

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fourteenth Legislature
40th Day

Thursday, April 6, 1961.

The House met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

RE LEADER-POST ARTICLE RE PETRO-CHEMICAL INDUSTRY FOR ESTEVAN

Mr. Ian H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):

Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on this article that appeared in the "Leader-Post" regarding a petro-chemical industry for Saskatchewan. I want to say that as far as Estevan is concerned, we are quite ready for this industry to move in. They have conducted certain tests down there and with our available water supply, or coal, gas and raw materials, Estevan is certainly ready to go ahead. They have started a low-cost housing program, and we are just waiting for this company to come and get started. However, I was a little surprised to find that Mr. Spry made the announcement, out of England, because as an Alderman of the City of Estevan, we were instructed, and we had discussed it amongst ourselves, and I think amongst officials of the Government to keep it quiet, at least until such time as this company was ready to move. I'd just like to as the Minister if it's now a policy for the announcements to come from Mr. Spry's office.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member had read the article carefully, he'd see that Mr. Spry has made no such announcement. What the reporter from the "Leader-Post" has done is to quote from the Annual Report of the Department of Co-operatives, which contains a review of the activities of the Agent General for the year. In the course of his report, the reporter from the "Leader-Post" brought it to me and drew my attention to it. Mr. Spry says that he was, on the instructions of the instructions of the Government, carrying out discussions and meetings from

April 6, 1961

time to time with certain British and Italian firms. There has been no announcement by Mr. Spry. The article in question refers only to the statements taken from the Annual Report of Mr. Spry, which is printed, and on the desks of all the Members.

Mr. Spry has made no such announcement, and no Government official has made any announcement regarding these particular interests who are looking into the possibilities of a petro-chemical industry. The Government is not in a position to make any announcements. The matter lies entirely with them and when the time comes to make an announcement, it will come from them.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mrs. Strum regarding nuclear disarmament.

Mrs. Gladys Strum (Saskatoon City):

I suggest that we get rid of this resolution. I would like to close the debate.

Mr. Thatcher: — The hon. Member is not here this morning but I think it would be quite in order, as far as this group is concerned, for the hon. Member to proceed. I can understand her wish in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: — It is quite in order to proceed in the absence of the Member who adjourned the debate if the House agrees to do so.

Mrs. Strum: — I find myself in the most . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I must point out that the hon. Member is about to close the debate.

Mrs. Strum: — I find myself in a very awkward position. I canvassed both sides of the House to try to get speakers, and everybody said no. I was in the position of the little red hen. I went around and said, "Who will take care of this?" and nobody wanted to, you see. So, I came loaded with all kinds of references and to my horror, the hon. Member for Cutknife jerked the chair from under me, as it were, as I was about to rise. At that point the little red hen became the little wet hen, and I threatened to shoot him if he ever did that again. Now, for a peace-loving person, that's a very violent statement, and I apologize to

the Member. However, I think that I am ready to fight for peace.

Mr. Speaker, seriously, nothing is more important in the world today than the subject matter of this resolution, and had we done nothing else in this Session but consider its implications, I think this Session would have been worthwhile.

Now, I'm not taking my own personal opinion for this authority, but everywhere you look, you'll find evidence to prove that this is true. The latest authority is Doctor Toynbee in the last issue of "MacLean's Magazine," and as he is an outstanding international authority, I'd like to quote just a few lines from his article in "MacLean's Magazine" which he writes under the title of "The Last Choice of Western Society". He points out that we have a new situation in world history. And he says that:

"Now that for the first time in history the whole human race has been united on the military plane, the choice confronting us may be one between going all the way to unity or going under. What seems improbable is that a society can ever again be united by force. This seems improbable, because the force used in future warfare would be atomic force, and this would annihilate the society, leaving nothing in existence to unite."

And then he goes on to say that this new situation developed in the year 1949, and that a great many people have not yet adjusted their thinking to meet this new situation. He says:

"Thus the year 1949 opened a new era in human history. Before that date, the survival of the human race had been assured ever since the time partway through the Palaeolithic Age, when mankind won unchallengeable ascendancy over all other forms of life on this planet as well as over inanimate nature. Between that time and the year 1949 man's crimes and follies could and did wreck civilizations and bring unnecessary and undeserved sufferings upon countless numbers of men, women, and children. But the worst that man could do with his pre-atomic technology was not enough to enable him to destroy his own race. Genocide, at least,

April 6, 1961

was beyond his power until the atomic weapon had been invented and had been acquired by more states than one.”

And, so he reinforces our argument. He says that in the next war, if we use the ultimate in weapons, no one will win because no one will be left, and the planet will be uninhabitable. They tell us now that we have a new term, “over-kill”; that we have enough atomic weapons to kill three times as many persons as are now on this planet. That’s a very chilling thought, isn’t it? We have now ready and waiting and in the air constantly above us, in planes, triggered to go, something that can start off a chain reaction in atomic warfare that would leave our planet uninhabitable.

