

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Fourteenth Legislature
10th Day

Tuesday, October 24, 1961.

SITTING OF THE HOUSE

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, last evening when we were discussing the agreement we had reached regarding sittings of the House, it was suggested by the Leader of the Opposition that there had been some breach of faith in this regard and some misunderstanding as to the commitment which was given. I wish to refer the House to the Hansard of this Assembly for Friday, October 13, page 88, in which I said at the conclusion of the discussion:

“I wonder if this would not be the most satisfactory way to go ahead with the mornings. We haven’t any legislation in front of us except the Medical Care Insurance Act. When we get into the legislation itself if the members feel that they would like to cut down to half days, then the whips could confer, knock off the morning sittings or the evening sittings, whichever seems the more appropriate to the members. I wonder if this would meet the situation.”

Then on the Hansard of Monday, October 16, the following Monday, page 113, I am recorded as having said:

“On Friday I made a proposal because of the very proper concern which some members had that when we get into the medical care legislation, members may feel that they want more time. My suggestion was that if we agreed to sit mornings, afternoons and evenings, except of course on Wednesdays, on the Speech from the Throne, then the whips could arrange it. We could bring in a motion either not to sit mornings, or to adjourn some evenings at 5:30 so that the members could have the evenings to work it over.”

Those were the two commitments which I made at that time. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they still

stand. If the members on either side in their caucuses feel that we ought to introduce a motion not to sit mornings, or to adjourn at 5:30, then of course, this I shall be very glad to introduce. But the conduct of the business of the House lies with the House itself, and the government doesn't presume to dictate to the House what order of business that you follow.

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, as far as the opposition is concerned, we have indicated several times already, both on the floor of the House and through our whips, as was suggested by the Premier, we didn't feel that we should be sitting both mornings and evenings, and we very definitely took it as a commitment on the part of the Premier, that if we gave such an indication we wouldn't have to sit. Now, he can play on words all he likes, but this is a breach of a gentlemen's agreement, and I don't like it.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think this statement is to be debated at this time, and I don't think remarks of this nature are in order.

STATEMENT RE INCOME TAX ACT

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, just a word with regard to the Act Respecting Income Tax which has just been distributed, and which was passed for first reading on division a minute ago.

It is rather a lengthy act, and perhaps I may say insofar as the discretion of this legislature concerning this act is concerned, it is in fact limited to two areas. We do have discretion, (some members might call in indiscretion) with regard to the additional rates of taxation to be imposed. The second discretion is really only one of drafting. A model bill has been prepared. The principles must be accepted, according to the arrangement with the federal government, so these we can't change. We can say some of the things somewhat differently, but this is truly a matter of drafting.

There is being prepared, and I hope to have it distributed fairly soon, some fairly lengthy notes with regard to the background and interpretation of this bill . . .

MOTION RE TRADE UNION ACT

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg) moved the following resolution:

“That this Assembly is of the opinion that The Trade Union Act, being Chapter 259 of the Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, should be amended to prohibit deductions from wages of employees from being used to finance any political party.”

He said: I feel that nowadays the rights of the individuals the rights of the individuals are being infringed upon more and more by all forms of governments and the only way we can stop that is determined effort on the part of governments and people in the governments to try and stop this infringement on the rights of individuals. It is rather difficult at times to control governments in that respect, but we can certainly do everything we can to stop this infringement on rights and freedoms of individuals by independent groups or political parties, regardless of their political stripe. Be they socialists, communists, Liberals, it doesn't matter what you have, these rights must be preserved at all costs. In view of that Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to try and make an attempt to try to rectify the wrongs or the evils we see coming.

Reading the other day in some paper, I noticed a few comments which rather appealed to me in some respects. I believe and I know, that the left wing CCF have convinced the CCF party, and now they have sort of pulled a trick from the treasure house of Marxism. The extreme left wingers within the ranks of the CCF have now convinced the CCF party that they should amalgamate – merge. Communist politics or socialist politics, after all what is the difference? The difference has been admitted by many members opposite, Mr. Speaker. What is the difference between communism or socialism? It has been publicly admitted. Communist politics is therefore, the increasingly systematic manipulation of people, wittingly or unwittingly, willing or unwilling, singly or in groups. The object is always power, all else is technique.

I suggest to the members of the government, members of the CCF party to sit back and think this over because it is not true, that increasingly they are manipulating the people, and their only object is power. As I say all else is technique.

October 24, 1961

The only freedom that deserves the name is that of pursuing our own good in our own way, so long as we don't intend to deprive others or to impede others in the search or in their efforts to attain it.

We can always see, Mr. Speaker, the left wing elements trying to impede anyone who is trying to preserve that right. If the Attorney General would just sit back and listen for a little while, he might learn a little something on how to preserve the right. He has the responsibility in that department to do everything he can to preserve the rights of people, whoever or whatever they may be.

Out now part-time Premier in the province, or the new party leader, and I'll quote from the "Leader Post" May 8, he said:

"All of us can live in a country where there is freedom of thought and action. Mr. Douglas said the future is bleak for those who don't."

With this statement of the leader of the new party, I agree most whole-heartedly because I do want to live in a country of freedom of thought and action and I do admit that the future is bleak for those who don't.

Now I ask, why does his new party not practise what they preach? The actions, the intentions of the new party, of which he is leader, have only taken some definite stands and views in encouraging the check-off for political purposes. Where is the freedom of thought or action, when at their founding convention the new party decided that the local unions could vote themselves in support financially of a political party and check-off dues would be collected under this plan. Where is the freedom of thought in that respect? Members of affiliated unions will automatically be doomed, also to be party members and be charged 5¢ per month as part of their union dues, unless they take individual action at a union level to contract out of this arrangement. Now some people will argue, what is a measly 5¢? It has been said in this House, just a word across the floor by the Minister of Labour, and he said 'what's 5¢?' This is not a matter of monetary value, Mr. Speaker, nor will it create any financial hardships, but it is a matter of moral value, rights of the individual, being committed by others. This means, Mr. Speaker, that a union, where the representation at a meeting is small probably due to the indifference, you will find that a well organized group

could commit the local union to a check-off. As an indication I should probably mention a small part of an article that appeared in the 'Leader Post' October 3, 1961.

“A delegation representing 6,000 Member unions, voted 60 to 54 for withdrawal.”

I am just using that part of the quote to show that a small group of people can commit 6,000 people to one thing or the other. Now in this particular case I am not debating whether the actions of this particular union were correct in deciding whether they were right, or whether they were wrong in withdrawing or anything else. The only reason I'm bringing this up is to show that very, very often the representation at the meeting does not truly represent the majority, or even much less than the majority of the party.

Premier Douglas: — A meeting of shareholders would?

Mr. Coderre: — He says, 'a meeting of shareholders would.' Well, we probably will discuss that a little later Mr. Speaker.

But what I'm bringing up is that if these union meetings do or do not decide that a union should or should not contribute, insofar as political parties are concerned, this is committing people generally and is morally wrong. Unless there was unanimous approval in that respect, I feel that it would be immoral and wrong.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You should have read it over before you started speaking.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Coderre: — Many local unions have taken a very positive stand against the check-off for political purposes, but the socialists at the convention pressed their point very, very strongly. I presume they wanted to lay their cotton-picking fingers on the slush funds that would accrue. I accuse the socialists of doing great harm to local unions, Mr. Speaker, by trying to impose such actions on the wage earners.

Many opponents of the clause, Mr. Speaker, claim that it is undemocratic and I agree with them, it is rightly so. I believe that it capitalizes on the indifference and the apathy of the average union member, and we find that a very small percentage of union members actually attend meeting.

October 24, 1961

When it comes to deciding positively what action should be taken for the betterment of the conditions of work, then it may have its merits, but when you try to commit individuals to some philosophy, whether it is a political philosophy or religious philosophy or whatever it may be, I believe it is morally wrong. There are many of those members who rarely attend meetings and many will become contributing members of the party without any knowledge. Arguments may be brought forth stating that a person should attend meetings. We all know that, Mr. Speaker. When we have municipal elections, or elections, the small percentage of people who take an active part in our politics today; it is really sad to see this. But the same thing is taking place within all our labour organizations. You have people who are part of organizations just for the sake of belonging, but they are not there.

I believe that the reasons for indifference and the apathy of the union members, in this respect, is lack of opportunity for full expression at meetings, and fear of intimidation. I'll tell you more that this later, Mr. Speaker, where members have been intimidated for having expressed themselves, contrary to the wishes of meetings. It is a general apathy on the part of the public and it is our duty as legislators to safeguard those very same people, because of their indifference, because of that apathy in life generally. That is our duty, Sir, as legislators, not to tell people what to do, but to prevent people from doing what they should not do to those who cannot do for themselves what they should.

Some of the union big shots across the line, and for all we know some of them may have a gangster background- we don't know – some of them have been accused to that effect – have fallen in for this socialist thinking, this political party sneaking into it, and they also are trying to sneak into this. They probably hope to further feather their nests. I should like to bring forth somewhat of an argument in regard to the arrogance of some union bosses. I have here from the 'Leader Post', September 26, 1961, and I shall quote:

“The Retail, Wholesale, Department Stores International Union will not stint in its financial support of Canada's New Democratic Party, the union chief said in Regina Saturday. Max Greenberg of New York, international president of the 168 thousand member union said that the international union has already contributed to the new party.”

I'll stop here for a moment. He has already contributed to the party without consulting any of the members, anywhere.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Who told you?

Mr. Coderre: — I'll show you that, Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes, why they have not been consulted. If you're prepared, I'll bring many union members in here providing that you can assure them that they will not be ousted out of the unions, or kicked out, or taken advantage of. I know of many members of that very same union who are violently opposed to the check-off. But the leader of this party has committed his union membership already for political dues without the consultation of the membership as a whole.

“I am thrilled with the concept of the new party,” he says, “and we will support it strongly, financially and morally, to make it virile and strong.”

That's his view and his right to have so, but has he the right to support it financially with dues that have been collected for other purposes? These dues have been collected from the union membership for welfare purposes, as a wage reserve . . . I don't know the terms used in it, but for the betterment of the working man, the wage earners themselves within their organization. Rightly so, but has a union boss got the right to take that money and use it for other purposes than it is intended?

“Mr. Greenberg, and George Fowler of Toronto, an international vice-president and Canadian director of the union (and so on), Mr. Alvin Heaps, Jack Farley, executive secretary, both of New York were in Regina during a cross country tour to step up membership in the 20 thousand member Canadian organization.”

Making statements like that in regard to political check-off is certainly not going to be very encouraging to try and increase the membership, which they should, which they have a right to do so. A lot of these boys might think twice if they are going to have to contribute to a party that they will have no trust in. Regardless of what party it is, Mr. Speaker. I direct my attack in this particular case to the NDP because they have instigated, and they have fostered this idea, this plan of sneaking in the back door and trying to divide the wonderful efforts that made these unions. He goes on and he says:

October 24, 1961

“We have pledged financial support. We have contributed and we will continue to contribute. We will not stint. Mr. Fowler said the 20 thousand member Canadian section of the union had oversubscribed their quota set forth at the founding convention, but he would not reveal the amount.”

The audacity and the daring of any one to commit these 20 thousand members to that, without consultation and with arrogance towards its membership. Mr. Max Greenberg is wrong. I challenge any of them to put this issue to a complete vote, a secret vote by an independent board to supervise the vote amongst each union at any place here in Regina. I know, Mr. Speaker, I'm just a small town businessman. I have had the occasion upon occasion to go into every wholesale house in this city, talking to the shipper, the warehouseman, the man at the desk – all union members, and they are violently opposed to this action. Many of them are opposed to this type of check-off and this is the one reason why I am bringing this resolution in this House. The people across can sit back, Mr. Speaker, and have a good smug smile. That's the socialist arrogance that is coming out.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Shout louder.

Mr. Coderre: — If only one person out of all this group who belong to this labour organization would have approached me and expressed opposition, but it is not one, Mr. Speaker, it is literally dozens. On coffee row I have met them, all across the north of the track in the wholesale section.

I emphasize again, it is upon the insistence of many of these employees that I am bringing this resolution in. Many have indicated their opposition of an outsider telling them what political party they should support through financial political check-off. It is wrong for unions in Saskatchewan or anywhere for that matter, be they Liberal, Social Credit, Conservative, CCF or what have you, to have to contribute to a political party by check-off because the majority of the group or an organization to which they belong, do so.

Theoretically we understand that they can check out, but immediately upon doing so he loses the secrecy of his ballot, and identifies himself as hostile to the party in which the union would be contributing to. Such

a unionist would become the target of disciplinary action and outright hostility. Oh, they may smile, Mr. Speaker. All they have to do is have a good examination of their conscience, and have a good discussion with many of these people. Not only CCFers, but Liberals and Conservatives alike, all people who believe in freedom of choice and decision. Opposition to those advocating the automatic check-off said that a person could contract in, a principle under which only these union members who individually indicate their wish to pay a political levy, should be considered as bona fide members of the new party. There is something wrong, even with this voluntary signing on or checking on. This binds, Mr. Speaker, a member in perpetuity, and any change of mind by that member would have the same effect as being automatically on the check-off list. He'd have to sign off, after checking on. In any event, Mr. Speaker, it is still immoral and undemocratic. Whether you sign on or whether you sign off, the automatic check-off strips the individual of the secrecy ballot. Unwillingly and unwittingly. You'll hear some arguments about the signing out. The signing out would be an indication of disloyalty to the party and subject to being expelled by the union. Oh you may smile.

Premier Douglas: — It couldn't be under the constitution of the union.

Mr. Coderre: — Possibly not. You say it couldn't, but it has happened, Mr. Speaker. With the stroke of a pen, a judge in California recently deleted the first amendment from the constitution – I am speaking of what has happened in the States and what can happen here. Two American citizens were stripped of their birthright of free speech, and this put fifteen million union members along the road to political serfdom. The judge accomplished this mass of mischief by signing an order publicly from union policy. “It can't be done eh?” ‘Such men’, said the judge, ‘are disloyal and the union may properly protect itself by expelling them.’ What the judge left unsaid is plain enough. The union member must learn to swallow his convictions and agree with his labour bosses if he wishes to keep the union card which is often an indispensable passport to employment. The closed mouth logically follows the closed shop principle. The right of every American to speak freely on public issues, explicitly guaranteed by the first amendment, must give way to the iron law of union security.

