born a serf, he championed the national freedom of the Ukraine, and dared to criticize the national, economic, religious and political oppression in the Russian empire. The significance of the literary work of Taras Shevchenko reaches beyond his native land. His “Kobzar”, a book containing his works has been translated into the major languages and ranks among the world's classics of literature. In commemoration to Shevchenko the Ukrainian Canadian Committee with the co-operation of the Government of the Province of Manitoba has erected a memorial monument on the legislative grounds in the City of Winnipeg. The official unveiling ceremonies will take place on July 9th this year.

In our province, Shevchenko's works constitute a class known as Ukrainian III at the University of Saskatchewan, so that students who major in foreign languages have an opportunity to study his great works.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, and I hope that I am not contravening the rules of this Assembly, you will have noticed that the pages have placed on the desks of the hon. lady Members of this House, and also on that of the Premier, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and yours Sir, colorful Ukrainian Easter eggs donated by the Ukrainian ladies of my area in baskets provided by the Ukrainian ladies of Regina. I sincerely trust that these are received in the spirit in which they are given.

Hon Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — This Easter egg, known to the Ukrainians as “pysanka” stands for a new life, associated with this festival of spring, and with the general awakening and the rebirth of nature, which brings joy, a new hope for a better life, and new desires, health and wealth. Furthermore, to the Ukrainians, its significance is associated religiously with the resurrection of Christ, which is the main theme of Eater the world over.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for Members in all parts of the House when I thank those who have just spoken in very eloquent tribute to the great Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko.

I am sure also that I speak for those who are the recipients of these lovely baskets and Easter eggs, when I say how grateful we are for the gift itself, and for what it symbolizes.

Those of us who do not have the privilege of understanding the Ukrainian language, cannot understand the beauty and the heroic measures contained in the poems of the Ukrainian bard. It is a marvelous thing that whenever men have spoken out for freedom, in any part of the world, their voices have reached beyond barriers of language and race and distance. Even from the translations which were read this afternoon, I am sure that all of us sense that here was a man who spoke for freedom and for liberty everywhere in the world.

I couldn't help thinking when the Member for Humboldt was speaking, and outlining something of the life of Shevchenko, how much he resembles the Scottish poet Bobby Burns, who was also born a humble plowman, and who wrote for the ordinary people. In his day and generation large numbers of the ordinary folk couldn't

March 30, 1961

read or write, but they learned his poems by heart. As they worked at their looms, and as they went down into the coal mines, and as they met in the pubs of Scotland, they sang his songs, and they recited his poems, with the result that two hundred years later, the influence of Bobby Burns still spreads throughout the world.

This is equally true of this great Ukrainian poet, who spoke for ordinary folk. It is part of the genius of poetry that men can put into thoughts the things that the rest of us just feel. We are indebted to those who have reminded us of this great poet and of this great patriot. I think we all recognize that it is not sufficient to pay tribute to a man such as this, unless in paying tribute, we too, rededicate ourselves to the things for which he stood and other people like him stood. The Ukrainian people themselves take fresh courage to carry on the struggle for an increasing measure of freedom and liberty. The rest of us recognize that freedom is not won once and for all, that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, and that men never retain freedom unless they are prepared to preserve it, to struggle for it and to watch over it. I think that Shevchenko would agree, as every other person who loves freedom would agree, that we must keep moving on toward the light which they held up for the world to see. I think the words of my own national bard sums it up very well when he said:

“Then let us pray that come it may —
As come it will for a’ that —
That sense and worth o’er a’ the earth
May bear the gree, and a’ that.
For a’ that, and a’ that,
It’s coming yet, for a’ that,
That man to man, the warld o’er,
Shall brothers be for a’ that!”

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):

Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss in my duty if I did not also associate the Members of this group, and particularly those of us who are not of Ukrainian descent, with the things that have been said here this afternoon. I thought I had received a reasonably liberal education, but quite frankly I learned a good deal by listening to the speeches of hon. Members.

Ukrainian people have made a great contribution to the well-being and the welfare of the Province of Saskatchewan. I know that they will continue to make that contribution, and I can see now, after listening to hon. Members that some of the works of this poet Taras Shevchenko, must have proved to be some of the inspiration. I want to thank the hon. Member for sending us these Easter eggs. The gesture is appreciated. Thank you very much.

WELCOME TO 4H CLUB MEMBERS

Mr. Speaker: — Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to inform the hon. Members that later today His Honour the Lieutenant Governor will give Royal Assent to certain Bills in the Chamber.

I would also like to draw to the attention of the hon. Members a group of fine young people in the Speaker's Gallery this afternoon, who are members of the 4H club of Success — the 4H Beef Club, under the leadership of Mr. Walter Bowditch and Mr. John Bradley. I hope that they have a very pleasant afternoon with us, and also an informative one.

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Provincial Treasurer):

Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would move in order to pass Interim Supply we proceed to Government Orders, and then revert to motions.

The reason for making this request, is as you know, the end of the financial year is approaching and by the time we next meet will have passed. In order that we may have some money to pay bills come the first of the month, it is necessary for us to ask for an interim supply Bill which will be approved by His Honour when he attends later this afternoon.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

The Order for Committee of Supply was then called.

March 30, 1961

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):

Mr. Speaker, at this particular time, if I understand the rules correctly, we would be permitted to raise any grievances, is that correct? That is the way they do it in the House of Commons.

Premier Douglas: — I am familiar with the procedure which has been followed in Ottawa, and it has never been followed in this House as hon. Members know. We have motions, we move to go into supply day after day. Our standing orders do not provide for the raising of questions going into supply. This, however, is not a regular motion, this is simply a motion for interim supply.

Mr. Thatcher: — Of course, under Beauschesne, even on interim supply, I believe you can raise a grievance, can you not? I am not going to press it today, but I think in future, when these motions are brought in, we might be prepared to raise grievances.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to debate the question now, but I think under our Standing Orders, I made some inquiries of this some years ago from our previous clerk, and he informed me that under our Standing Orders it wasn't possible to introduce a motion going into supply. This perhaps should be looked at by the Standing Orders Committee, but it never has been the custom, and my understanding was that it is not permissible under our Standing Orders.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe that our Standing Orders do say that when it is moved for the House to go into Committee of Supply that they do so without question being put. I leave the Chair without question being put, except in the case when that Motion is made for the purpose of the Minister making the budget presentation. I think it is fairly clear on that point. My understanding also is that it has never been done in this House, in spite of what the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggests.