Another thing that we have to take into consideration is that in the past, wars, although they were destructive, although they were foolish, although they were dreadful, they did not alter the genetic pattern of life. Although they mutilated people and killed them by the thousands, nature had built into the race, the inviolate germ of life that was not altered by mutilation on the outside. You could cut off arms and legs, and wound and maim, but the offspring of these people would be born whole, because only through genetic inheritance can you bring about the cripple and the imbecile. But, that ladies and gentlemen has been altered. That is no longer true. Atomic fallout alters the genetic pattern of plant and animal life, and that’s why even testing has to be banned. We are worried now about retarded children, and they tell us that retarded children carry an extra gene in the chromosome; that it is an alteration of the genetic pattern, that brings about the retarded child. Yet, we are now living in an area that gets maximum fallout while we absorb carbon 14, and many other of these deadly radioactive materials in our milk, in our plant and animal life, and we may even now be breeding a race of monsters, unknowingly.

Now, are we going to condone this nonsense? Are we going to go on as civilized people, knowing what is happening and out of habit, or out of mistaken loyalty, permit it to happen without protest? I am glad that we have enough people in Canada who are big enough to go beyond party lines to say that this must stop. I am glad that there are people who are willing to march in the rain and in the slush and get skinned heels and

wet coats and bedraggled bodies, doing these great marches across the world, that our Governments must listen and we may still do something about this dreadful situation that threatens mankind, wherever he may live in the world.

So, I want not to extend this debate, because everyone is tired of talk. We are all tired of listening to each other, but I merely want to say that there is nothing in this Session as important as this resolution. It is a question of annihilation or co-existence. Toynbee has something to say about this too, and I am always pleased when people agree with me. I was very happy that Toynbee agreed with me. He says:

There are encouraging precedents in the history of the co-existence of Protestantism with Catholicism, and of Islam with Christianity, since the date which the Catholic-Protestant, and the Christian-Moslem wars of religion petered out. These wars came to an end because it became evident to both belligerent parties simultaneously that it was beyond the power of either of them to wipe its adversary off the map. After this recognition the old quarrel between them gradually became less and less absorbing.”

No one detests the methods of Communism more than I do. No one detests the denial of freedom and dignity more than I do. I get into a row with my colleagues here sometimes because they refuse to give dignity to women — sometimes. And the war between the sexes and the war between the black and whites is the same war. It is the war between the people who are denied the dignity of maturity and the people who want it. If we are to grant human rights, not rights to women or rights to colored people, but human rights to all people, then we must permit these people to live. We must not only live, and let live, but we must live and help live, and that is why the resources that we are now squandering on destruction, should be used to help people to live, and our technicians that are engaged in plotting destruction should be loaned to help to bring about these advances in technology that would wipe out famine, and wipe out hunger, and wipe out unproductive areas in the earth.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how you close this off, I've already moved it, how do I finish it? Okay I'm all for it.

April 6, 1961

The question being put, it was agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas

Messieurs

Douglas	Dewhurst	Brockelbank
Lloyd	Nollet	Kuziak
Cooper (Mrs.)	Strum (Mrs.)	Davies
Willis	Brown	Thurston
Blakeney	Erb	Nicholson
Turnbull	Stone	Whelan
Thibault	Kramer	Johnson
Meakes	Thiessen	Snyder
Kluzak	Dahlman	Semchuk
Perkins	Peterson	Brotten

Nays

Messieurs

Thatcher	McCarthy	Danielson
Guy	Klein	Coderre
MacDougall	Snedker	

GOVERNMENT ORDERS — ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney.

That Bill No. 56 — An Act to provide for the Alteration of Certain Mineral Contracts — be now read the second time.

Mr. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to comment on this Bill any further until it gets into Committee.

The question being put, it was agreed to on the following recorded division, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Yeas

Messieurs

Douglas	Dewhurst	Brockelbank
Lloyd	Nollet	Kuziak
Cooper (Mrs.)	Strum (Mrs.)	Davies
Willis	Brown	Thurston
Blakeney	Erb	Nicholson
Turnbull	Stone	Whelan
Thibault	Kramer	Johnson
Meakes	Thiessen	Snyder
Kluzak	Dahlman	Semchuk
Perkins	Peterson	Brotten
McCarthy	Klein	MacDougall
Snedker		

Nays

Messieurs

Thatcher	Danielson	McFarlane
Guy	Boldt	Coderre

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 79 — An act to amend The Administration of Estates of the Mentally Incompetent Act

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Minister of Education):

Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend The Estates of the Mentally Incompetent Act, and it is a Bill which is made necessary because of the changes provided for in The Mental Health Act, 1961. That is the Act which the hon. Minister of Health introduced into this House recently and which went through Committee of the Whole and third reading, yesterday, I believe.

The changes in this Act are quite small and follow from The Mental Health Act. There is a redefinition of "hospital" to make it comply with the definition in The Mental Health Act, and similarly a redefinition of a mentally incompetent person. The old Administrator of the Estates of the Mentally Incompetent Act provided that the administrator would take charge of an estate when a person has been committed to a mental institution. Now that The Mental Health Act makes provision for voluntary admission to mental institutions this was no longer a

April 6, 1961

possible definition of the time when the administrator should take charge, and accordingly the administrator's status will be dependent upon whether a Certificate of Incompetence is issued pursuant to Section 20 of The Mental Health Act.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, there are no points of principle in the Bill. There are simply changes in wording to make it comply with the provisions in The Mental Health Act, and a couple of small changes to make it comply with the recent changes in The Land Titles Act. These, I think, can most properly be discussed in Committee, and accordingly Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of the Bill.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Bill No. 80 — An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, the amendments contained in this Bill are, many of them similar to those which are found in the Rural Municipality Bill, and there are other minor changes and I think that all of these can be better discussed in Committee, and I would move that this Bill be now read a second time.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

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