My arguments at this point, Mr. Speaker, are neither for nor against the closed shop principle. That

is something that the unions may arrange themselves and request governments to do. I am not having discussions or arguments in that respect, but I am concerned about the right of the individual to express himself. This has been indicated where one or two individuals have dared to express themselves publicly contrary to the wishes of the union and have been expelled. Therefore we must safeguard that particular part of a wage earner's or a unionist's approach to the matter. This indicates some sort of intimidation. Similar acts of signing out would make this person a marked man and probably subject to union disciplinary action as has taken place elsewhere.

Another example of disciplinary action by a union has been indicated here. The United Steel workers of America shut down the American steel industry in 1959 for 116 days. At the biannual convention of this union, held in Atlantic City in September, a union member from Pennsylvania disagreed with a union leader's policy, circulated leaflets setting forth his criticism, and what happened? Shop sergeants-at-arms promptly seized him and he was severely beaten up. He had to be taken to the hospital. Some elements within these labour unions are definitely taking advantage of many people who don't quite agree or don't fall into line.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, dare a wage earner, or a unionist, sign off or sign on, or refuse to sign on or ask to sign off? I probably don't blame the union bosses for that. To the everlasting shame of the CCF, Mr. Speaker, for political reasons brought into their fold the union bosses. To their everlasting shame.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — But this socialist group, Mr. Speaker, is creating a rift in many cases within labour circles. The action by this government has and is creating a rift in many cases within the labour unions.

The local organization of the Saskatchewan Hospital in Weyburn were involved in very hot discussions recently on this matter alone. Tempers raised and many were very concerned with the actions. Everywhere where this question of political check-off is brought up for discussion, some divisions are created and in many cases people involved dare not raise their voices for fear of some reprisal. For shame to have included this political check-off in their constitution.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to do all I can to help those who do not wish to contribute in one way or another. I am happy though, Mr. Speaker, to see that some unions have not fallen into line. I would like to quote some excerpts from the ‘Leader Post’ of the 22nd, 1961, dateline Edmonton.

“About 100 delegates approved a resolution which said that the union will not instruct its members how to vote or compel its members to make financial contributions to any political party.”

I give credit to them for that bold action. They defied the socialist brass who had infiltrated the labour unions and organizations.

He says:

“The union officers at the convention found that no support would be given to the New Democratic Party, until it got something about rival unions . . .

“However, the New Democratic party continued to come in for wholesale criticism with the Canadian Labour Congress and the United Steel Workers of America, a CLC affiliate.”

Another situation which arises, and one which is creating grave concern for the rights and freedoms of the individual, and one which will have nothing but repercussions on the well-being of the wage earners, and that is the question of the battle for a bigger share of the wage earner’s collected dues, as I have illustrated in this release. This battle between unions, which is beginning to take shape now, because of socialist infiltration, is simply not good for the wage earner, Mr. Speaker. This puts the unionist in the squeeze of the big union bosses, politically infiltrated and pushed by these socialists, who are trying to push their way in and creating division amongst their ranks. It is a question of the battle for the big one – for a bigger and bigger share of the union dues. It is an everlasting shame, Mr. Speaker, on these socialists.

Labour, Mr. Speaker, is not just a mere chattel, since the human dignity of the workingman must be recognized, and consequently he can’t be bought and sold like a piece of merchandise. That has been the case recently with the union boss and the socialist. They are bartering for that, just as a piece of merchandise over the counter. Where is the human dignity of man? Have the socialists got any dignity? As I said a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, communist

October 24, 1961

politics therefore, is the increasingly systematic manipulation of people, wittingly or unwittingly, willing or unwilling, singly or in groups. The object is always power. Socialist power! The inalienable rights of every human being is the right of association, Mr. Speaker, without compulsion, with whom he wishes. No legislation should be on the statute of this province or any province, or any state for that matter, that would deny this right to anyone, Mr. Speaker. In fact, legislation should be on the statutes here to protect his association by coercion. What of the political check-off system, what of signing in, or what of signing off? The persons using this practice of signing on or off would have to divulge his personal thoughts and intentions, and make himself a marked man. It is best, Mr. Speaker, to safeguard him now.

According to the polls, it was shown that 66 per cent of labour union households are opposed to the new party. Sixty-six per cent of the labour union households are opposed to the new party. The CLC membership indicates that 35 per cent are opposed. In view of the mentioned loss of individual freedoms, and taking into consideration the rights of this 66 per cent of union members who are opposed, and even the 35 per cent of the membership of the CLC I move this resolution.

Something was said a few moments ago, in regard to business contributing to a political party, or individuals contributing to a political party. We have assumed, Mr. Speaker, in our democratic system of way of life, that a person who has earned some money of his own free will can contribute to anyone or anything he wishes. This is our democratic right. In no way, Mr. Speaker, is that comparable to what will take place in the labour unions, in this case, as it is from the individual contributing. The source of revenue whether it is a little business man, big business man, whether it is a wage earner or not, according to the system of which we believe, a man who earns something for his services, for his administration, it rightfully belongs to him. This administration, Mr. Speaker, has accepted that because they are not bringing a bill to the legislature in that respect. If they say that a person who earns something, it belongs to him, I presume he can do what he wishes after the government has its share through taxes for services which are to be rendered. There is no argument there, Mr. Speaker, to say whether a person may or may not contribute. A businessman or an individual is not binding anyone by contributing to a political party. He may contribute one time, and he may not the next day, either by membership or otherwise. It has been mentioned in the past that the

brewery industry is probably contributing to the political party across the floor. They can withdraw their contributions if they wish. They are not compelling anyone to buy their beer or their liquor in order to make this contribution. As a businessman I am fully entitled to contribute to whatever party I wish. Of course, it is quite obvious it will be to the Liberal party, but my customers are not obligated in any way to purchase from me, so that I can make that little extra profit if I wish and give it to a political party of my choice. There is no comparison of this to where the majority of people within an organization vote.

I think we must remember this and keep this clearly in mind, Mr. Speaker, that businessmen or individuals are free agents to do as they wish, while the wage earner is not a free agent. He is in an organization, trying to better his way of life, and not be dictated to by socialists who have infiltrated within their ranks, and trying to commit them to a political check-off.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, the last time I spoke in this House was the day before I went to the hospital last March, and I was pleased to have been remembered by both sides of the House. The opposition sent flowers and they were very nice; the government side sent a basket of fruit, and I appreciate the thought behind both and wish to thank all concerned. I also wish to thank the Minister of Public Works for carrying on so capably during my absence.

Now, the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) has seen fit to introduce a resolution, and has just spoken in favour of it.

As members will recall, such an amendment to the labour regulations act was passed in the British Columbia legislature last March. It reads as follows. This is the famous Bill 42 that we've heard so much about in the last few months. Section (b)

“No trade union and no person acting on behalf of a trade union shall directly or indirectly contribution to or expend on behalf of any political party, or on behalf of any candidate for political office, any monies deducted from an employee's wages under subsection (1) or a collective agreement, or pay as a condition of membership in the trade union.”

October 24, 1961

This is exactly what the member for Gravelbourg wants in our Trade Union Act. Let us look for a moment at the Votes and Proceedings for the British Columbia legislature of March 16, 1961. On that date the bill was agreed to on second reading on a division of 33 to 16. Three of the Liberal members voted with the Social Credit, one voted with the CCF. On March 27, when the bill was up for third reading, Mr. Strachan, CCF leader moved that the bill be proceeded with six months hence. The good old six months! hoist, Mr. Speaker. On this occasion however, the Liberal members reversed themselves and three voted with the CCF against Bill 42, one paired. Bill 42 was finally passed on the same division 20 to 16. So we see that the Liberal party in British Columbia is not favourable to the resolution we have under discussion here this morning.

Can the opposition show that any union in this province has requested this amendment? I don't think they can. The only union that asked for this legislation in British Columbia was Jimmy Hoffa's Teamster's union. Are the Liberals of Saskatchewan, the provincial voice of Jimmy Hoffa? While speaking to a mass meeting in Vancouver a few months ago he opposed political action by his union. Actually, Mr. Speaker, such matters do not belong in the Trade Union Act at all. If such a suggestion had any merit, it should go into the elections act, but it has no merit, and no government that believes in democracy could accept such a proposal.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, the CCF has a sizable representation in the BC legislature – 13 members I believe it is. In fact we almost formed the government in that province a few years ago; we were just one member short. It will be interesting to note however, Mr. Speaker, that Premier Bennett of British Columbia would not allow any debate on the Speech from the Throne – I am referring to the session they had just a few weeks ago – would not allow any debate on the Speech from the Throne; would not allow anyone to speak or the resolutions brought in by the opposition, the CCF members. What a difference in Saskatchewan. The opposition here has been given every opportunity to speak on the Speech from the Throne, and any resolutions they care to bring in.

Just to get back to Jimmy Hoffa for a moment. Time and time again members opposite have thrown the name 'Jimmy Hoffa' across the floor of this House, attempting in some mysterious way to link him up with the CCF and scare the people of this province, especially the farmers. In my opinion this man has hurt the cause of labour a great

deal. One thing however that he has been successful in doing is to make the courts of the United States appear both impotent and ineffective.

The hon. member who has just sat down has said a lot about union bosses and referred to some circumstances that happened down in Weyburn not long ago, of which I have no recollection at all. Many of these so-called bosses were originally from the farms; boys who came into the cities took employment and got into some union or other. Reference to what has happened in California or other parts of the United States should not concern labour in the province of Saskatchewan, and we heard a good deal about that in the last 25 or 30 minutes.

Now to get back to the resolution before us. The originators of this proposal have argued that many people resent being obliged to contribution to a political party by means of a check-off. They want our present legislation, governing labour unions changed. They want it to be replaced by legislation prohibiting check-offs from the wages of the employees. On the surface this proposal has a lot in its favour. Indeed why should anybody be made to support a party, not of his choice? None of us want this sort of thing. We are all opposed in principle to any manoeuvres whereby our money is channelled into the treasuries of political parties, which work against our interests. But the hon. member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) has introduced a motion which would in effect instruct the members what they must not do with part of their dues. They must not use it for political reasons, he says. Labour will not like such interference with their rights, and I anticipate will, in no uncertain terms, let their views be known.

No union is going to be dictatorial enough to pay over to a political party an assessment, small as it may be, without the members consent, and if any individual indicates he does not wish such deductions to be made, it will not be made. It will be said of course that such procedure will brand him as being against the political party which the majority wish to support, and that other employees will make it disagreeable for him. He would be disciplined. the hon. member used that word 'disciplined.' This is far from the truth.

Presuming a plant has 50 employees and 10 signify they do not wish to contribute to a political party through a dues deduction. Perhaps they have some reason and would

October 24, 1961

rather contribute personally in cash. But let us say out of the 10 – four are Liberals, four Conservatives and two Social Credit. It may never be known throughout the plant that they are unfavourable to this deduction, but if it does become known – what about it? These ten persons are not going to be abused or ridiculed or disciplined in some way or other. Far from it. There may be some good-natured kidding as to who are good Liberals or good Conservatives, or good social Creditors, but that is as far as it would go. There would be no intimidation – the hon. member used that word. There would be no intimidation at all. In most situations employees in any place of employment are friends regardless of politics. We see the same thing elsewhere through the community, whether it be church, or service clubs, or veterans' associations, chambers of commerce, or any place where people of various political beliefs come in contact with each other. The wage earner is no different. I would like to emphasize that point. The wage earner is no different.

I happen to know of a situation right in this city where practically all employees of this concern support the present government, but with one exception – a dyed in the wool Liberal, year after year after year. He has a son who has worked with this government the last two or three years, and I understand does a good job. We do not say that only government supporters need apply for employment, as was the case previous to 1944.

During the 1960 campaign, certain employees of this government, apparently certain that the CCF was going to be defeated, openly jeered at other civil servants known to be CCF supporters. No action was taken and these fellows are still on the payroll, but they have been very quiet since June 1960. Just think what would have happened if the situation would have been reversed. I know a man in this city who as a civil servant was dismissed back in the 'thirties because he went to a Coldwell meeting.

I'll now read section 25 of the Saskatchewan Trade Union Act, which refers to the check-off. Actually it is a slang term, Mr. Speaker.

“Upon the request in writing of any employee, and upon request of a trade union representing the majority of employees in any bargaining unit of its employees, the employer shall deduct and pay in periodic payments out of the wages due to such employee, to the person designated by the trade union to receive the same, the union

dues of such employee, and the employer shall furnish to such trade unions, the names of the employees who have given such authority. Failure to make payments and furnish information required by this section shall be an unfair labour practice.”

That is the end of section 25. I recall when the act was passed, Mr. Speaker, and one of the five members opposite did make some objections, but that is long since forgotten. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, we have heard little or no complaint, and it is only logical to assume that both labour and management now, 17 ½ years later have become used to such procedure under section 25. It is merely one more wage deduction, along with such deductions as health cards, bonds, donations to the United Appeal, the Red Cross and so forth. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is preferable both to management and labour to have dues paid in this way, rather than have the union shop steward or the union secretary going around each month seeing each union member individually and collecting the dues in cash. Such procedure interferes with operation of the plant and takes the time of the secretary and all the members away from their work on each occasion that that is done.

This resolution interferes with the right of the individual or group of individuals to do with their own money as they please, which violates a fundamental principle of freedom. Are the Liberals trying to use the power of parliament to interfere, not only in the right of a citizen to do with his own money what he pleases, but also to interfere with the right of one specific group in our society, to take political action. I state emphatically that the CCF never has proposed any member of any union, or any union be forced to support any political party.

The Canadian Labour Congress will not affiliate with the New Democratic Party. Claude Jodein has said that time and time again. This means, no part of union dues paid to the Canadian Labour Congress will be used to finance a political party. It will be a democratic decision of the individual unions whether or not they wish to actively participate in political action. The individual member of any particular union will not have to contribute if he does not wish to. We believe in freedom of the individual, Mr. Speaker, and as long as we are the government, we will protect the freedom of the individual.