Mr. Thatcher: — That is quite alright, Mr. Speaker, but I do say again, that likely the next interim supply that comes up, we will try to use this privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — Before that time we will have

a good look at all the rules involved and make a ruling in regard to it. I do now leave the Chair.

MOTION RE INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Eldon A. Johnson (Kerrobot-Kindersley):

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

“That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to enact legislation which will make it possible for a province to assume complete administration of Indian Affairs when such decentralization is requested by a province and by a majority of the Treaty Indians in that province; and requests the Government of Saskatchewan to give consideration to negotiating with the Government of Canada the financial arrangements which will permit the province to make services enjoyed by all the people of Saskatchewan available to Indians, and to undertake such specialized educational, developmental and economic programs as would be required by reason of the special needs and problems of Indian communities.”

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Members from Cumberland, Meadow Lake, Redberry, and Humboldt for their excellent addresses on the centenary of the death of their esteemed Ukrainian poet. I certainly feel indebted to them for having described so eloquently the accomplishments of this great and noteworthy poet.

In dealing with my own resolution, I would like to draw the attention of Members in the House to experiences that they may have had in our own native land. As a farm boy able to traverse the prairie, I, like many other Members of the House, have been intrigued by certain evidence of previous occupation in this country. Many of us, of course, have noticed the circular rings of small-sized field stones that we call teepee rings, and I believe this is quite correct. These are evidence of the people who lived here before us. These field stones that were left by the Indians were used in order to hold down the edges of their teepees which were their dwellings, and they survived for us to see, and to provoke our curiosity.

March 30, 1961

I would like also to say that some of us have had our curiosity further provoked, and have been further intrigued by discoveries on our wind blown fields. I recollect very well, during the very difficult years of the 30s when our land was drifting, that for an inexpensive diversion we used to walk across the fields and search for further remnants of the people who had gone before us.

I would like at this time to draw the attention of the House to one of these artifacts that was discovered on these plains. This is not necessarily an extraordinarily good one, but it is rather unusual, and I will show it to this House because it is something fairly large and it can be easily seen, I believe. It is a spearpoint that was used by some people in this area. They used it very likely to defend themselves and to obtain their food and their clothing and their shelter from the buffalo herds that roamed the prairie.

I think this study of these people is something that is of great interest and great value. I would like to draw the attention of the House to some endeavours that are of considerable interest. As I indicated, many of these artifacts are to be found in our fields, and it is by no way possible to give any date as to when they were left here. It could be 200 years or it could be 2000. That is why I draw your attention to a very interesting development at the Boundary Dam site. As Members are fully aware, a generating station has been built there which provides us with electricity in order that it may run, of course, quite a large dam had to be constructed. It was judged by people at the Natural History Museum and Members of the Government that it would be desirable to make some archaeological investigations at this site. The site that was explored is now known as the Long Creek site, and it is of particular significance because at that time they were able to discover areas where the existence of previous cultures was indicated. By digging down several feet they could deduce the various activities, the method of living of the people that went before us here. Through the co-operation of the Power Corporation, archaeologists, paleontologists, soil specialists and various scientists, it has been possible to establish that there have been successive periods of occupation dating back at least 5000 years.

This is very interesting, because this is one of the first such sites so excavated in this province. I think most of us will agree that the study of these

people who have gone before us is of tremendous interest and value. It raises some questions too, such as where did they come from, and how long had they been here, and where are they now? Perhaps, I shouldn't conjecture at too great a length as to how long they had been here. It is generally believed that at some time, possibly 20,000 to 30,000 years ago the first immigrations came to Canada across the Bering Strait. This is of interest to us here because it is generally believed that one of their routes was between the Cordilleran and Keewatin ice sheets which covered most of this area at that time, and that is why we people in the prairies will find occasionally an artifact which is generally believed to be of very considerable antiquity.

I would like to draw your attention to another point. You may not see this too well; it is, unfortunately broken. This is a type of point that is generally believed to have been made at the time when the mammoth, the camel and prehistoric horse lived in North America, because points of this nature have been discovered in company with their remains. That indicates quite conclusively that there have been people here for a very long period of time.

Now I would like to dwell on this much longer, but I think that I should proceed to ask the question — where are these people now, and how are they?

I had not intended primarily to emphasize the activities of the Government, or the Natural History Museum. I have intended primarily to indicate to you the long period of occupancy of these prairies by people other than ourselves, and the culture that they possessed. I think that we should be concerned for these reasons, and because we are now occupying their ancestral home we should now be concerned about their well-being.

Now, in this day and age it is a very good thing that people concern themselves about the well-being of others. In fact it is very common, very popular for people in the west to be concerned about the under-developed areas in other parts of the world. Of course, all of us here are very proud of things like the Colombo Plan, the various United Nations organizations that help people to better themselves and to improve their manner of existence. However, I would like to raise this matter again that there are some people here at home that do need our help.

It is also popular to dwell at present on the

March 30, 1961

theory of Malthus, whose general theories were that the population of the world tended to increase in geometrical proportions, that is by a process of multiplication, whereas the resources to provide for food increase only in an arithmetic progression, that is in a process of addition.

We're also acquainted with what is called the world's population explosion. I would like to draw the attention of this Assembly to what you might call also a population explosion that is occurring right in our own province. To make some comparisons of population increase, the birth rate is often used as a statistic in comparing the rate of population increase. I searched through the 1958 United Nations statistical year book, and I found that of the birth rates listed, the highest that I could locate was for Guatemala which listed the birth rate as 48.7 live births per 1000 population. Comparing this with Canada, our national birth rate is 27.6 per 1000, for this same year 1958. However, for the year 1959 the birth rate of Indian people on the reserves was 53.7 per 1000. That is, it appears to be higher than that of any nation recorded in the United Nations statistical year book. I use this figure with some hesitancy because on one hand, we would be comparing a part of a population, with entire populations. However, the fact cannot escape us that the Indian population is increasing at quite a rapid rate. This is further evidenced by the fact that in the past years Indian population on reserves has been increasing at the rate of about 5% a year. This compares with South America as a whole 2.3% a year; Southwest Asia 2.4% a year; Ivory Coast 5.3%; Costa Rica 4%; Taiwan 3.6% and Canada itself 2.8. The Indian population is increasing faster than any of those national populations.

Now, as we proceed further and ask ourselves about the resources that these people are living on, and the income of Indian people. Of course, the resources on the reserves have not been increased; there has been no way in which the Indians could increase them, and we see this dilemma of an increasing population on quite a static resource. Another method of comparing the well-being of people is the per capita income. I'll only compare the per capita incomes of the people of Saskatchewan as a whole with that of our segment of the Indian population. For the year 1958 you will find that the average personal per capita income was \$1245 for the people of Saskatchewan as a whole. However, the per capita income of the Indian segment of this population was only about \$208, one-sixth of that of the rest of the population. It is also of importance to note that

of this quite meagre income only approximately half of it was derived from resources such as trapping, fishing, hunting, wages and sale of products from the reserve. Only about half was made up from these endeavours and approximately 40% of this quite low income was made up by transfer of payments of the Social Welfare type which includes mother's allowance and things of that nature.

Now, this indicates very clearly that the Indian is not able to enjoy a large ration of the benefits of our society that we are able to enjoy. I would like to also make this point, and I don't think any Member will contest this, that the reason is not because of any inadequacy of Indian people. I think all of us here will agree that the inherent ability of the Indian is as great as that of the Caucasian or any other race. Now, if that be so, it must indicate that we as responsible people in the province, we as the occupants of the prairie land that was used to graze the buffalo, have not been doing all that was possible in order to make it possible for the Indian to make the transition from his nomadic, stone-age culture to that of a very complicated and demanding 20th century. It is most obvious that the standard of living enjoyed by Indians is incomparably poor to that which the rest of us are able to enjoy. This is witnessed by the fact that power and telephones are virtually nonexistent on reserves, very few Indians are able to own an automobile or a truck or any kind, and of course, this is adequately borne out when we compare the per capita income of the Indian people with that of the rest of us.

To make another comparison of the degree to which we have helped our Indian people to compete in our society, we could compare them according to what they are doing in the field of education. Certainly, education as far as we're concerned, is usually the open sesame to a better standard of living and a fuller life, but we find that only about two-thirds of our Indian children reach Grade VIII; one in six goes to Grade X; only about two or three in thirty obtain Grade XII; and very few go to technical school or university. In fact, for the year 1958 there were four Indian people going to University, four going to normal, and six attending nursing school, and four attending a commercial course, and six attending trades, and four going under training as nurse's aides, and one other, a total of twenty-nine. This seems to indicate very sadly that we have a greater responsibility than we have been assuming in order to help the Indian to compete in our present society.

March 30, 1961

I think one of our first responsibilities is one of trying to understand the difficulties that beset an Indian living on a reserve. Even though the world in which we live in is one essentially of change, change itself is not an easy process, in fact it is often one that is very painful. We should also recognize that customs themselves and cultures change slowly, and this can be witnessed by visiting any ethnic group in this province. We still find, of course, the customs of the French, the Ukrainians, the Germans the Chinese and so on still being carried on, and I do not in any way suggest that this is not good; it is just a part of human behaviour. But, we shouldn't deprecate the Indian for his slowness, or what seems to be his slowness in changing his form of culture because we behave in exactly the same way. We should not forget that the Indians have been forced to evolve from a stone-age culture to what we hope is a civilized 20th century culture, in a matter of only a very few generations.

I would imagine that it is scarcely one hundred years since stone tools and stone weapons were still used on these prairies. I think this lack of understanding is one of the impediments preventing us from providing a better standard of living for Indian people. I think that we should recognize the effect that the reserve system has had on the Indians. It has on one hand, of course, allowed him to survive as an ethnic entity, however, on the other hand there is ample evidence to indicate that it has prevented the Indian from making decisions for himself, and of course, making decisions for yourself is the essence of responsibility. It seems to me that the reserve system has hampered, or is hampering the Indian from assuming responsibility.

I remember talking to an Indian on a Reserve this fall. He said that he had raised some cattle and that he wasn't allowed to sell a single one without the authority of the Indian agent. Now, in part there may be a good enough reason for that, however, this is part of the whole manner of treating the Indian more like a minor or an incompetent person, than as a person with potentialities. In fact, I was reminded by this conversation with this Indian of one of the tragic sagas of these prairies, and I was reminded of the story of Almighty Voice, who shot a cow without permission, and as a result there were several deaths including his own, and this was, as far as I can find out, one of the last blood battles between Indians and Whites in this province, and this occurred in the Minichinas Hills some 70 miles northeast of Duck Lake in the year 1896.

Now, I am sure that the modern Indian didn't run any such risk, and yet we find that very little has changed since that time. I would like to emphasize that I am not proposing that the reserve system be abolished — far from it. I believe that we must provide a sanctuary for the Indian as long as he feels that he needs it, as long as he desires it, because this is his right, and this is our covenant. I believe that it will take a very long time, if ever, in which all Indians will wish to leave entirely the Reserves for this harsh society of the outside world.

I would like to point out and emphasize that a good many Indians must leave the reserve every year. In fact, it was indicated that about 3.7% of the Indians do leave the reserve, and this however, still leaves an appreciable margin of Indians who will be on the reserve and who find the resources on the reserve increasingly dwindling. I think we should try to understand the problem confronting an Indian who is thinking of leaving the reserve. On one hand, he recognizes the poverty of the reserve, on the other hand, in leaving the reserve, he recognizes that he may appear different from other people, he may talk differently, his concept of many things is different. Also, he is usually poorly equipped academically in order to compete with the people who are not on the reserve. Also, there is another factor, even his own people may accuse him of putting on airs, or of trying to be like "Monias" the white man, which is another difficulty which confronts the Indian in contemplating a life off the Reserve.

I think it is a great hypocrisy of our side in general to assume that in this country that there is no discrimination. It may not be intentional, but it is nevertheless in my opinion, the effect of our enactments toward the Indian. I don't think we should beat our breasts about the apartheid of other nations until we have solved more of our problems at home. It is simply not good enough for us to say to the Indian, "Come and be a farmer," when the rest of us own the land. It is simply not good enough to us to say to him to come and be something else when we know very well that he is not equipped to do so. I believe we have made some mistakes in the past, and it seems very often that in spite of the very worthwhile works that the churches have done in helping the Indian, far too often the churches have regarded the Indian as a soul to be saved from either his own paganism or the clutches of another church. And, far too frequently, the Indian has been ignored as a human person with human needs, and the need to provide for himself and his family

March 30, 1961

in a rapidly changing world. I would hope that we as politicians would not fall into a similar area and I think we should never forget that the Indian is a person and we should not simply regard him as a voter.