I will again refer to statements that refusal to contribute through a dues check-off to a political party

will leave a worker open to abuse or attack or discrimination by his fellow workers. I reject that suggestion. It is ridiculous. Anyone who has spent any time in the lunch rooms, I want to emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, anyone who has spent any time in the lunch rooms of any industrial plant knows that some great political arguments go on there. But there is no discrimination against any worker on political grounds. There would probably be strong resentment against some individual who had been known to 'scab' at some time or other. That is a different matter altogether. But anyone who suggests there would be discrimination because of a difference of politics has a pretty low opinion of Canadian wage earners. The wage earners of Canada are, on the whole a tolerant, understanding body of men and women, who respect the individual's personal rights. Any discrimination over the New Democratic Party is more likely to be undertaken by the employers against workers who have the temerity to express political opinions contrary to those of the employer.

Many years ago Samuel Gompers coined a classic phrase in outlining the political action unions should take: "Reward your friends and punish your enemies" he said. Now Samuel Gompers has been dead for a long, long time and this would be away back around the turn of the century. As a matter of fact Samuel Gompers did not believe in direct political action by unions either, but he proposed they support members known to be favourable to labour. "Reward your friends and punish your enemies." No doubt it is the view of this that prompts the Liberals to place this resolution on the order paper.

If the trade unions of Saskatchewan want to take their place in battle for the abolition of injustice and wrongs, then this CCF government will welcome such help. I suggest that for this legislature to attempt to dictate to any union as to how it should or should not use its money is highly improper, and should not be seriously considered. Some unions have, particularly during election campaigns, had their members go on the air or on television, or put out literature, purely on a voluntary basis. I know of one which contributes 9¢ per member or \$1.08 a year, a sum which is hardly going to cripple any individual financially. Many unions will probably contribute in other ways. It is entirely up to them, collectively or individually. Some may not contribute at all.

The trade union act says in substance that upon the request of a trade union representing the majority of

employees, the employer shall deduct and pay out of wages due to his employees, to the person designated by the trade union to receive the same, the union dues of the employees. The trade union act does not say for what purpose the union dues shall be applied by the union. This is not an accidental omission, Mr. Speaker. The trade union act deliberately leaves it up to the union to decide how exactly union funds will be spent. It is for the unions themselves to determine what portion of their funds shall be spent on welfare, what on education, what on legal advice, and what on recreation, and what on politics. To limit the right of labour unions to dispose freely of their funds, to a limitation of action which if it were allowed to take place, would establish an extremely unpopular precedent, and create a good deal of resentment among the wage earners of this province, as it has done among the wage earners in British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that in my opinion, amending the trade union act in the manner suggested in this resolution, by this or any other government, would I repeat be highly improper and most undemocratic. If the mover of this resolution feels strongly enough about the matter, he should take it up with the unions direct. I think I can anticipate where they would tell him to go.

In closing, I would like to remind the opposition of what sir Winston Churchill said in the British House of Commons on the 4th of April, 1944:

“It must be remembered that the function of parliament is not only to pass good laws, but to stop bad laws.”

This resolution if carried out would be a bad law. I shall not support the resolution.

Mr. Gordon T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, it is more with regret than any other particular sentiment that I consider it necessary to take part in the debate regarding the resolution which was introduced by the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre). The very nature of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is an indication of retrograde reasoning, which was recently conceived both on the east and the west coast of Canada. Now the nature of this particular resolution and the inference that trade unionists should be prohibited from contributing to a political party of their choice, has about it the odour of restriction and discrimination.

October 24, 1961

Now may I point out, Mr. Speaker, that this attempt to introduce anti-labour legislation in Canada seems to be following a familiar pattern which was also established in the United States and it would almost appear that it has followed American investment capital across the international border and into Canada.

It was recognized many years ago, Mr. Speaker, that an individual or a single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer. This I believe, Mr. Speaker, underlies labours 175 year up hill fight to form effective unions. This struggle was made more difficult by the unscrupulous and the ruthless methods in business operation and the attempt to suppress labour unions.

Now perhaps it might be valuable at this time, Mr. Speaker, to briefly review some of the earliest legislation which was brought into effect in Great Britain quite a number of years ago. I think perhaps by this process it may serve to bring into focus the vital contribution that organized labour groups have made to the social, the economic and the political atmosphere in those countries, wherever they have been active. Now the earliest acts which were passed in Great Britain were the acts of 1802, 1819 and 1831, and these acts apply almost exclusively to cotton factories. At that time an act was passed, the earliest act of 1802, which excluded children under 9 years of age from working in these cotton factories, and at the same time the hours of work were reduced to 12 hours a day or 69 hours a week. Night work at that time was prohibited for children under 18 years of age and while all this early legislation was a step in the right direction, it is only fair to note at this time that these acts were flagrantly violated because of the fact that no inspectors were appointed at that time, therefore, no particular effort was made to enforce the earlier acts.

In 1842 an act was passed which prohibited the employment of boys under 10 years of age and all women from underground work in mines. It wasn't until 1844 that the compulsory fencing of machinery in factories, for purposes of safety, was made mandatory. It wasn't until 1847 that a 10 ½ hour day was introduced, being lowered from the 12-hour day that I mentioned earlier. This was not further reduced until 1874 when the hours of work were reduced from 10 ½ to 10 hours a day. It wasn't until 1860, Mr. Speaker, a scant 100 years ago, that inspectors were finally appointed, and many of the earlier acts were finally enforced as a result of these inspectors being appointed. At the same time children between the ages of 9 and 13 years were

restricted to 8 hours a day when working in industry. At the same time a provision was made for 2 hours schooling each day for these youngsters. In 1872, boys between the age of 10 and 12 were restricted to 6 hours a day when they were working underground in mines and at approximately the same time children who were under 8 years of age . . .

Mr. Foley: — I don't believe this has any relation to the resolution in question.

Mr. Speaker: — It is an interesting discourse on the history of the labour unions, but I think it should be tied in as quickly as possible with the motion that we have before us.

Mr. Snyder: — I think, Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed just a few minutes, I can relate quite closely the reason I have for stating these facts to the satisfaction of the hon. members opposite. It is rather difficult to talk about anti-labour legislation without indicating some of the instances where labour legislation has been extremely important, and where it has been fought in various ways by various people, and for various reasons, no doubt. I feel that there is a definite association, and a definite connection here. I think you will see, I have every intention of tying the ends together if the member opposite will be a little patient.

I was just saying, Mr. Speaker, that in 1872, boys between 10 and 12 years of age were restricted to 6 hours a day in underground work in mines and children under 6 years of age were restricted from work in agricultural farm gangs. Now the reason I mention these facts, Mr. Speaker, is to draw to the attention of members on this side of the House and on the other side of the House, that the fact that within the life span of some of our more senior citizens, that this transition has taken place, as a result of the persistence and the diligence of organized trade union groups. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, but what the employer of that day undoubtedly had a tendency to cry doom and bloody ruin at the extent of these very extreme labour laws at that time. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, a similar transition was taking place in the United States. A similar development was going on with trade unionists exerting pressure for the purpose of bringing about better working conditions for themselves and adequate wages in order that they could support their families in a reasonably dignified fashion.

In 1786, Mr. Speaker, history was made in the United States when the journeymen printers formed a temporary association for the purpose of establishing for themselves the wage of \$1.00 a day. The employer turned them down and this precipitated the first organized strike in the United States of America. This strike was one which the employees won and by that process they were able to establish a basic wage for themselves of \$1.00 a day. A few years later, about 20 years later, 8 Philadelphia shoemakers stood in a courtroom awaiting the verdict of the jury in the now famous Cordwainer's case. Now this trial, Mr. Speaker, had been a very dramatic one. It was precipitated when these shoemakers were brought to trial on a charge of law breaking and their crime was they had joined together, they had formed a union and they had struck for higher wages. The court at that time upheld the position of the employers and found the shoemakers guilty of criminal conspiracy. Guilty of joining together, of forming a union, and guilty of conspiracy to raise wages.

Now individual employees could apply to their employer and ask for an increase in wages, but for them to join together and to refuse to work for substandard wages, then that was a conspiracy. That was illegal in the United States of America in 1806. Nevertheless these unions formed and they operated in spite of the resistance of the employer and various other groups.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that while some members opposite and some members of the general public, indicate today that they are out of favour with labour organizations because of the fact that they are too large and they are too wealthy and they are too powerful. I suggest that even in the very early days when unions were extremely small, extremely poor and extremely weak, this same rightwing reactionary element was present even at that time. I want to suggest also, Mr. Speaker, that unions have only grown in the same relationship as industry and finance has grown in this country and elsewhere.

By 1820 in the United States, one-half of the nation's factory workers were children between 9 and 120 years of age. They were working 13 hours a day for a wage of between 33 and 67¢ a week. I suggest that this hardly conforms to the ideology of the former American president, who said:

“To secure to each labourer the whole product of his labour as nearly as possible is a worthy object of any government.”

This was a quotation by a former president of the United States, Mr. Abraham Lincoln.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that many of the tactics which were used 100 years ago are still being used today. The attempt that we see today to drive a wedge between farm and labour groups resembles very closely the effort that was made by industry a number of years ago in the effort to play off the native born employee against the foreign born employee, under the impression that by this process they would cause friction between these two groups and as long as they hated each other sufficiently, they would not joining together to work together for better conditions. They had hoped that they would continue of course to work for 16 hours a day as they had been doing, for wages which the employer chose to pay them.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if today a man cannot be thrown in jail because he is unable to pay a debt, or if today we have child labour legislation which prohibits the employment of children, and I suggest today that if the employer must pay a minimum wage – if we have such things as unemployment insurance and compensation, that no credit is due to the industrial or financial magnates. These conditions, Mr. Speaker, were fought for by generations of workers, who were both persecuted and prosecuted for fighting brutal and oppressive conditions. Many of these martyrs, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Coderre: — The trend of the discussion of the hon. member seems to be way off the base as far as the resolution is concerned. I don't believe that at any time during my speech did I mention the trend of labour or pros and consultation of it. I was dealing specifically with the resolution. He seems to be taking a heck of a long time to get to his point.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I do believe that the hon. member is endeavouring to establish the relationship between what has happened in the past and what is happening at the present time. I agree that he is not in a hurry about it, but just because the hon. member from Gravelbourg (Mr.Coderre) did not mention it in his speech, does not say that this hon. member cannot mention it in his. I think he may continue, but I wish he would come to his point.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — On a point of order. The motion before the House is asking for very wide powers to be introduced and to take away from a very large section of the community certain inalienable rights that they have. Now the member is suggesting that the freedom of members of this House should be curtailed. I was following the hon. member very closely and I think the points he has made so far are quite relevant in this proposal before the chamber.

Mr. Snyder: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a definite element of impatience on the part of the members opposite, and with a little patience on their part, I am sure in a very short time I will get to the specific point, something that the members opposite seems to dismiss from their minds, that sometimes it is a little necessary to build up a case for the point you are trying to emphasize. With your permission there are only another few remarks before I go directly into the matter that we have under discussion at the present time.

I was saying before I sat down, Mr. Speaker, that these conditions were fought for by generations of workers, who were both prosecuted and persecuted for their efforts. I also mentioned that many of these martyrs also died in impoverished circumstances and have received little credit for the contribution which they have given to the establishment of liberty and democracy in this country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, today when we see the old political parties carrying on a campaign which follows this old familiar pattern of protecting vested interests and opposing reforms that are long over due, it is appropriate perhaps to inquire then into the reasons for this apparently strange behaviour. I would like to draw attention of the assembly to an article which appeared in MacLean's Magazine, September 9, 1961. It was written by James Scott, who was former national Liberal organizer. It is entitled 'Political Slush Funds Corrupt all parties.' While Mr. Scott seems to be somewhat apprehensive regarding the pittance of 60¢ a year which the wage earners will contribute toward the new political party, he also points out that big corporate donors, so he claims, do not attempt to interfere directly with party policy. He goes on to say — I already said, he was until recently the national Liberal organizer. Until recently, Mr. Speaker, that was his position. He goes on to state that generally the donors of these large sums

of money contribute to both the Liberal and the Conservative parties. He claims that the traditional split is 60-40. Sixty per cent to the party which is in power and 40 per cent to the opposition.

Now Mr. Scott states also, in the September 9 issue, that any citizen of Canada can lay his views before the Prime Minister or the Leader of the Opposition. But human nature being as it is, and these men are human, a man whose firm donates \$25 thousand or \$50 thousand to a political party every election, is likely to get through to the leader of the party a lot faster than someone who the party never heard of.

Now I think it might be well also if we noted in passing, Mr. Speaker, that \$50 thousand was reported to be the amount of the contribution which was made in the Regina area, a matter of a few months ago for the purpose of defeating the CCF government. Had this been possible it would undoubtedly have made it unnecessary for insurance companies in this province to reduce their premiums by that 20 per cent that we all know so much about.

Mr. Speaker, another article appeared in the same issue of MacLean's Magazine, September 9, 1961. It was written by Ralph Allen and is entitled 'The Year the Government Sold the St. Lawrence River.' It states:

"The exact price was in fact \$700 thousand for the Liberal war chest. A raft of personal bribes to senators and fixers, a couple of fat partnerships. It was the most barefaced public steal in more than fifty years. The investigation resulted from a charge in the House of Commons, by Robert Gardner of the United Farmers of Alberta, that the Beauharnois company, through a false prospectus was well on its way to defrauding the investing public. Opposition Leader R.B. Bennett also demanded an investigation into the Beauharnois company, but on returning as Prime Minister, he had more urgent things on his mind, among them the knowledge that his own party had taken \$30 thousand from the Sweezy interests."