Another error that we have fallen into is allowing too much of the land to be leased out to white farmers. This may be an easy way of doing things, but it is not encouraging the Indian to make his own decisions, it has not helped him to gain the spirit that is necessary to help himself. It would seem to me that there is a great field for co-operatives and co-operative farming for the Indians on the reserve.

Now, I don't wish to seem to be too condemnatory of the things that have been done for the Indians because some very good things have been done, and I would like to note some of them. I believe that the formation of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians is a very important step in helping the Indians. I was very much impressed by the officials that the Indians chose for themselves, and I gained a great deal of confidence from meeting some members of this Federation, and some of their chiefs. Also, I would like to commend the Government for something that has helped me immensely, and that was the northern tour, and I hope the Government will be able to give more tours of this province in order that we may understand our problems better. Another very good thing that has been done, and this I noticed on the northern tour, was the formation and organization of the co-operative fisheries and the co-operative filleting plants in the north. I think these are very impressive, and I was very much impressed by a co-operative trade store at La Loche. While visiting this store one of the Indians said to us, "It is astonishing what better prices that the Hudson Bay can give us, after we established our co-op store — even though the Hudson Bay has been here for 100 years". That is exactly what he said.

I think another matter of interest, that we should give some attention to is in the field of handicrafts. The Indian people do make some of the most interesting and most artistic handicrafts of any people. I think it is pitiful that when we see the souvenirs exhibited in our stores, a high proportion of it is rubbish of no value, made in Japan or some other country. It is very tragic when stores could sell genuine artifacts of genuine beauty. I was very pleased to note in the March issue of the "Canadian Geographic Journal", a write-up describing the northern handicrafts co-operative association, which has in it some one hundred and nineteen members. I am very pleased to note that

the Government gave this organization a grant and loaned them advisers, and that the Arts Board gave them assistance in planning this project. This is of a great deal of interest. I know the people that make these handicrafts put a great deal of work in them and it is also of substantial help to get this extra income.

I would like to commend the Government for the work done in studying the problems of the Indian people. The work done by the sociologists, ethnologists and anthropologists is very helpful in order for us to understand the social needs and economic needs of our Indian people. It will be a great help in understanding and helping us to deal with the very complex problems confronting us.

Another matter that I think is a very good thing is the employment of a Provincial Archaeologist. I certainly believe that it is very important that we try to learn as much as possible about the culture of these people and try to answer some of the questions as to where they came from and what they did, and I am hoping that sometime in the near future at Regina College, there will be a department of Archaeology. At present there is none in western Canada.

I would also like to commend the Government for its display in the Natural History Museum. There is a very interesting display of Indian work and exhibits indicating the Indian culture.

Mr. Speaker, in order that we may endeavour to help the Indians I believe that some concrete and specific action is necessary, and I believe that many of the difficulties that have beset us have been due to the split in responsibility between the Provincial and Federal Governments. It seems reasonable to me that if this matter were clarified to a far greater extent, to provide for decentralization of responsibility of many matters pertaining to the Indians it would be to the Indians' advantage. It is for those reasons, and the reasons that I have indicated that I move this Resolution.

At 4:10 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, gave Royal Assent to certain Bills.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Guy regarding aid to Uranium City and the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank.

March 30, 1961

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabasca):

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Leader of the Opposition who is absent, and with his consent I would beg leave to close the debate on this, in order to get it off the Order Paper.

Before closing it I would like to just say . . .

Premier Douglas: — As long as it is clear that the hon. Member is speaking to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — Oh, that's right, pardon me. We're on the amendment at this time. I was assuming that he was speaking for Mr. Thatcher in regard to continuing the debate on the amendment. If you do not wish to continue to speak on the amendment, the hon. Member from Athabasca does have the privilege to speak on the amendment if he wishes to, but not to close the debate on the amendment, or the debate on the motion at this time.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not just too clear: Now if the amendment is disposed of, if we have the vote on the amendment, can I mention the amendment when closing the debate on the motion?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, there has been an amendment moved to the motion which the Member for Athabasca presented to the House. He can speak on the amendment; he's quite within his rights to speak on the amendment. Then when we come to the motion, he has the right to close the debate, but in closing the debate, he cannot refer to the amendment, unless it's passed and becomes part of the motion.

Mr. Guy: — Okay, Mr. Speaker, I will speak on the amendment.

Mr. Danielson: — An amendment that's carried does become a part of the motion.

Premier Douglas: — That's right, and then he can speak on it.

Mr. Speaker: — If the amendment is carried, he certainly has the privilege of speaking on it when he closes the debate, because then it's part of the motion, but just in case Mr. Brockelbank's amendment was defeated, he should speak on it now.

Mr. Guy: — Well, in that case, we'll have the vote on the amendment, but if it is passed then I can speak on the amendment and the motion as I close the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — Right.

Premier Douglas: — Except that he can't argue for not passing the amendment. After the amendment has been passed it becomes part of the motion. He can comment on it but he can't argue against passing the amendment when the House has already passed it. If he wants to object to the amendment, then of course, he should do so while the amendment is before the House, I would suggest.

Mr. Guy: — That's okay then. We'll just proceed with the amendment, and then I'll speak and close the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — The proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:

That the following words be added to the motion:

“and further this Assembly recommends to the Federal Government that Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited be requested to undertake an active exploration program for minerals which could be processed in their plant near Uranium City.”

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

The debate is now on the motion as amended.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the Member should be warned that he's closing the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes. The Member about to speak, I must say, is about to close the debate on the motion as amended.

Allan R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear, while listening to the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources the other day, that he was going to support my motion, but I was rather sorry that not one resolution could go through this House during this Session, so far, without the Federal Government being called upon to provide the major share of assistance.

March 30, 1961

Now I am sure that we agree also with the amendment, as naturally the Uranium City area would appreciate help from any source, at this time. But if I felt that the Federal Government had the main responsibility, well then I feel that that would have been in the main intent of my motion. I would like to bring to the attention of the House, so that there will be no misunderstanding, that this motion was presented to ask the Provincial Government to take some action at this time, and the adding and the supporting of this amendment does not in any way, shape, or form, lessen their responsibility to the people in the Uranium City area at this time.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the Minister review what the Provincial Government has done in the past, and I'm sure that it is appreciated. I was interested in his views on what the Federal Government should have done in the past, and what the Federal Government should be doing in the future. I was also interested in what the role was that Eldorado should be playing at this time. While he was speaking, he seemed to forget the main idea of the motion when he neglected, unintentionally, I hope, to mention any concrete assistance that the Provincial Government was willing to give. There was no suggestion made that they would give any financial assistance, and since the Minister assured me that they were aware of all the problems besetting the people in the area, I assumed that he feels that any meetings between the Government, the council, the mining authorities, and so on, at this time, would not be warranted.

But when I am asked by the council and the citizens of the Uranium area, what was the Province of Saskatchewan's attitude towards this motion, I will be forced to admit that they had two solutions advocated by the Minister of Mineral Resources on behalf of his Government. One was, a list of what the Federal Government shouldn't be doing now. Secondly, that Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited should start an active exploration program for minerals which could be processed in their plant near Uranium City.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — That's all right. They won't believe you anyway.

Mr. Guy: — Now, since these suggestions came from the Government, and the latter suggestion has been added as an amendment, and passed, I hope I'm right in assuming that this Government will contact immediately the Federal Government

and Eldorado Mining and Refining, giving them their recommendations, and I would be pleased to receive copies of their requests, when they are made. I also hope that they will assume their responsibility as outlined in the first clause of the motion, with the same vigor and tenacity that they show when requesting aid from the Federal Government. I know that I and the people of Uranium City will be waiting with a great deal of anticipation, during the next few months, to see what assistance this Government is willing to give, to try and ensure a future for this northern settlement, which has and can't continue to do so much in the way of developing northern Saskatchewan.

I would like to say in closing that I hope that this motion, as amended, will be carried unanimously.

The question being put on the motion as amended, it was agreed to unanimously.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd:

(1) That notwithstanding Standing Order 5(1) and Standing Order 2, this House shall adjourn on Thursday, March 30, 1961; at 5:30 o'clock p.m., and shall stand adjourned until Monday, April 3, 1961, at 2:30 p.m.

(2) That notwithstanding Standing Order 2, this House shall, commencing Tuesday, April 4, 1961, meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m., and there shall be an intermission from 12:30 o'clock p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

(3) That on Wednesday, April 5, 1961, and on each Wednesday until the end of the Session Standing Order 5(2) be suspended so that the sitting of the Assembly may be continued at 7:30 p.m.; and

(4) That, notwithstanding Standing Order 2, on Saturday, April 8, 1961, and on each Saturday until the end of the Session, the Assembly shall meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. until 10:00 p.m. with a two hour intermission at 12:30 o'clock p.m. and 5:30 o'clock p.m., the Order of Business on Saturday to be the same as on Friday.

The question being put on the motion, it was agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 71 — An Act to amend The Land Titles Act, 1960

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Minister of Education):

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Mr. Walker, I would like to say that this is an amendment to the Land Titles Act and that it is designed to do a number of things.

It is, firstly, designed to provide for the certain changes necessary if Land Titles Offices are amalgamated — to provide that filings in the old office are deemed to be filings in the new and enlarged office.

It is also designed to make some small changes to permit the Attorney General to engage graduates in law from other universities, who may not be members of the Bar of Saskatchewan, as Registrars of Land Titles Offices.

It is also designed to clarify and enlarge the provisions with respect to the destruction of documents which no longer are of use. In this regard, it follows a procedure which has been introduced several years ago for the microfilming of documents, and, generally, for the classification of documents which are in the Land Titles Offices. And in particular, the Bill provides for the destruction of documents which have been withdrawn or discharged for twenty years or more. It provides for the destruction of certain documents under some old Tax Arrears Acts and the Tax Arrears Consolidation Act which is not the present Tax Enforcement Act, I may say.

Also, the Bill provides a procedure whereby the contents of a document which is lost or mislaid may be proven in a court of law. This just simply sets out a procedure which will be of assistance in court.

The Bill further provides for and gives a power to the Registrar of the Land Titles Office, and sets out a procedure whereby he can ascertain whether an execution or lien which is filed in the Land Titles Office applies to a certain piece of land. By way of further explanation of that — executions and liens

are filed against people's names and not against parcels of lands, whereas, the parcels of land are registered in people's names. There is always the problem of ascertaining whether the John Jones named in the execution is the same John Q. Jones who owns a particular piece of land. This is a perennial problem that lawyers face, and this Bill provides a procedure whereby the Registrar can obtain information under oath and if he feels that on the basis of this evidence on oath the particular execution or lien does not apply to the particular parcel of land, he can indicate that it does not.

Those, Mr. Speaker are the changes which are provided for in this particular amendment of The Land Titles Act and with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of the Bill.

Mrs. M.J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I only have a few words to say, as most of the questions will be taken up in Committee. The one question that does arise though, and this is a matter of principle, is the question of closing down Land Titles Offices. Section 6(a), of course, looks after the mechanics of transferring titles. I would again like to draw the attention of you Mr. Speaker and the House, to the fact that this is not a good procedure, this is not being taken too kindly, and I doubt whether we should continue with centralization in respect of this any further than we have gone. I think that the indignation and the difficulties that have been aroused in sections of the country merely by the closing down two Land Titles Offices, is significant. I think there's an uneasiness throughout the entire province because of this. I certainly hope that the Government takes it under very serious consideration before making any further moves in this direction.

Certainly, these offices mean a lot to the local community. I think that it seems a little inconsistent, on one hand, to be spending thousands of dollars studying the problems of local communities, and why they're getting smaller, and on the other hand, doing things deliberately that will wipe out these communities. This is exactly what this is doing. Everytime you take away a Land Titles Office or you close down a court house, or you make it a part-time court house, you're not only removing some of the dignity that has surrounded the administration of these things, but you're taking it further away from the people who were vitally concerned, the people who could go and look at their titles, and now

March 30, 1961

have to get legal assistance in order to make a search in Regina for this. I hope this doesn't continue. I wouldn't like to see it happen to our Land Titles Office in Humboldt.