Now, it appears, Mr. Speaker, that some of our present day politicians also forgot about the Trans-Canada pipeline as soon as they left the cool shade of the opposition

benches. Along this same tone, Mr. Speaker, a question was asked in the House of Commons, some years ago, which some members present may have some recollection of. The Premier of this province was in the House of Commons at that time. The question was asked in the House of Commons regarding the relationship between the Liberal government and various sugar combines. It was claimed at that time that there was no shortage of sugar and there was no particular need for sugar rationing. Prime Minister King at that time was asked if he would state categorically that the sugar combines had not made a financial contribution to the Liberal party, and that assurance, Mr. Speaker, was not given. Now the Western Producer, in commenting on the possible reasons for the sugar companies contributing to the Liberal party stated at that time, and I quote:

“The very purpose of their existence is to make money, not to give it away without some hope of return. Mr. King suggests that it is practically libellous to suggest that their gifts have any influence whatever on the course of legislation. Why then do they give? It is notorious that the whole subject is shrouded in a cloud of mystery and too often is discussed in terms of smug, barefaced, hypocrisy. The dubious link between big business and political parties which is forged and maintained by the giving and receiving of public funds has done more to lower the prestige of public life in Canada and bring it into disrepute than any other single factor.”

Now, had I wished to take up a great portion of the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, I could have cited many other similar cases, where special privilege has been given to corporations as a result of financial contributions.

May I suggest at this time, Mr. Speaker, that governments have nothing to give except that which they take from the people. That is not an original quotation, it has been said before, but it is as true now as it was when it was said originally. These accommodations which are provided for special interests are not only given at the expense of the general public, but the means by which they are secured result in an erosion of our personal liberties. They are a threat to democracy whenever they are used to corrupt the elected representatives of the people of this, or of any other country.

apparently, Mr. Speaker, this principle was of no particular concern to those corporations for whom the Liberal federal government lifted the price controls and abolished the excess profit's tax in 1945.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, when one considers the magnitude of these operations and the significance which they have to the economy of this and other countries, it might be expected that there would be very little objection to the wage earner contributing 5¢ a month to a political party, and having it deducted from his pay cheque.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to an article which appeared in the April 29 issue of the Star Weekly. It is an editorial which is entitled 'Sauce for the Goose.' It says:

“There is unintentional irony in the fact that some politicians are protesting that sauce for the old party geese should not be sauce for the new party gander. the sauce in this case is made up of campaign funds and contributions. The Conservatives, Liberals and Social Credit parties raise much of their funds from big business contributions. Apparently it is wrong however for the new party to seek a little sauce by financing itself through contributions from trade unionists. The political check-off as some people like to call it.”

The concluding paragraph, I will not read it all, but the concluding paragraph states:

“Nevertheless there is a dash of unmitigated gall in the protests of spokesmen for the old parties against the new party scheme.”

He concludes by saying:

“When the Liberals, Conservatives and Socreds are willing to finance themselves democratically through membership fees, and to disclose the source of all funds, only then will they have the right to criticize the new party financing, without appearing as hypocrites.”

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I wish also, Mr. Speaker, to point out in various ways that corporations have tried not only to strangle labour organizations, but their arm is also reached into other farm operated organizations. Some members in this House will recall that in the early days of the consumer co-operative oil refinery in Regina, one of the overtures that the private oil companies made towards the co-op was in cutting of their supply of crude oil at that time, in 1966. Many members will remember this incident. It was their belief that if they cut off the supply of crude oil to the Regina co-op that this would leave the co-op with a million dollars worth of scrap iron on their hands. As we all know an oil refinery is useless without crude oil. The co-op however managed to survive this crisis with no thanks to big business. They survived this crisis by going about systematically drilling for their own oil supply.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this attempt to prevent wage earners from making contributions to a political party resembles the effort which was made around the turn of the century in Great Britain, when just about everything that a labour organization did, at that time, was illegal. These were the conditions which made the labouring groups in Great Britain decide to take political action, and enter into politics directly in order that they might have their own representatives in the halls of fame where laws are made.

I just want to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that while a few political dinosaurs remain in both British Columbia and in Newfoundland and perhaps also in the province of Saskatchewan, who believe that they can strangle the labour movement with 18th century labour legislation, the fact remains that this is out of tune with the times. Those who believe otherwise will soon find that they are digging their own political graves. Now it should be clear, Mr. Speaker, that I have no intention whatsoever of supporting the resolution.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be associated with the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) in the moving of this resolution. I believe I can state this to the House that in spite of the statements made by the Minister of Labour, and the junior member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) that the member for Gravelbourg takes a very serious interest in the welfare of every workingman and woman in the province

of Saskatchewan. I have been quite interested myself, since becoming a member of this legislature, and getting to know the member for Gravelbourg, that someone who is as far removed as he is from actual dealings with labour people in this province, should take the intense interest that he has taken since becoming a member of this legislature in the interests of the working people and in the interests of labour in the province of Saskatchewan. I feel therefore that in moving this resolution, the member for Gravelbourg has expressed what he definitely feels are the wishes of a great number of the labouring people, not only in this province, but from one end of this country to the other.

I believe I as well, because of the fact that in my constituency I have a much larger labour voting group than there is in the constituency of Gravelbourg, that I can say as well that within the last few months, I have had on many occasions expressions from labouring people, not people who have voted for me politically in the past, but people who have supported the party that represents at the present time, the government of this province, that have come to me and stated that one thing they did not desire, and that was to see the labour bosses in political control in this country. For that reason they could not see their way clear to support the so-called New Democratic Party in this country, because they were going to be chained to the labour bosses who have control of the labour unions, particular unions in a political way, and they said that power should never be given to the union bosses and the union leaders in this country. So I say that many working people in this province and Canada today are sincerely worried about their future as working people, because they know that in nations that actually believe in the philosophy of these people that are today in control of labour unions in this country, that labour is no longer free, and labour no longer enjoys the freedom of collective bargaining because of the fact that those that are in charge of labour unions no longer desire the welfare of the people that they represent, but only desire the power that they can achieve by political control of the working people and the mass of people in any country of the world. So I say, I think the member for Gravelbourg, in moving this resolution, is expressing the thoughts of the individual workers, not the labour bosses, and after all that is who we should be speaking for in this legislature.

October 24, 1961

In spite of the remarks of the Minister of Labour I want to say here that I feel that the Minister of Labour has been a very sincere representative of the working people in this province. I believe that he has, on the whole, done a sincere job in trying to present the workingman's position in this legislature. I feel on the other hand that when he was first elected to this legislature, I don't think he, as a representative of labour would desire the check-off for political purposes and I don't honestly think today that he does honestly feel that there should be a check-off for political purposes.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — On a point of privilege, I do wish to deny the allegations made by the member. I do believe this is a good thing.

Mr. Speaker: — This can be done at the close of the speech, or now with the consent of the member speaking.

Mr. Gardiner: — I said, Mr. Speaker, that I felt in my own heart, knowing the minister, that I don't think at the time when he came into public life in this House, that he would have supported a system of collection of political funds such as we are seeing take place in this province and throughout Canada at the present time. If he says he does, I of course will accept his statement in that regard. But I still have that kind feeling for him that I feel that sincerely and down in his heart he doesn't really believe in forcing anyone in this province or in the dominion of Canada to pay over political dues to any political party, including that of his own.

Now in the remarks of the gentleman who took his seat a few moments ago, with regard to the long history of labour reform in this country and he even went to many other countries of the world as well, to speak about labour reforms. The only thing he did not indicate in making his address was where most of the labour reforms in this country originated from. The gentleman who is responsible for most of the labour reforms that were initiated in this country, the late Rt. Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, who was one of the greatest disciples of the labour movement in this country. He was one of the greatest figures for many years, as the first deputy minister of labour, and one of the first Ministers of Labour in this country of ours.

I can also relate, Mr. Speaker, if I desire to take the time, the work of many labour leaders in the past history of the dominion of Canada, not political leaders such as we have today, many of whom do not know the meaning of the word 'work' and never have, who did not work themselves up through the ranks of labour but came in from the top, were brought in from the top in order to try and gain political control in this country of ours. I can have great respect for labour leaders who have worked their way up through the ranks, have proven themselves in the battle for labour reform, but I cannot, Mr. Speaker, have any respect for any individual who would attempt to gain political control of this country through the work, sweat and the tears of the labouring people of Canada, and that is exactly what we're seeing take place today.

Two men, Claude Jodoin, and Stanley Knowles, who were defeated by their own people as representatives of their people in this country of ours, who then turned and asked the union bosses to appoint them as heads of the largest union organization in this country, for one purpose and one purpose only – to gain political control. If those particular individuals and particularly the vice-president of the Canadian Labour Congress had separated himself, on taking that position with the Canadian Labour Congress, from political activities with the CCF party, then I would say possibly he had accepted this position with the idea of looking after the welfare of the working people. But today, the Canadian Labour Congress is paying the salary of Mr. Stanley Knowles, not in the interests of the workingmen, but in the interests of a political party. I don't think there is anyone who can deny that particular pattern. He is being paid in the interests of the party – the New Democratic Party and previously the CCF party, and not in the interests of the individual worker in this country.

I can remember one case of one of the leaders of one of our largest labour organizations entering political life in this country, and immediately he resigned his position with that particular union when he became Minister of Labour in the dominion of Canada and that was Mr. Humphrey Mitchell. He was a very respected labour leader in this country prior to entering politics. But when he entered politics he divorced himself completely from the labour organizations, as an official of that organization, as he should if he was going to enter public life with the ideals and the interests of the workingman at heart. I hope all of us have the interests of the working man at heart, not

only in this legislature, but in every legislature in the dominion of Canada. That man, when he decided that he would perhaps do his best for the working man by entering public life and becoming Minister of Labour in the federal government, had the courage to withdraw from the position that he held in the labour organizations of this country, a position he had worked himself up to, not through politics, not through political influence that he had, but a job that he had worked himself up to in the eyes of the working men that he represented to become one of the leaders of one of the largest labour organizations in the dominion of Canada. For an individual like that, or a person like my friend the Minister of Labour in this province, who I know worked himself up through the labour organizations in this province, because he was one of them and worked with them, and for that reason I say that I feel that he came into public life in this province with the sincere interests of the working man at heart. But on the other hand those today that would attempt to make use of the labour organizations in this country for strictly political purposes, I have nothing but condemnation for that type of practice.

The major principle that is enunciated in this resolution, contrary to the thoughts of the two speakers on the other side of the House, does not restrict the liberty of one individual in the dominion of Canada or in the province of Saskatchewan. It does not restrict the liberty of one individual and I challenge either of the speakers to prove how it does restrict the liberty of any individual in the province of Saskatchewan. Anyone in any union organization has the right, and will have, if this goes into effect to pay his dues to any political party of his choice and how anyone across the way can claim that through this resolution we are asking for a restriction of the liberty of the people of this province, then I say that he is trying to delude himself and the people of this province into believing something that definitely is not true. In fact, quite to the contrary. We are asking for the right of each of these workers to belong to any political party of his choice, and pay money to that party, without restriction, without anyone within the labour union having the right to the knowledge as to what political party he is going to decide to support, if he wants to support any of them. He will have that liberty under that resolution. None of his rights or liberties as a union man will be restricted one iota if this resolution is passed. There is no one in the labour organizations, and no one on the other side of the House that can prove any differently.

This resolution that has been moved by the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) contains within it, all the elements of democracy which we in this country have come to enjoy through the past years, and through the progress and reform of governments of almost all political descriptions. All we ask is for the same inalienable right for the working man, that every other individual has, that is the right to support the political party of his own choice without any restriction on that liberty by any group, whether government or union.

There have been certain remarks that have been made here today with regard to contributions from certain organizations and certain groups. I want to say here for myself and I think I am speaking for most of the members of all political parties in this country, that of course there are always black sheep, we know that – you have them, we have them – probably every political party in the dominion of Canada has had them, but when anyone across the way will stand up, after the record of his party in this province and condemn others, I think he better remember he is living in a glass house.

I want to just relate to my friend across the way that most of these organizations, if he checked the records – I am not too certain which religious denomination he belongs to in this country, but I know this, that the organizations and groups that he is speaking about, support every church in the dominion of Canada, and many churches depend on the generous amount of the money they receive from the same organizations that he is condemning today for making contributions to political organizations as well. I have no regret at accepting financial support from organizations that also are prepared to support every religious organization in this country. I would hope for good purposes, I would hope that they are not contributing those funds in order to try and influence the particular church those funds are going to. But my friends across the way seem to have the suspicion if anyone is going to buy a membership in a political party, that he is buying it for the purpose of trying to influence it, in order to try and bring some benefit to himself.

Now, everyone doesn't think in that way when he contributes money to a political party, and I hope that most of us don't contribute to political parties because we think we are going to realize something of benefit to ourselves. We pay out money for memberships, we pay out for contributions to political parties because we feel that

October 24, 1961

they are best equipped to provide us with the type of government in this country, and I would hope this would be the view of everyone who supports any party, whether it is the party across the way or this, that that government might provide the best in service for the people of this country, to provide an economic climate whether it's for labour or for business, or whether it's for the professions. That that government might provide the economic climate whereby all the people of this country would be better off.

I am not saying for a moment that everyone is going to be this way, as the gentleman across the way said. All of us are human, and probably there are some that will make contributions to your party and to mine with the knowledge and hope that if they then go to the leader of that party, that they can gain some personal advantage for themselves. But I am quite certain that in most cases, with all political parties, that the type of attitude wouldn't be accepted by the political leaders, and if it was accepted on many occasions, most of the great political leaders we've had since the beginning of this country would not have been where they were – would not have received the support of the common everyday individual in this country as they did during their long record of years. So I say to my friend at the back that there is no use throwing stones when you've also got a glasshouse in your particular area.

So with regard to contributions, I feel that every organization – I am just going to indicate this as a story as to where my friends across the way get their money as well. It is a story from a number of years ago, when the Liberal leader in this province went up the street, and he found as he went into every business place in the city of Regina, somebody else had been ahead of him. Do you know who it was? Mr. M.J. Coldwell. He was around and he was seeking his funds and his support from exactly the same people that the leader of the Liberal party in the province was seeking his financial support from as well.