Aside from that, aside, so far, as it involved me personally, I don't like to see it happen any place in the province, because I think this is the part of the chiselling away of small communities. I think that eventually, if we have any hope or optimism for the growth of Saskatchewan, we're going to be decentralizing it, in twenty years or so. Meanwhile, these buildings will be used for another purpose, or they'll be sold or closed down, and this is not a good thing. I think we should look at this question, not only for the next few years, but with a larger view in mind, that if it's at all possible to keep them open, I think they should be kept opened. I don't think there'll be any great complaint by the people in Regina or Saskatoon who might be using these facilities, but it does make a great difference to the small communities, where this is an important function, and takes an important place, and the people involved are local residents. I know that this has caused a lot of hardship, and the mere talk of it, is causing hardships to many families, and disturbing many people.

I hope that the Government will not take any further steps in this direction.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Bill No. 73 — An Act to amend The Marriage Act

Hon. Mr. Erb (Minister of Health):

Mr. Speaker, this is an Act to amend the Marriage Act, and the reasons we have to do this is that, since we are amending the Mental Hygiene Act, and as a result of the revision and amendment of that Act, it will be henceforth known as The Mental Health Act, and as this Act — The Marriage Act — relates to the Mental Hygiene Act and will relate to the new Mental Health Act, it is necessary to bring this Act into line with the latter. There are very simple amendments here; that wherever it says Mental Hygiene Act, we shall amend it to Mental Health Act. In section 2, 3 and 4, and where it says "mental defective", it shall be substituted by the words "mentally retarded person" — we're simply changing the wording.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Premier Douglas: — Is the Minister suggesting that all the people who get married are mentally disturbed?

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Sometimes their motives may be questioned.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Bill No. 74 — An Act to amend The Municipal Expropriation Act

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):

This Act of course is the law under which municipalities expropriate land for road allowances, and so forth. The amendment is a very simple one — it is simply to provide for less delay in some occasions, in the municipality giving the right to enter and to use the lands, and at the same time, protect the rights of the owner.

Now I would move that Bill No. 74 — an Act to amend the Municipal Expropriation Act, be now read a second time.

Mrs. Batten: — May I ask the hon. Member a question? Does this mean that it's no longer necessary for the municipalities to file a plan.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes, it's still necessary. We can discuss this in Committee, I think.

Mrs. Batten: — Still, it doesn't make it simpler. It doesn't remove any of the ordinary procedures.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — We can discuss that detail in Committee, I think, Mr. Speaker.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

March 30, 1961

**Bill No. 75 — An Act to amend The Members of the Legislation Assembly Superannuation Act,
1954**

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Provincial Treasurer):

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of items in this Bill which are matters of administration and which can be discussed in Committee. There are, however, some changes, probably two in number, that ought to be discussed at this time.

These changes have to do with removing some of the prohibitions which previously, under certain circumstances, could prevent a Member from drawing his superannuation, and they have to do with the maximum established in the present Act for superannuation of a Member of the Legislature.

I will deal first of all, with the prohibitions, as I've called them. Under the present Act, a Member from the Federal Parliament who has qualified for superannuation under their Act may come into our Legislature and continue to draw his superannuation. This, we think, is a proper situation, since he has been entitled to it in all respects, because of his service in the Federal House. The situation, however, is not that, according to our present Act. In other words, a Member might qualify for superannuation in all respects. But if he left our Legislature, after so qualifying and if he at some time subsequently became a Member of the Federal House, he would no longer be entitled to draw that superannuation. We would be no longer entitled to pay it to him.

I think it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the right to draw superannuation should be governed not by what happens to a person before his particular service or after that particular service. So long as he qualified according to the conditions laid down in the Act, then he should not be prevented from accepting this because of what he happens to do later. This, I think, is particularly true if we consider the fact that if a Member qualified for superannuation under our Act, left the Legislature, went to work for a bank or insurance company, or any occupation whatsoever, other than going to the House of Commons, he could continue to draw his pension. If he went to work for the people of Canada, as a Member of the House of Commons, then, according to the present Act, he would be not entitled to receive his superannuation

which he had qualified for, and in part, paid for.

So, the amendments to this Act seek to remove these prohibitions, these effects from each end of the situation. They propose then that a Member who may have drawn a Federal pension, a pension according to the Federal Act, may come into our House and still be entitled to continue to receive that pension, and that is proper. He will also be entitled, on a voluntary basis, to take part in our pension plan if he wishes, something which the present Act now prevents.

At the other end, it provides that a Member having qualified under our Act, leaving our Legislature and going to the Federal Parliament, would be entitled, if he meets the conditions otherwise prescribed, to draw a pension under the provincial plan.

The second change to which I want to have reference has to do with the maximum pension allowable under the present Act. That maximum is \$3,000 a year. At the time it was established, \$3,000 per year was the maximum effective under the Public Service Superannuation Act. Since that time, the Public Service Superannuation Act maximum has moved up and the proposal here is that the maximum under the M.L.A.'s Superannuation Act be made to conform with the maximum under the Public Service Superannuation Act.

Since these are changes, in a sense, in benefits and conditions, Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be worthwhile information for the House if at this time I reviewed for a few minutes, our Act in comparison with some of the other Acts which are established across the country.

I think it is correct to say that when the Saskatchewan Act was passed, we were alone among the provinces in having such an Act. There was one passed very shortly before which affected the Members of the Federal Parliament, but I think I'm correct in saying there were no other provinces. At the present time, however, there are seven provinces, including Saskatchewan, which do have Superannuation Acts. In the province of Alberta there is no provision so far as the M.L.A.'s are concerned. Theirs is restricted to Cabinet Ministers only. But taking that into consideration there are now seven provinces with some kind of a superannuation plan. I won't bother, by the way, to give the details for the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but will have some comment on Saskatchewan, British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario.

March 30, 1961

In our Act the rate which we contribute is established at 5% of the indemnity. It is 6% insofar as the Canadian pension is concerned, and so far as the British Columbia Act is concerned. In Alberta it is 5%, by Ministers, on salary only, and in Ontario it is 6% of both indemnity and salary. I should have mentioned that there is a proposal in our Act which will increase the contribution insofar as the salary of the Ministers and of the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, from 5% to 7%. In other words, if the Act passes, the Members will continue to contribute on the basis of 5% on their indemnity. The Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition will contribute 5% on their indemnity, but will contribute at the rate of 7%, insofar as their salary is concerned.