So I say to my friends across the way, I have no hesitation in saying that I believe that they got the majority of their funds from the same place as any other political party, and I don't care whether Ralph Allen states it, or whether any other script writer in the country tries to leave the impression in the minds of the Canadian people that this party across the way got their money in any different form, or from any different individual, than any other

political party in Canada. I know it is not true, and I know that they do receive, in large amounts, their money from the same sources as every other political party in this country. But they are adding one more. They are adding one more now. They are not satisfied to be as well off as the rest of us. They want to be a little better off, and so if they cannot be a little better off by democratic methods, then they say 'well why not use some other method.' The group method, that is the idea of the socialists. The group method, that they can worm their way in, as I have stated before, into every organization in this country and get a few people who are unscrupulous enough to use their political position and their political beliefs to influence the community organizations – if they can do that of course that is the history of socialism down through the years. Worm into every organization that is of any use in the community, and then use that organization for political purposes, and that is why I am very happy today, in this democracy, that I am not a socialist.

I think I have made it very plain in my remarks, and there is just one other point that I would like to make at this time. I am very pleased indeed to see that most of the civil service organizations throughout the dominion of Canada, many of them at least, have stated that they would refuse to affiliate with any union which was affiliated with a political party in the dominion of Canada. At least it appears that in many places, many provinces in many parts of this country, that the civil servants have a lot more sense, and they are probably led by reasonable men and not politicians in most cases, they are led by people that actually have the responsibilities of the people that they serve in their interests, and not the interests of a political party. So I say I am pleased that most of the civil service groups, have stated that if their particular unions affiliated with any political party, that they would refuse and they would withdraw from affiliation with that particular union. I hope that that will be the case in this province. I notice that the civil service union, possibly not just for that reason, in this province has already withdrawn itself from the Canadian Labour Congress. But I am quite certain if any pressure had been brought to bear on the civil service union in this province to force it to affiliate with the New Democratic Party, I am quite certain that the government of this province would have found this same answer from the people that work for them. I would hope that the majority of them are reasonable people, and intelligent people, and I think they will decide on that course, and I think it is the only course

for every union in this country to decide on. But at the same time if they do decide on political affiliation, I feel that they have no right, no matter how great a majority in that group, they have no right to place any other worker, whether it's 15 to 1 or whether it's 100 to 1, any other individual in the position of having to sign off from any political party in order to be able to preserve his right of freedom of choice in a democratic way of the party that he honestly believes in and honestly supports.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to associate myself with the member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) in seconding this resolution, which will provide to the working people of this country, to many of the people who I represent, a continuation of freedom and democracy in this great land of ours.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member sits down, I wonder if he would be good enough to withdraw his reference to Mr. M.J. Coldwell, a very distinguished Canadian. I am sure he cannot support the charges he made against Mr. Coldwell, and I think he should be good enough to withdraw this reference. Mr. Coldwell, I am sure, will deny it in due course, but unless the hon. member can submit the names of the people who will give that evidence, he should withdraw this reference.

Mr. Gardiner: — This same statement has been made in the House of Commons in Ottawa on more than one occasion, and it has never been denied by Mr. Coldwell. The information comes from the former Premier of this province, the Rt. Hon. James G. Gardiner.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to submit a reference in Hansard to support the claim he has made that this charge has been made in the House of Commons. I suggest he submit the Hansard record.

Mr. Gardiner: — I have given you the reference of my information, and I am not prepared to withdraw it at all. I have given you my source of information. If Mr. Coldwell is prepared to deny that he ever went to any business place in the city of Regina and asked for campaign funds, that is his business.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, in entering the debate this afternoon on this motion, I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Labour and my colleague from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) for their presentations in the discussion of this matter. I think that they have done very well, and there is really very little that I can add to what they have had to say.

I do think though, Mr. Speaker, that the discussion this morning from the opposition has been significant in one thing and that is the hostility that is displayed throughout their remarks to trade union organizations and their leaders.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Davies: — There is no use, Mr. Speaker, for the members opposite to say “we are not talking about the trade union members, we are only talking about the union bosses.” This was mentioned I think about ten times between the two speakers that have introduced this matter. They well know that remarks of this kind are reflections on the membership of trade unions that have elected these so-called union bosses, who constitute, I think, the honest leadership of the trade union movement in Canada. I say that the remarks of the two speakers who have at this time brought forward the opinion of their party on this resolution before us, are quite significant. I say that they regard trade unions not so much as workers’ organizations, but as conspiracies, Mr. Speaker. The same type of attitude that my fellow M.L.A. for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) has stated is “18th century thinking.” I am really amazed at the bottomless misunderstanding that seems to exist on union processes, among the members opposite. Mr. Speaker, this can’t be made up for by vociferous and emotional arguments that are advanced at the top level of one’s voice in attempting justification of this motion.

Now the resolution that is before us is of course very similar to the action that was undertaken in Bill 42 by the B.C. Social Credit government earlier in this year. It has been said that in Bill 42, the Social Credit government proceeded most unfavourably, from the viewpoint of organized labour in British Columbia and elsewhere, to make a number of amendments. One such amendment had to do with preventing union members from utilizing their own union dues to support a political party of their choice, as well as making certain other stipulations along these lines. According to the unionists in the province of British Columbia,

Bill 42 has prevented unions not only from utilizing union dues collected through the check-off method for political support, but also prevents trade unions from using membership dues that are collected in cash for political purposes. I suggest that the resolution before us, in the light of the remarks that have been made in substantiation of the resolution, seems to suggest that the same approach is being taken in this House.

The motion envisages not only the same effects as the legislation that was passed in British Columbia, but in effect what it is doing is to prohibit the exercise of ordinary rights of people to take part in political affairs, in support of candidates of their own choosing and the choosing of their political organizations. I say that what is really at stake here is a fundamental interference with political rights, not of organizations, but of individuals.

This of course is a contrary viewpoint to the one expressed by the mover and the seconder of the resolution. It means first of all, Mr. Speaker, that a unionist can't decide to dispose of a portion of their funds to finance candidates that they believe they should support. It means secondly that even if there is a minority group within a trade union who want to donate part of their dues payments for political purposes, they will be prohibited from doing so. I say too, that if there is a union treasury that has been built up through the contributions of trade union dues, that similarly the motion envisages a prohibition in respect to using this amount.

I say, it is not only a basic interference in the rights of these working people at this level, but it is a basic interference in the long held and long understood right of trade unions to support political parties or candidates of their choice, whichever they wish it to be. Overseas in countries like Great Britain as I believe the Minister of Labour has told us, these rights are traditional. It is evident therefore that what the hon. members opposite seek to do here is to interfere with rights that are not only established in trade unions, but are established throughout the British Commonwealth.

I pointed out that Bill 42 was passed by the Social Credit government earlier this year and that it dealt with a number of matters including the particular issue we are now dealing with. I want to point out also, and I think this is sign, that this was a successor to the notorious and the iniquitous Bill 43, promulgated

by the Social Credit government in the previous year. I say this whole succession of anti-labour acts on the part of the B.C. government is illustrative of what has gone on there, showing the pattern of anti-labour laws in that province as they have developed there and are developing elsewhere in Canada. It is said that following the passage of Bill 42 in British Columbia, the CCF members in the House attempted to introduce a bill of rights for approval of the members of the assembly. This was very bluntly turned down, I am told that the Attorney General, Robert Bonner, speaking for the government is reported to have said, 'that the government can't consent to repeal its own legislation in such a short time.' He was referring, I presume, to Bill 42.

I suggest that the action contemplated by the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) not only interferes with the choice of unions to support candidates of recognized Canadian political parties, or any other party that might spring up. It also I think, interferes with the rights of trade unions to take part in civic affairs, because as you know today, in most of our larger urban centres, we have various civic political parties. As you know it has been the habit of labour groups from time to time to assist these bodies so far as they feel they will forward the welfare of labour people. The motion that we're discussing today, in my opinion, would further curtail the opportunity of political action by labour people, through restricting their political activities on a local level.

The hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) has spoken about small union meetings that authorize the check-off of trade union dues for political purposes. Now I can only say this, Mr. Speaker, that all of us know that on very important questions, in any organization, there is from time to time a certain apathy. Of course, if decisions are made when there is not a large turnout this is generally considered, in organizational life, to be the fault of those who don't attend. I do want to say this, that to my knowledge the question that we are discussing, when it is put for approval to trade unionists (and I speak particularly of the people in this province in trade unions, whom I know best), is advertised well ahead of time. Trade unionists certainly do understand that this question is coming up for consideration and approval. To say that there are some meetings that are attended only by a few is first of all a speculation because I don't think there was any example given to us by the hon. member for Gravelbourg. Secondly I want to say that every step, so far as I know, has been made to acquaint union people with vital questions that are to be discussed at subsequent meetings. Moreover, I

October 24, 1961

know of no trade union body that does not have in its rules of order the provision for reconsideration of actions undertaken by a previous meeting. It seems to me that these are quite adequate safeguards and belie the statements that have been made by the hon. member from Gravelbourg.

I know that over the last 20 years that I have been actively associated with the trade union movement in this country, that the Canadian Labour Congress (I should perhaps say both the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, and the Canadian Congress of Labour before the amalgamation in 1956), undertook a most thorough going program to try to make unions the most vital institutions for the purpose of democratic decisions. I don't think that there is any trade union body in North America that has done more in this report than Canadian organization. There has been a program of institutes, seminars, study classes, dissemination of literature – every type of educational activity that had a bearing on this question of the importance of attending trade union meetings. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that very many people indeed, not only in this province, but across the country are going to resent these continual reiterations about “union big shots”, “union bosses”, “gangsters”. There is just a steady repetition of this type of statement by the members of the opposition. I say it will be resented, and resented not just by the honest leaders who are trying to do a good job for the trade union movement, but resented by the people who put them there, and put them there in regular convention.

I want to tell the member this too, that the whole question of approach to political contributions by the Canadian trade union movement has certainly not been hasty and for that matter it is not very recent either. This has been going on in one way or another, Mr. Speaker, for more than 50 years. The trade union movement in 1958, when they considered at the Canadian Labour Congress convention, the recommendations to help form a political party, further discussed this question. There were at this meeting almost 2,000 delegates from all across Canada, from the local unions that make up the organizations within the Canadian Labour Congress. There was approximately the same number of people present at the convention in 1960 that ratified the resolution, suggesting that it was now time for labour to take part in a political party with other liberally minded people and the CCF, in Canada. There was only a handful – and I believe if the hon. members would get the news accounts of the day, they could verify what I have just said – only a dozen or so people who voted against that resolution and the proposition that there should be financial

support from trade unions to their pl party.

Mr. Foley: — Was it a secret ballot?

Hon. Mr. Davies: — It was a ballot, Mr. Speaker, in the usual fashion conducted in conventions of 2,000 people – by a show of hands. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that the constitution of the Canadian Labour Congress does provide for roll call vote, which incidentally when taken operates over some 7 or 8 hours, because of the number of delegates involved. This can be undertaken when requested by a sufficiency of the delegates. It was not requested and there was no reason for it as indicated by the extremely large number who voted for it, and the comparably insignificant number of people who voted against it.

The Assembly recessed at 12:30 p.m.

The Assembly resumed at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, when the House rose for luncheon I believe that I had taken some time in dealing with the remarks of the two speakers from the opposition on this resolution, and I had chided them in a friendly way about the attitude they had taken towards the trade union movement and its leadership. I suggested that they look upon trade unions more as a menace and as a contagion, than as a part of the democratic process. I think I had also given some examples of how this resolution, if it were acted upon, would work detrimentally, not only for trade union people, but for democratic processes themselves.

I think I had something to say about the constant reiteration on the theme of “union gangsters” and “big shots”, and all the other coloured words which are intended, I think, to prejudice people today against trade unions as good institutions. I do think they are, Mr. Speaker, institutions that work for good, and I make bold to say that the trade union movement in North America has done more for the dignity and self respect of man than the party represented by the hon. gentlemen and the lady opposite me.

In this connection I noted a reference – I believe it was by the hon. member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) – to the support of the new party idea by leaders in the United States, and as I got the connection, it was intended to infer that the interference of the United States labour leaders was the cause, in large part, of some unions in Canada accepting the new party.

October 24, 1961

I wonder if my hon. friends, Mr. Speaker, had noted what is really to the contrary. I wondered if they had noted the remarks of Mr. McDonald, President of United Steel Workers of America with headquarters, of course, in the United States, who made a visit to Ontario last year, and made rather unfavourable reference to the idea of union joining in a political party.

I would think that, on the whole, this is the attitude of many of the trade union leaders in the United States. They of course, have had a different method of pursuing political action, due to their different processes of government. The point I want to make is this, that far from the new party idea being one that has arisen in the United States, it is one that has been disputed by many of the trade union leaders in that country. I again suggest, ms that the new party idea in Canadian trade union circles is really an outgrowth of Canadian experience, and the Canadian trade union movement.

This is not to say that the trade union movement in North America, whether in the United States part or the Canadian part, has not from time to time made funds from union treasuries, and therefore the union dues of the members available for political purposes. in the United States, the trade union people habitually decide upon the person they consider to best represent their interests, whether in the Democratic or Republic parties, (although I must confess that it is generally more in the former party that they give their support) and then decide on what measure of financial aid will be accorded that candidate.

I might suggest perhaps the reason for this is in the difference which lies in political methods in the United States. I am sure hon. members have heard of the example where, in some ridings in the U.S.A. a candidate has been nominated in the primary, who turns out to be the same person for both the Republican and Democratic parties. This is quite possible in the method that is pursued in that country. Of course the whole question of "aiding your friends and punishing your enemies" as elaborated by Mr. Samuel Gompers more than 50 years ago, makes some sense in that kind of context. It makes very little sense in the kind of experience that we know, and the sort of background that we know in Canada and in Commonwealth countries, where with the responsible government medium government really functions so that executive power is held directly by elected people. Our ministers, for example are always the members of the legislative institution – and cannot simply be named as they are at the federal level in the United States from outside the government.

So I say there are main differences in the union approach as between the United States and Canada. In any event I want to repeat there is very strong evidence that Canadian trade union people on the question of aid to political parties have made up their own minds, and have pursued a practice which is really opposed, or at least rather different from the practice followed in the United States.

I think the example I gave of Mr. Donald McDonald, the President of the United Steel Workers attitude is a good one. I recall some mention being made, by the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) about the excellent labour laws which have been provided by his party as an extenuation of the idea that the hon. members who sit opposite me are not really opposed to unions. I want to say that I myself have some respect for some of the things which Mackenzie King implemented as the Prime Minister of Canada, during his term of office. I may not find a large measure of agreement with his policies but I think he was a much misunderstood man. Having said that, I must also say that a considerable part of the trade union movement of this country and indeed that of the United States, does not think of Mr. Mackenzie King in quite that way. He, after all, was the author of the so-called Rockefeller formula, which stands as a sort of a milestone in the formation of company unionism in the two countries. You can read about the medium if you want to, to look into the history of trade unions, particularly in the United States.

So I say that thinking about Mr. King in this sense, I don't think he can be held up as the pillar of trade union rights.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I said I thought that not only would this motion if effected in legislation, result in the curtailment of trade union political rights acting at provincial and federal levels, but that it would have an adverse effect on their rights in supporting municipal candidates. I think I gave some examples of what I meant. It seems to me, dealing again generally, the issue is this: whether working people, the largest part of the Canadian population, have an ordinary right to enter into the political field and to support candidates of their own choosing, or partly of their own choosing, if you like, because it amounts really, in essence, to the same thing.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is specious and hypocritical to say that that right is possessed if the means of supporting candidates is not provided. I say these means again are largely financial, especially today. There isn't anyone in this House that doesn't know about the costs of campaigning to pay for television, radio broadcasts to do all those things that are necessary to influence people in today's political world. I say the importance of union people contributing through their treasury, or from their dues to political funds is this, that it really enables them to get into the political world in a genuine fashion – not merely on its outskirts. People's rights in a democracy are really not only concerned with the right to vote for a candidate of one's own choice. They also mean that people have the right to select candidates of their choice, and to support them in any election at any level. I state my opinion again, that if the motion of the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) were carried into legislation, it would very substantially interfere, and would probably abrogate those rights.

Mr. Foley: — Not whatsoever; not in a union.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — It has been suggested that the “contracting out” procedure, so-called, which is designed for those who don't wish in a trade union to contribute to a political party, is unsatisfactory; they say it is unsatisfactory because timid people might be afraid to exercise their privilege and they might be discriminated against.

Mr. Speaker, there are many types of spending in trade unions as in other bodies, and as in other bodies trade unionists propose types of spending, which probably get some members pretty stirred up. I have certainly seen some very good examples in my time. But there is no valid reason, Mr. Speaker, to suppose that people are afraid to oppose political participation as they would do in respect of any other issue involving money. So, in other words, members who do not want to help support political action would be quite free to do so.

I say this that the hon. member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) hasn't really given us this kind of an approach. If he had wanted to deal with this side of thing he would merely have proposed that there would be an amendment in one of our acts, that would make it an offence to exercise any discrimination against a person because he refused to make a contribution to a candidate or to a party. I say he hasn't proposed anything of the sort.

what he has advocated, Mr. Speaker, is really a sweeping denial of rights for working people, and this is completely and altogether different. While we are talking on this question of individual rights, I call to mind what a friend of mine from New Brunswick was telling me not so long ago where, after the recent election in which the Liberal party triumphed, there was a fairly large scale dismissal of government employees. Subsequently there was a commission set up to investigate these dismissals which ran, I think, into several hundred people. I wondered how much attention the party represented by the hon. members opposite had given to this particular event in that province?

Mr. Speaker, what I really charge here is that the resolution we are debating is intended not to safeguard the rights of any trade unionist, but to interfere with the political rights of union people. I suggest that it is intended to retard the progress of the New Democratic Party, because this would be to the political advantage of the Liberal and the opposition parties in this province, and elsewhere. I say that the crux of the resolution is that it attempts to cripple the effective organizations of main political opposition to parties like those represented by my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the labour movement in British Columbia declared when these matters were being debated that the Social Credit party of that province was fulfilling its obligations to the big corporations by further restrictions on the Canadian trade union movement. I wonder if there is not a similar indication in this legislature, exhibited by the introduction of this resolution. I point out, too, that the resolution, as was the case with the British Columbia law, says absolutely nothing about the contributions of corporations to political parties, and I say that this omission again, is quite deliberate.

When one considers the process in trade unions, these matters decided by debate; they are decided by the voice of the membership of the trade unions. they make their own choice, in spite of what members opposite have said. Consider, however, what happens when corporate contributions are made. In how many cases, may I ask my hon. friends, are these matters put before the shareholders of a company? Are they permitted to vote on whether or not these contributions are made? I say what happens, Mr. Speaker, is this, that contributions are made and decided by a few personnel at the top levels of the corporation, and the politics of the shareholders are entirely disregarded. There is no such thing at all in these instances, Mr. Speaker, as "contracting out"!

My colleague from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) remarked upon an article in the Star-Weekly, and I have noticed at the same time a similar one in the Toronto Daily Star, commenting on the British Columbia legislation when it was introduced. I think they properly called the bill “class” legislation. The paper pointed out that in the British Columbia forest industry there were, for example, 25,000 members of the International Woodworkers of America, and that they would not, Mr. Speaker, be able to spend a penny of their treasury to back any party or candidate. Yet, the Toronto Daily Star says, (and I am quoting):

“ . . . that any of the giant corporations which dominate the forest industry would be quite free if they wish to contribute cash through political war chests.”

Again, talking about this question of what I would call business political action, I am not suggesting that they shouldn't take it as they see fit, but I do object when it is suggested that there be any interference with the right of the working man to take action somewhat similarly.

The periodical “Business Week” reported recently that American industry spends \$2 billion a year just for public relations to influence the public. It said in the same article that 80 per cent of all news stories originated from public relations sources. They gave an example of this which might be interesting in the resolution we are discussing, of one firm that had spent \$400 thousand on public relations, trying to get Congress to free gas producers from certain federal price controls. I understand that this company in 17 months had produced 6,300 speeches, 290 telecasts, 475 radio talks, 7,700 newspaper contacts, and 5 ½ million pieces of literature. Who paid the bill, Mr. Speaker? It was the gas consumer that paid the bill and he also surely had no opportunity to contract out.

Mr. Gardiner: — What about the power corporation? How much did they spend?

Hon. Mr. Davies: — We're told, Mr. Speaker, that in the past few years 250 thousand management representatives in the United States and 20 thousand in Canada have been trained in the art of politics. One business leader had this to say of the movement, that it had “just begun”. Again I suggest that the expense involved was passed on to the consumer and he wasn't consulted about it. Amidst this kind of background, we are

now being asked to prevent the organized working people from engaging in practical politics. I say, and I say this sincerely to my friends opposite, that the effect of this would be to stifle the articulate voice of the employees of this country, who number the great majority of the population.

Because, Mr. Speaker, the trade union movement is really, and I am now talking about the economic side of things, the only organization, the only medium that has ever expressed the aspirations of the working man, because it is the only place where the working man is protected in his right to express his opinions.

Mr. Thatcher: — They won't all contribute . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, . . . just as long as it is voluntary.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says they won't all contribute. The Leader of the Opposition means this. They can contribute in the manner that he would like them to contribute – he wants them to make another choice, to go out and select another amount of money and pay this over to the political party. He objects to them making their decision democratically, from taking that money either from the union treasuries or from their own union dues, as they determine.

I want to point out again, and I don't think this can be too greatly emphasized. I'm not talking about the exceptions; there are exceptions of this kind which I think can be dealt with. Where there has been any anti-democratic practice or process indicated that has frustrated the right of the individual to exercise his choice to contribute or not to contribute steps can be taken.

I said before this was not the approach taken in the resolution. These matters are decided, not in body of labour bosses of five, six, ten or twenty people as is intimated. These are decided basically in the open membership meetings of thousands of union lodges across the country. This is where the decisions are made. Yes, these things are discussed at the provincial level, in council at national level, at national executive, but the decisions on how this money is to be contributed is in the main, made at the trade union level. the whole procedure is essentially democratic. I say this isn't the case with handouts from corporations to political parties.

October 24, 1961

Mr. Thatcher: — You don't mind handouts from corporations either.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Though the hon. members opposite would like us to forget it they know full well that throughout the history of this country that the large business institutions have made their contributions to the old parties.

Mr. Thatcher: — You are willing to get as much as you can that way too.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, any time the parties of this country want to associate themselves with us, let's get legislation that will disclose the source of every political contribution.

Mr. Thatcher: — You use a lot of pressure to get it, too.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — I say, Mr. Speaker, that for too long in this country political funds have been on and under-the-table basis . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Certainly in the CCF.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — I am proud to say that I belong to a party that has relied in the main for its contributions on the man in the street.

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh come on, you know better than that, and so do I.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — And the Leader of the Opposition knows this is true.

Mr. Thatcher: — Ask the Minister of Social Welfare.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — He afraid the people would finance his campaign.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — I don't think it is a good thing when the major contribution for any political party comes from institutions such as corporations where the decision is made by whom; by the shareholders? No! By the management people? Yes! I say that the record in Canada is overwhelming; that the Liberals and the Tory party and Social Credit party have been the recipients of contributions from big business.

Mr. Thatcher: — I'm here to say that the CCF get as much that way as they can, also.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — I say, Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary that where working people want to band themselves together so they can be effective politically we should have the type of opposition that we see here today exhibited by this resolution on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that for all the reasons I have given and have tried to supply here today, and on the ordinary grounds of maintaining political liberties, ordinary individual liberty in the sense that I think we should look at, this resolution should be effectively rejected.

Mr. Ian MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): —Mr. Speaker, I have listened to a holier-than-thou attitude for the last three-quarters of an hour by the senior member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies), and I can say that in all sincerity he was left on third base, and the last man was put out before he got there.

In suggesting this motion which was brought forth by the member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre), the members on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, will oppose it for very obvious reasons. There are some who will try to argue that there is nothing wrong with employees being forced to have deductions taken from their pay cheques for purposes mentioned in the motion. The New Democratic Party can steal the money from the working man, but they cannot steal his vote. I don't know if the junior member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) was speaking for the Brotherhood of Railway Workers or not, but I would suggest that if he took a poll or a vote from these people, he would get nowhere near 50 per cent who were willing to have their wages and union dues deducted in part for political funds.

I think this would apply not only to those people, but it is an amazing thing, when people will call you up unsolicited and tell you they are definitely opposed to this, and what are you going to do about it? Are we going to let them go ahead and do it, or are we going to raise our voice to try and help protect these people? It would seem to me that if the government opposite and the party they represent were not the benefactors of these deductions,

October 24, 1961

you would hear howls to high heaven from the CCF, especially if these funds were to be taken for some other political party outside the New Democratic Party or the CCF.

It would be just as fair to force the labouring man to contribute from his salary deductions to, say, the Red Cross, the cancer fund, or the heart fund, or something like that. This is, at least, charity, and I don't think the people should have to be told, nor should they be forced to contribute to anything, particularly anything political. If they have the welfare of the country at heart, which I believe most people have, then I am sure they will contribute, as all Canadians contributed in the past, to all worthwhile charity. It would seem to me to be more fair to expect people to be forced to pay for charity than it would be to ask them to support a political party for which they have no use.

The reason why socialists want the Trade Union Act to stay as it is is very clear, since the socialist party, and the heads of unions, have dragged union members into their new national political party; they know it makes sound financial sense to have money coming in every month for political purposes. The working people of Canada as a whole, I don't believe, were ever consulted or were the rank and file of union members. It would be just as fair if Canadian workers who belong to unions had a deduction taken from every pay cheque they receive for all political parties in this country. The most ridiculous part of the whole thing is that the workers of Canada, by and large, have never supported a party, that wants them forcibly to finance that political party.

I think that working people, whether they belong to a trade union or not, have the right to handle their own wages, and it is most dictatorial for the government to allow legislation to be on its books that would force working people of the province, or any part of Canada, to contribute to their slush funds.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only the idea that many people who are workers in this country might not want to contribute to the New Democratic Party; and it is not only that many workers who belong to trade unions can ill afford to contribute to any political party, but the question is more far-reaching than meets the eye. The government, by supporting this type of contribution, as laid down in the Trade Union Act, is saying that we should have only one

political party in this country. Surely in a country such as Canada, where trade union members in the past have supported the Liberal party and other governments for many years, have never been forced to finance it, and the rights of those people should be protected.

I know there are many workers in Saskatchewan who do not want to be forced to contribute to any political party. They want to vote as they like, and if they fell like making a donation to a political party, that is entirely their choice, but they want to feel free to make that donation; they don't want to be dictated to by the government as to whom they are going to contribute to, or how much.

This puts the civil servants of this province in quite a spot. It would seem to me that civil servants who belong to the union are going to be intimidated into financing this new party, and I can see they have no way out; for how would a young civil servant coming up ever hope to get anywhere in his department, if the cabinet minister under whom he worked knew that he was opposed to his party. Of course, there are people in the government who will say they can sign out, but surely the civil servant working for the socialist party is going to be in quite a position if he is asked to sign out. He knows full well he would be risking his job.

Premier Douglas: — Could I ask my hon. friend a question? Does he know of any union of the government employees who have passed a resolution to contribute to a political party?

Mr. MacDougall: — No, but I do know that during the last election there were certain people who went around in your various departments and asked for a donation, and which man would dare say no? I mean, it's only logical. If they didn't, and were working for you directly, where would they be? What would you say to them? What would some of the other cabinet ministers say?

Premier Douglas: — The hon. member — would he care to mention where this was done? And by whom? Mr. Speaker, he can't make charges like that and place someone in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker: — It is in order for the hon. Premier to make an interruption,

but if he is asking questions, of course, I think it would be better if he had the consent of the member speaking.

Mr. MacDougall: — Mr. Speaker, taxes are a necessity to finance the operation of government programs, but the suggestion that any people in this country should be forced to finance the political group whose main aim is to get a strangle hold on the people and to get themselves elected to office, is an entirely different question. It would occur to me that there must be many farmers who also wonder if it might not be too long before they come under the same obligation. supposing they take grain to the elevators and get their cash ticket, would they be deducted for political funds just the same as they are for P.F.A.A. This is the next logical step, since they claim to have farmers with them (which I doubt very much that they have as many farmers as they say they do.)