With regard to the basis on which the annual superannuation allowance is calculated here in Saskatchewan, our calculation is roughly 2% per year of service times the average of the five highest years of remuneration paid. In Canada — Federal Parliament — it is 75% of the total contribution. In British Columbia it is paid at 3% per year of service. Ours, you will recall is 2%, times the number of years — 2% of the average income for five years. In British Columbia it is 3% times the average annual income in the ten highest years, plus another 1% times the average over the total period not contributed for. In Alberta it is calculated on the basis similar to ours, and in Ontario, they simply take 75% of the total contributions as being the annual amount received in one year.

With regard to the maximum allowance which is available, I've indicated ours was \$4,000, and this will be altered to conform with the maximum under the Public Service Commission, which would bring it, as of April 1st, to \$3,980. In Canada — Federal Parliament — the maximum is 75% of the indemnity. In British Columbia there is no maximum specified, however, they are limited to contributing for twenty-four years, so conceivably they could earn up to over 70% of the amount on which they contributed, that is, of salary, plus indemnity. In Alberta it is approximately 50% of the salary for the Ministers. In Ontario it is 75% of the indemnity or one-half of the Ministers' salary, which is the maximum. In other words, even though we are increasing our maximum somewhat, it will still not be as high as in those other provinces.

In most other respects the Acts are rather similar. I'm not going to comment on them, Mr. Speaker, at this time. I thought the House might be interested in knowing how our Act compares with others.

I would move second reading of the Bill.

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):

Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks on this particular Bill that I would like to make at this time. I shall speak at greater length when it comes into Committee.

The hon. Members in this party on the whole, of course, support the principle of contribution pensions for M.L.A.'s. We have seen instances in recent years of men who have served long and faithfully through their life, then were defeated at the polls. Several were destitute. I can think off hand of one Premier of this province who found himself in those circumstances.

So, I think it's only fair that M.L.A.'s or Cabinet Ministers should have the same privilege as people have in industry, namely, of contributing through the years to an adequate and proper pension scheme. So I say again, that as far as the principle of this Bill, the Liberal Opposition does not take exception. But there are several details of this Bill that, if we understand them correctly, we are not in sympathy with.

The first amendment, if I understood the Minister correctly, proposed that those who are receiving money from the Federal superannuation fund can join the provincial pension scheme if they wish. I presume that the only two Members who would be effected in that manner would be myself and the hon. Member for Saskatoon. This clause makes it optional whether or not we wish to join the provincial pension scheme. Let me say at once, the Members of this Party feel very strongly that no M.L.A. or M.P. should receive a double pension. In other words the Members receiving a pension from Ottawa shouldn't receive it from here, or vice versa. And so the first amendment, if I understand it correctly, we shall oppose.

The second amendment that you are suggesting, proposes that if an M.L.A. or a Cabinet Minister in this House was elected to Ottawa, he could draw his pension from here while sitting in the House of Commons. I can't see anything wrong with such a procedure. But once that M.P. has sat long enough to qualify for a pension in Ottawa, then he might find himself drawing a double pension. I think there should be some provision in the Act which would prevent a circumstance like that arising.

Your third amendment is to increase the maximum pension. If I understand the Act correctly, a Cabinet Minister could on April 1st, 1961, get a pension of

March 30, 1961

\$3,980, and on April 1st, 1962, he could get a pension of \$4,200. In other words, in effect, the ceiling is being raised by \$1,200. We can't go along with such an increase, I believe if I read this Bill correctly the Leader of the Opposition gets in there somewhere. But the circumstances in Ottawa are these. The ceiling for a man who has served the maximum, which if my memory serves me is seventeen sessions, is \$3,000. That man can have been a Cabinet Minister who served twenty-five years or thirty, but he still only gets a pension of \$3,000. The pension scheme in Ottawa, whether it's for a Private Member or a Cabinet Minister, is precisely the same. Now how could this Legislature justify paying one of its Members \$4,200, when a private or Federal Cabinet Minister can only get \$3,000? We think that the ceiling of \$3,000 is adequate, and we hope the Government will reconsider and keep that ceiling where it is.

There has been a good deal of talk this year about the need for economy, and a good deal of talk of the plight of old age pensioners. I remember when a pension scheme was discussed in Ottawa, some of my socialist friends opposed it. One of the arguments they used, I don't know if it was a good one or not, but one of the arguments they used was how can this Government pay \$3,000 a year to Members as pensions, when the poor old age pensioner is only getting, I think it was \$45.00 a month at that time. Well whether that's a valid argument or whether it isn't, I think there will be resentment in the country in view of the small supplementary old age pension which is being paid by this Legislature, if hon. Members suddenly take it upon themselves to increase the amount of the Cabinet Minister's pension to \$4,200. Therefore, I say again, unless we can be persuaded that there's some valid reason for it, I don't think this group can go along with the principle at the present time. As I say, I'm going to have more to say when the actual Bill gets into Committee. But this is the way I interpret the Act, if I read it correctly. Perhaps the Minister could tell me if I've made any mistakes in so doing.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, may I make a . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I must point out to the hon. Members that the hon. Minister is about to close the debate.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, could I be permitted to ask the Minister a question?

Mr. Speaker: — Pardon me you have already spoken on this debate.

Mr. Thatcher: — Could I just ask him a question?

Mr. Speaker: — I don't know how that would fit in with our rules of procedure.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well I'll get another Member to ask it for me if you insist, but I think it will just take a minute if . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! If it's agreeable to the House that this be allowed? . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — I wonder if the Minister could supply the House with, shall we say the balance sheet, of the fund as it stands now. Is that available somewhere to Members so we can see what has been paid to date, whether it's financially solvent and so on?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I think as a matter of fact it has been tabled.

Mr. Thatcher: — It could have been I didn't see it.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — May I just comment on the question. I inquired about this recently and I find that the fund is still growing. That is, into the fund go the contributions of the Members together with a matching contribution by the Government. As at the end of the year this was more than enough, of course, to take care of payments going out.

Now, just a word or two on the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. He objects first of all, to two parts of the proposal, namely, that a person might come from the Federal House, having earned a pension there, and might then be elected to the Provincial House and qualify for a pension under our Act. Well it is a bit difficult admittedly, to put two pensions together, and yet in terms of the principle involved I must confess that I don't see anything basically wrong with this. Let me put it this way,

March 30, 1961

a person could come into this House having a pension from any other group, and if he were here long enough to qualify, would be entitled to the pension here because of his service here. In other words, I don't see any reason why the eligibility for a pension is different for a person who may have been in the Federal House, then it is for a person who wasn't in the Federal House. I don't see any reason why the eligibility for a pension under this plan should be different for a person who may have worked for a bank or an industry, than it is for a person who may have been in the Federal House. It seems to me that this ought to stand on all fours. And perhaps I should just add here, of course, that he cannot use — the Member referred to a double pension — he cannot use the time that he sat in the Federal House, having received a pension for it, to qualify in any way for a pension here. He can't make use of the time doubled. He earns the Federal pension by virtue of certain service in the Federal House; he earns the pension here by virtue of certain service in this House, and I don't see why the one should cancel out the other simply because they happen both to be in the public service field of political activity.