Surely any person who wants to keep this country free would not want this to happen. I notice there were remarks made this morning regarding the union bosses controlling this thing. You often read of union meetings where the bosses have complete control, and anybody who steps out of line is either severely thrashed, or looked on . . .

Hon. Mr. Davies: — What books do you read?

Mr. MacDougall: — It happens all over the place, and particularly in the United States.

Premier Douglas: — All over the funny papers.

Mr. MacDougall: — Another thing about this political check-off system is that it frequently makes employers the unwilling collectors of political funds, and surely no employer should be expected to be the financial agent, as it were, of a political party. Slowly but surely the freedom of the people is being lost, and this method of party support is, to my way of thinking, almost diabolical.

If union members in Canada were all socialist, this government wouldn't have to have legislation of this type, but the government knows full well that many, many, if not most union members would oppose this violation of their right; having to sign out of paying political funds to a political party. I would certainly, if I should happen

to be a union man, object violently to having my rights infringed upon in this manner.

If the leaders of the union want to contribute a whole or a part of their earnings to the new party, I think they should be quite free to do so, but I do not think the working people in Canada who belong to the union should be forced, and this is what the minister from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) said – he didn't think this was force at all; he thought it would give them more freedom. This is most ridiculous – even the most naïve of working people could see through that.

Mr. Speaker, I think finally that it takes away the democratic right of the secret vote, because after all if you make people sign out on these union funds, they are going to be a marked man. there's no question about that, and as I said before, when labour unions call you unsolicited and tell you they are violently opposed, then I think that we should uphold this resolution from the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) and I will certainly, for one, wholeheartedly support his resolution.

Mr. Ed Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(debate adjourned)

MOTION RE FODDER RESERVE BANKS

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley) moved the following resolution:

“That this Assembly deplores the failure of the Government to establish and maintain adequate fodder reserve banks for the feeding of cattle and recommends to the consideration of this Government that immediate provision be made for establishing and maintaining fodder reserve banks in this Province.”

He said: Mr. Speaker, I consider it a pleasure to move the resolution placed on the Order Paper opposite my name at this time, and especially in a year such as this.

Mr. Speaker, I merely read this resolution to you and to the members of this House in order that I may describe

what I think is a fodder reserve bank. In the minds of some members it may only mean a pile of hay somewhere out on the prairie. To me a fodder reserve bank means an area of our province which is used for the production of fodder. A fodder reserve bank would be an area where we could utilize the water resources of an area of our province, along with the native grass resources, cultivated grass resources, and so forth. A fodder reserve bank means to me a supply of fodder that has been secured, prepared and stored, and the fodder reserve bank also means to me a facility whereby farmers in this province can make use of those services. So, during the course of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, when I refer to what I think are allied services to the production and storing of fodder. I hope you will understand my interpretation of what I consider is a fodder reserve bank.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all farmers in this province have had an opportunity to witness the scuttling of negotiats of the main planks of the policies of the group to your right, when they were speaking and asking support of the rural people of this province, prior to 1944. As you will recall, and as many hon. members in this House will recall, one of the many and varied promises made to the people of this province by those who sit on your right, was that they were going to set up a system whereby feed and fodder would be put up in years of good conditions to carry the cattle herds of the farmers of this province in the interests of their livestock program over a period of bad times.

I can say that I have heard the Minister of Agriculture in the past speaking on this very thing; I have heard the Premier and different supporters of this government at different times throughout this province, mention this very thing. After they were elected to power in 1944 I believe that the Minister of Agriculture was quite sincere along with some of those who support him, and so they decided to set up their version of a fodder reserve. Not only did they set up a fodder reserve bank (their version of it), but also they set up a system whereby they could conserve and save cereal grains. So over the years we find that they have set up some grain storage facilities. It is true they were very small, and did not seem practical; they were not set up under a system that would ultimately be useful to the farmers of this province, and later on we find that all those facilities, all those services were discontinued.

Then they proceeded to set up their version of a fodder reserve bank, so over the years we have found in various parts of this province, hay being baled and put up

in outside storage, and inside storage. I don't know what happened to their plan, Mr. Speaker; I don't know whether it was just designed for so much political propaganda, or whether it was designed to be practical, but in the years when a substantial amount of fodder could have been put up, could have been put in satisfactory storage, and could have been in a position to be utilized by the farmers of this province, for the maintenance and substance of their herds that this has not proved to be the case.

You can recall some two years ago when many of the farmers of this province were caught with insufficient amounts of hay, straw or roughage to carry their cattle through what appeared at that time a very severe winter, there was practically no amount of fodder in this province in this type of a program.

Because of lack of policy, because of insufficient storage, because of carelessness in handling and storing of fodder, when the time came to utilize some of this reserve we found that in too many cases much had been destroyed or rotted, or wasn't fit for livestock consumption. So, in one of the first years when the farmers had to depend on the services of this type, they found that service was not available to them. Then they found that the cost of the feed that they had to take out of feed banks, the quality of such was not proper for the cattle. In spite of that, they had to pay the full costs, and as they went along they had to pick out the rotten stuff, the destroyed stuff in order to get at the other hay.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege I know the hon. member wouldn't want to mislead the House, but this fodder was not sold as hay — any spoiled part of it was given away.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I don't think that could be counted as a point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I assume it does. The hon. member made a statement that we charged a uniform price regardless of what the quality was. I am saying this is not correct, and not in accordance with facts.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think that will fit in with the definition of a point of privilege as given by authorities. I think it is rather a correction that may be made with the consent of the member who is speaking, or at the close of his speech.

Mr. McFarlane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the hon. minister's interjection will not have any effect on what I have to say, because in the area that I represent, farmers in my area had to go to these so-called feed banks and that was the instructions they were given. They had to pick up the fodder bring it home, and take all the pile that was there. I am listening to the farmers; if I am wrong then they are wrong. The minister has the privilege to correct me when I am finished speaking.

One of the basic reasons, as I stated at the outset of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, was this: one of the reasons they formulated their so-called policy was because of the experience of the farmers and the government in this province during the ten years of drought and depression in the 1930's. We have had the experience in Saskatchewan for a great many years in the problems of drought, and trying to sustain not only the human population, but the livestock population in years of drought. This is not something new, because when this country was first explored, or first opened up it was condemned for agricultural purposes. That area of Canada known as the Palliser Triangle, when it was first explored was stated in the records of that time that it would be unsuitable for agriculture. Of course, Mr. Speaker, that was proven incorrect, and over the years, and because of the ingenuity of farmers, because of mechanization, and because of agricultural policies of provincial and federal governments, Liberals and Conservatives at that time, this country was settled and developed by, as I say, the ingenuity of these types of people.

So from a land that was considered a desert, we have transformed Saskatchewan into what it was at one time, and to what it is today, the bread-basket of the world.

When we, as I say, go over the agricultural history of this province, we have found there are certain areas of Saskatchewan that do not lend themselves to grain growing of cereal production. There are areas of the province, probably the area where the Minister of Agriculture comes from, that lend themselves to more of a cattle raising economy. So, when we build up the agricultural economic structure of this province, the greatest results in Saskatchewan and in these certain areas, is when we combine the two; when we took some marginal land and utilized that for the raising of livestock; when we took the grain growing areas of the province, naturally grain growing was the chief occupation. Then on the vast areas of this province we have solidified our agricultural economy; built up our

homes; built up our services, but then we diversified, when we united the cattle raising and the grain growing together.

Even that, Mr. Speaker, has left us with a serious problem. I think we can best understand that problem when we look at a map of Saskatchewan, and break it down into townships. I would just commend this map to all members on both sides of this House – to those responsible in any way in this province with agricultural economics, and the formulation of agricultural policies. Because it illustrates to us the diversification of the province, and indicates to us the problems in the various areas. I think a guide to different problems throughout this province can be taken from this very map as set up by the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. I think we can classify the provinces into three separate and distinct areas. In that area of the province east of the second meridian, which is up against the Manitoba border, right to the American border through the northern part of the province, all along the Manitoba border, it is quite significant that, in a period of 21 years, since P.F.A.A. has been established, the average amount of payment to the people in that area would amount to about an average of two payments in 21 years – two payments in 21 years. The significant part of that, Mr. Speaker, is that that area has had less crop failures in that period of time, and because it has had less crop failures in that period of time it has established itself to the point where today that is the area with the heaviest cattle population of Saskatchewan.

The significant thing there again is that it is also the area of the province where the farm holdings are probably the smallest; they comprise the entire east section of Saskatchewan right through to the furthestmost northern part of settled land.

Then we come into the great central part of the province, that part I refer to as the area west of the second meridian and east of the third meridian. The significance there is that in that area, the P.F.A.A. payments to farmers have only averaged about five times during the past 21 years. That area of the province, Mr. Speaker, I submit, is where you have your greatest concentration of mixed farming and grain growing. That includes the wheat growing belt of Regina plains and up into the northern part of the province. There again you have a vast difference in the climatic conditions over the past 21 years, because in the southern part of that area we have had P.F.A.A. payments up as high as about 14 or 15 times in some areas. Then in the further northern settled part of the province, those agricultural areas – some have only received it once in 21 years.

Then we go to the west side of the province, and here we find a vast distinction in climatic conditions and farming conditions and livestock raising conditions. In that area of the province, west of the third meridian, we find that out of 21 years some townships in that area have received P.F.A.A. 21 times. I would estimate that the average number of years which P.F.A.A. payments have been paid over that whole area of western Saskatchewan, would be about ten times out of 21 years. When we are drawing up an agricultural policy in this province, Mr. Speaker, we must take cognisance of these facts. We must see where the cattle population is centred in this province. We must see where climatic conditions are favourable to the diversification of farming, agriculture, cattle raising and grain producing, and we must find the areas where cattle raising ventures would probably suffer under climatic conditions.

Then because, Mr. Speaker, the basic industry in Saskatchewan today is still agriculture, over the long haul you have listened to hon. members opposite talk about mineral production, industrial development and so forth, but this basic industry in this province today is still the farming and the agricultural industry. When, due to climatic conditions or other factors, something happens to our agricultural industry, then the repercussions are felt all down through the economic lifeline of that province. A good indication of that is what we are seeing in the business economy in this province at the present time, because a dollar placed in the purchasing hands of the farmer goes through more services in this province than a dollar placed in any other person's hands. Sure, we developed the farm lands; we produced the grain; we produced cattle, and so forth, and that money goes through all the little villages, towns and supports the business men and all these services, etc. If you talk in terms of industrialization, or if you talk in terms of mineral development, the revenues from oil don't go through that same number of hands. The oil is developed, and the monies go to head office, probably outside the province. So our basic economy must be built around a strong agricultural policy in this province. That is why I say that this map is so valuable to us, because it gives us some indication of where our livestock herds should be maintained and where we can build up, or have access in getting feed and fodder to maintain these herds.

It is significant too, Mr. Speaker, by way of reference to state that in the municipalities of Saskatchewan up until the present time, some 42 municipalities, or LID's

in this province have received over \$1 million in P.F.A.A. since that program was first set up. So there we would have 42 areas in this province, where possibly something must be done, and something should be done to stabilize one agricultural industry. Before we can go further in setting up this program, I think we should look at the size of the farm holdings in this province. I think possibly that all members in this House realize that the majority of holdings in this province are the smaller ones, and in the smaller holdings we must, of necessity, diversify our agricultural operations.

I am just going to read out one or two of the figures so that we can see the significance of these farm buildings. I take these figures from a Wheat Board statistic, which classifies the number of permit holders in Saskatchewan. These figures may not, for all intents and purposes be exact but for practical purposes, I am sure they will serve to illustrate the point which we want to put across this afternoon.

I think it is significant that, our of 104,387 permit holders in Saskatchewan, 60 per cent or 62,450 are of the half section holdings or less. Sixty per cent of the permit holders of this province operate an acreage less than a half section. That figure is quite significant because I don't think there is anybody in this House who will argue the point with me that if a half section operator is to diversify his operations, that he must of necessity include cattle in those operations. Because on the map that I showed you, the largest number of half section farms are in the eastern part of the province, from the United States border through to the northern settled area. But a half section, or 320 acres in those areas, Mr. Speaker, doesn't necessarily mean that there are 320 acres under cultivation, and that is something that we must recognize.

The areas that I represent, and they are some of the best farm lands in Saskatchewan for mixed farming, they are fortunate in those areas if they can get 100 acres out of 160 under cultivation and for grain growing. Then because of the fact that so much of the balance of the land is wasteland, bush, trees, that type of land cannot be utilized for grazing or for the production of grain or feed. So it is in these same areas, here are 60 per cent of the farmers in Saskatchewan whose holdings are not of sufficient size for maintenance over a long period of time of a sufficient number of cattle, or to produce sufficient amounts of grain in order to carry on a long time stable agricultural business.

October 24, 1961

So then you must go a little higher, because in those areas to carry the amount of cattle under present conditions, they would need to keep themselves solid, they haven't got enough acres or enough pasture to raise the herd of cattle that they would like to have. In areas that I represent some of the half section farmers want to keep cattle, but do not have sufficient pasture, and so to maintain themselves in that type of enterprise, some responsibility has to be taken on for other purposes, by other persons where these cattle can be raised and fed until they realize some returns from this type of enterprise.

So we go on to the next largest holding, which is the three-quarter section farm in Saskatchewan. It is interesting to note here that 73 per cent of the holdings in Saskatchewan – the farm holdings, are a three-quarter section or less. That is a significant point, Mr. Speaker, - about 73 per cent of 76,200 farms. Once again the bracket we find these people in is that they still haven't got sufficient pasture, and still can't devote sufficient number of acres to crop under dry conditions, to maintain a sizable herd of livestock. So we must go to the section farmer. A section in some of the constituencies such as Elrose, Kindersley, and the Regina Plains would represent some 640 cultivated acres, but a section of land in the eastern area of the province may only represent about 400 acres at the most. So we are still in difficulty, but for all practical purposes I think in a situation such as this we will deal with a section of land. It is significant to know, Mr. Speaker, people talk in terms of big farmers, large farmers, but who are these big and large farmers, and what is the type of holding they have? It is significant to note that, in terms of a section of land, in this province, the one section farmer represent 87 per cent of the farmers here in Saskatchewan. So those who talk in terms of larger farmers, or bigger farmers, are really down to a figure of some 13 per cent beyond the section farmer.