The same thing is true with regard to the motion the other way of course. A person earns a pension in this House because of the length of service here, because of having made certain contributions, because of having become a certain age. Now then, I can see no reason why, when he moves to the Federal House, these factors should interfere with him qualifying under their terms, anymore than if he had not been in this House previously, and had been in some other branch of the public service or some other branch of private service and then went to the Federal House he'd qualify again on the basis of his service there. I don't see why what he did before should cancel it out.

Thirdly, with regard to the increase in the maximum for all Members to which the hon. Member has objected. I pointed out when I introduced the Bill, when I spoke on second reading just a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill originally stated a maximum which was at that time a maximum which obtained in the Public Service. In every other way, with one exception, what a Member has to do under this Act compares with what people do in regard to the Public Service Act. They have to contribute annually. Insofar as calculating the amount to be received is concerned, the calculation is made on exactly the same basis. I find it a little

difficult to understand why service as a Cabinet Minister should receive a pension more restrictive, than service as a Deputy Minister or anybody else in the public service. I don't really see why we should ask the same kind of payment of one, calculate the pension on the same basis, and say to the Cabinet Minister that your service is not worth as much to the public as the service of somebody else who happened to have been full time in the public service. And it's on that basis that we are proposing to tie it to the maximum in the public service. The one difference between the public service is that a Cabinet Minister may receive this at age 55. If he were in the public service he could still receive it at 55, but would receive a somewhat reduced level, but could if he had enough service receive it at 55.

The other difference is this I may add, that the person in the public service makes his contribution to the pension plan on a maximum of \$10,000, no matter what salary he or she may be getting, he makes it on the maximum of the \$10,000. A Cabinet Minister with salary and indemnity as they presently are, makes a contribution not on \$10,000, but on \$12,000, so he is actually making a contribution on a larger amount of money.

Now with regard to the maximum in the Federal House. May I say the situation is quite different in two ways. The Leader of the Opposition made quite a point of the fact that Cabinet Ministers there receive the same maximum as Private Members. So they do, so they do Mr. Speaker, they also contribute on the same amount. But the Cabinet Minister at Ottawa contributes on his indemnity, the same as every Member of Parliament does; he contributes not a single penny insofar as his salary is concerned. He contributes on his indemnity only, and this is a very considerable difference. In this province and in most of the other provincial schemes, the Cabinet Minister contributes on his indemnity and on his salary, and as I have just pointed out, Cabinet Ministers will in the future contribute at the rate of 7% on their salary, instead of 5% as is true with regard to the indemnity.

And the other point, of course, which is considerably different between here and Ottawa, is that in Ottawa the Cabinet Minister or the Member of Parliament, having qualified by virtue of a certain number of Sessions, regardless of age, may start to draw his pension. He may be thirty-five or he may be forty and he may draw a pension for the rest of his life for the full amount, a pension which I repeat may go up to 75% of the indemnity

March 30, 1961

on which he pays. He would have to be there quite a long while to accumulate that much, but no matter what his age is he starts to draw it. In our plan, however, a person does not draw the pension until he reaches the age of fifty-five.

I want to just go back again, since this point has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition, and refer to the maximum which is allowed in other provinces which have a plan. In Canada, my understanding is that the Federal plan is 75% of the indemnity. In British Columbia it would go up to something like 70% of the combined salary and indemnity, which would be much higher than ours will be. In Alberta they receive at the rate of 2% per year times the annual average salary for five years; they may contribute for twenty-five years and so they could go up to 50%. Now 50% of their salary alone is much more than our present maximum or that which is being suggested. In Ontario the maximum is one-half of the Minister's salary, which again is a larger maximum than ours. So I can say this, that in each of those provinces, and in the Federal Parliament, the maximum is not only higher than the one which is in our existing Act, but is also higher than the one which is being proposed. And I can say also, that the method of calculating the amount of pension, is in these other provinces a more generous one, or as generous as is ours.

I'm not going to make any apologies whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, for the fact that this increase in maximum is being proposed. I think there are two main points, one, as I say, by virtue of the comparison I have just made with other provinces seems to be in line with the decisions that have been made there, not quite as good but in line. Secondly, I can see no reason at all why a Cabinet Minister who is full time, should be more restricted insofar as the maximum pension he may earn under the same conditions, as some other member of the public service who is full time in a capacity other than that of a Cabinet Minister, of course.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Assessment Commission Act

Hon Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):

Mr. Speaker, in the early days of this Session, an Act to amend the Conservation and Development Act was passed, and these amendments provided that when there is an appeal in regard to an assessment under the Conservation and Development Act, the appeal would go to the Saskatchewan Assessment Commission, rather than to a District Court, and this amendment to the Saskatchewan Assessment Commission Act is just to provide for the hearing of those appeals which come from the Conservation and Development Act.

Mr. Speaker, I move that an Act to amend the Saskatchewan Assessment Commission Act, be now read a second time.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Bill No. 77 — An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act, 1960.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):

Mr. Speaker, the Bill to amend the Rural Municipality Act contains a few new provisions which I might mention.

First there is provision for organized contributions to a snow removal program. This amendment was requested by a number of municipalities in northern Saskatchewan. There is also provision for the financing of garbage disposal units. This will apply in Hamlets which are supplied with natural gas. In cities and towns where natural gas is supplied, many people are getting these garbage disposal units, and we thought that people living in the hamlets and having natural gas should have the same privileges.

There are some new provisions in regard to the collection of Farmers Union dues, and these provisions were worked out with the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities executive and the executive of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union, and were satisfactory and acceptable to both of them.

One other new provision is in regard to the division of certain license fees between the municipal funds and the educational authority.

March 30, 1961

The other clauses in the Act are dealing with details which can be better discussed in committee.

I would move that the Bill be now read a second time.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

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