I believe that a practical and efficient agricultural and wheat growing and livestock enterprise can be built, in many cases, on the section farm. But then other policies must be put into effect, and other policies must be carried out to subsidize those who wish to increase their economic income by additional raising of cattle. So I think we must deal with the situation from that angle and see what we can do to stabilize the diversified type of agricultural economy.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of regret that we have not seen these policies established by

this government, or have not seen policies carried out by this government which would tend to, for all practical purposes, stabilize a stock raising venture in this province.

Before we go any further we hear a great deal about the surplus of cattle in Saskatchewan and western Canada. Mr. Speaker, I don't think we have ever had a surplus of cattle here in Saskatchewan. It was true that, about a year ago I think the figures sent out by the Department of Agriculture stated that in Saskatchewan at that time we had 1,900,000 head of cattle. In the eyes of many people in this province it would indicate a surplus. To me, Mr. Speaker, it indicated no such thing. If the farmer today who is operating in these areas which I have described, cannot meet his commitments on the straight grain and cereal producing venture, then they have to be supplemented with cattle. And because for a few years climatic conditions in this province were favourable to the increasing of these cattle herds, then the farmers found themselves in the position where they could operate to better advantage, and have more cash on hand to meet their commitments. So for a period of time they enjoyed that type of venture, and it has paid off well to them.

Then we have had periods of drought. when the period of drought came and there was no provision made, then the same farmers had to reduce their herd, and by reducing their herd cut drastically into their net income for those years. They had thought and were promised and led to believe that policies would be set up; a program would be set up where if a drought similar to the 1930's, this government would have some assistance readily available where they would not have to sacrifice the herd. I don't think there is any excuse for the government in not taking that action. I think they have had the experience of the 1930's, because the minister opposite and many of his colleagues on the other side were raising cattle during that time.

Just for the record to show you, Mr. Speaker, and to show members of this House, and to show to the government that the government of the day had to go to similar conditions, similar to this year's drought, but not similar because of the longer extended period of time – by 1937, which was in our district, and in many areas of the province; by the end of 1937 we had gone through that terrific drought cycle – ten years of terrific drought. In 1938 the drought conditions in this province had started to disappear, but as I said by the end of 1937 we had come through ten consecutive years of drought and depredation of the cattle herd in the prime areas

October 24, 1961

of this province. so the government at that time, (and I'm going to give these figures to the House with your permission, Mr. Speaker, because I want to point out that we should have had some lesson from the experience of the drought at that time.) I want to point out to the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the members what the government had to do at that time to maintain the cattle herd in this province, to pick out the fodder shortage in the dry years of the 1930's developed after the dry summer of 1937. Free freight certificates for a shipment of over 500,000 tons of fodder were issued in the province. These certificates covered shipments from other parts of Canada and from the northern United States, Mr. Speaker. The urgency of the delivery of this fodder was revealed by a check of the records by the Department of Agriculture, which showed that during the five months from the first week in October until the fifth day of March, 1938 free freight certificates for the shipment of about 450,000 tons of fodder had been issued by the department. This represented, Mr. Speaker, about 45,000 freight carloads of fodder. As they averaged about ten tons per car at that time, this would amount to 1,000 trainloads of 45 cars each. If we can visualize it in those terms, 1,000 trainloads of fodder going into this province with 45 cars to a train. This amount of fodder represents enough bales to cover 5,100 miles if laid end to end, or a string of bales from Halifax to Vancouver, and almost back again. Or a stack of bales from Manitoba to Swift Current (your home area, Mr. Speaker) two bales wide and seven and one half feet high. It had taken 4,500,000 pounds of baling wire, or 100 carloads of 45,000 pounds per car to bale this amount of fodder.

Again it represented 28,125 eight-hour working days with a crew of six men and power baler. Or, in other words, it took 225 power balers and 1,350 men working every working day from the first week in October to the fifth of March, to bale this amount of fodder. To load this amount of fodder by horse and team and two men, which was the custom at that time, averaging the haul at five miles, represented 900 thousand man-hours and half that number of horse team-hours.

In order to get this amount of fodder during this period it was necessary to load on tracks 360 railroad cars every working day from the first week in October, 1937 to the 5th of March, 1938, on the average. Then 739 shippers took part in obtaining this fodder, and 1,125 points received shipment; in addition to this 5,000 carloads of feed grain was distributed.

So, Mr. Speaker, with these figures to draw on with the experience of the government which had assumed responsibility for this during that time, surely to goodness the people of Saskatchewan had reason to believe that this government would carry out the promises, and see that this situation would never take place in this province again. That was only the fodder, as I mentioned before they were setting up these storages to preserve cereal grains in case of an emergency again, and what was the amount of cereal grain in addition to the fodder that had to be shipped in up to that period of time. Seed wheat, \$7 million worth; seed oats, - the Minister of Agriculture and the press referred to see oats at that time as \$8 million which had to be shipped in; seed barley, \$1 million; feed oats, \$6 million, or a total of \$22 million. that was just in that period from October until March, 1938.

Those are the figures – this is what they should have based their program upon. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know what has happened since then. As I have pointed out to carry out some of the promises that were made loosely, areas in this province were designated as areas where hay was to be stored, and so hay was put up. The storage of cereal grains was abandoned; the grain was moved out; the building sold and for all practical purposes, the government isn't holding one bushel of feed in any government storage at the present time, to meet the emergencies by spring. What was the reason for getting rid of their bales of feed in their fodder storage program? It was simply this, Mr. Speaker; as I pointed out this hasn't been put up properly. Sure, we have heard in the past the Minister of Agriculture talking about areas where the hay was put up, and they had the hay and they could not sell it. In these cases the hay was ruined by the lack of supervision. Had they had a supervisor to see that the government's share of the hay had been put into proper stacks, properly covered, then there is no reason in the world why that hay and fodder would not have lasted at least for five years.

What are our experimental farms doing? You go down to the experimental farm at Indian Head in my constituency, and you will find that year after year they put up their supplies of fodder; it is built up in neat stacks, and on the second row from the top, Mr. Speaker, this is polyethylene covered, and this goes over the whole area of the stack. On top of the polyethylene to keep out the moisture, we have one more row of bales and this is the type of program they use to maintain the fodder reserves on the experimental farm at the present time. That has proved

October 24, 1961

practical, and I suggest had the government done the same thing, then some of the fodder they had in these stacks never would have gone out of condition, and some of it could have been available for at least use by the farmers two years ago, and in other cases the program could have been carried on, and some would still be available today.

We have heard much – when we talk in terms of fodder reserves, the minister and the CCF speak only in terms of a haystack. As I pointed out, Saskatchewan was considered, at the time it was first explored, not to be suitable for agriculture, but the people of Saskatchewan, the farmers of Saskatchewan have proved that statement incorrect. The areas which were considered to be the driest of the province have, because of the ingenuity of the persons concerned, because of the policies of federal governments, and the concern of P.F.R.A. and because of policies of previous provincial governments concerned, these areas have been transformed to a dried-out drought area to some of the finest ranch country to be found anywhere in western Canada.

When this land had been settled for ranching, naturally food reserves for winter or years of disaster had to be taken care of. Because of the type of the country, probably the first requisite for that type of country and areas which you come from too, Mr. Speaker, is an assured supply of water. So, realizing that water was probably most important, P.F.R.A. went ahead and put in community dug-outs; put in individual dug-outs for farmers and went ahead and put in large dams where the water could be stored for utilization, either by individuals or by groups, or governments in the future. Had this government gone ahead in areas such as this, and stepped up a program of their own, or even taken advantage of the federal government's program, and developed these areas, then the large portion of wasteland in that area of the province, Mr. Speaker, could have been put into the production of forage crops. Had it been put into the production of forest crops over the years we would have had an abundant source or supply to draw from. Because of the type of forage grains we have at the present time that are suitable to our types of soil conditions, and our type of climatic conditions, and I refer to different varieties of grasses; broom; crested wheat; crested rye and probably the best fodder of all, alfalfa – because of the access to those varieties of fodder and grasses, then a program of fodder conservation and utilization of water resources could have been set up for the people of this province.

I am going to say to the minister, and to the members of this House, that if we had a cattle population of 1,900,000 in the past – if they think in terms that it was a surplus, then something is going to have to be done because for all practical purposes in the years to come, 1,900,000 head of cattle in this province is going to be a small figure. The day is going to come in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, when I venture to say we will have a higher cattle population than the province of Alberta, and certainly a higher cattle population than the province of Manitoba. If we are to put the type of land – sub marginal land or type of land in this province that should be put into other means of production in the production of cereal grains, then cattle are going to have to supplant the production of grains from those areas. If the farmers of this province are to enjoy a measure of income relative to the cash outlay of the business type of venture, they are in, then their venture is going to have to be supplemented by a cattle production.

It is not enough to say, Mr. Speaker, that those 1,900,000 head of cattle are going to be raised in this province, but in the future the whole program of cattle production is going to be changed from purely a program of raising of cattle to where we find in Saskatchewan the biggest area in Canada where cattle are raised, fed and finished off to supply the markets of the world.

So, instead of doing in the future as we have done in the past, where we probably raise the cattle, ship them down to Ontario, Manitoba or Montreal, or the States to be finished, and then put on the market, if the cattle industry in this province is to prosper at all; if the farmers engaged in that business venture are to prosper, then the program particularly is going to be the finishing of the complete product from the time the calf is born and raised on the prairie, until it goes out as a finished product through the packing houses to the consumers of this nation and other nations in the world. That is the thing we have got to build our agricultural policies toward; the setting up and the maintaining and the building and sustaining of that type of policy.

The government in the past has talked a great deal about the community pastures they have set out; about the hay that has been taken off the community pastures, and this in their eyes is a form of fodder reserve. Mr. Speaker, regardless of what they have done in the past, or what they intend to do in the future, the situation is this -

October 24, 1961

that we haven't got adequate pasture for the cattle we should have in the province at this time. There are areas available in my constituency. Farmers there have pleaded with the government to come in and take over some of these areas and set them up as community pastures. I know there are areas in the constituency east of me – the constituency of Moosomin – areas there where we have all the advantages of nature; down through the valley where the cattle have summer and winter protection, with adequate supplies of water – areas there where the cattle producers and farmers alike are quite willing and agreeable to have community pastures set up.

I have farmers in my constituency who are trying to operate on a straight grain basis who simply cannot carry on that way. They want to get into cattle, but at the present time can only raise enough to put on the field after the crop is taken off. These farmers, if we are to see that they are to stay economically solvent must have some system whereby they can utilize their resources on their half section and have the advantage of a community pasture.

Then, when that type of program has been put up, then our community pasture program will to a certain extent be successful.

When hon. members on this side of the House continually brought this measure to the attention of the government, for all practical purposes still nothing has been done. We have been told that possibly the farmers should put up shelters, or some assistance should be given to farmers, to put up shelters on their own farm for the preservation of fodder reserves. Mr. Speaker, as sound and as practical as that type of approach may be, it accomplishes nothing, if there are not sufficient reserves to draw on, or sufficient supplies of fodder to put into the shelters. I think in view of the circumstances it has only amounted to a condemnation of the government's own policies.

Here in Saskatchewan we have areas where they could utilize the taking off of the fodder and storing it, and work towards preserving it, because after all, they own the Timber Board in this province, Mr. Speaker; the timber board can go up in the northern areas of the province, pick up the lumber, accumulate the poles, and I imagine that if it is as the government members say, where you have a service of cost, then for the products of the far north, they could be utilized to put up pole sheds or protection

at very little cost in carrying out a program, and protecting a program where fodder is put up, and protected from the elements and could be stored over a period of some five years. Because, after all, our research scientists tell us that hay loses very little of its food content in a period of three years. You can store it, if it is in good condition for a period of two years, and very little of its food value will be lost.

So I think, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, when outside this House they indicate that the farmers should be putting up outside shelters, I would say to him, for all practical purposes, if these programs are effective and efficient, then he has the full resources of the forests of the north, he has the full resources of his own crown corporation to utilize those resources, to make use of them, and use the materials in an economical way to provide storage facilities and the protection of fodder in whatever areas of the province they are required. To me I think that is a very practical suggestion; I don't think there could be any difficulty in carrying out a plan of that type.

To say that conditions only occur one year of say five or six would not altogether be true, because during the past three or four years alone, the dairy producers in my area of the province have had to rely on sources of fodder outside the province in order to maintain their dairy herd. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the mild shed area for the city of Regina is the largest area in Saskatchewan, east of Regina, taking into the constituency I represent. Not only this year, but last year and two years ago these dairy men, in order to carry on their venture, had to go to the province of Alberta to the irrigated areas to get feed to maintain their dairy herds, and carry out their operations.

If we had some policies in this province – some development in this province whereby we could have utilized the money that was produced in this province, then these people would not year after year have had to go outside provinces, and be a drain on government finances to keep bringing in their feed. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there are areas where a fodder bank could be set up, utilizing the land, utilizing the water, and producing the forage that is required to supply a ready market that has been there year after year.

October 24, 1961

So I say that, in light of the circumstances, in view of what has turned out, this government can only be censured and condemned for the lack of policy and lack of turning out policies over these 17 years, knowing the experience and history of this province.

So, having pointed out what I think should be done in this respect, pointing out what I think should be or is a feed reserve, or fodder reserve, not only in terms of a haystack on the prairies, but the utilization of land, water, resources to produce this commodity, and then setting it up and protecting it for those who need, and so desire. Mr. Speaker, that is my idea of a fodder reserve.

After the fodder reserves are being built up, and I think this program will receive universal acceptance; I know in the light of circumstances in the province of Manitoba this year, the Minister of Agriculture there is going ahead with a program of feed and fodder reserves for livestock. I think by what I can gather from the press, it is going to be put on a more or less regional basis, knowing the areas of the province who, year after year, need this type of assistance, and are trying to set up some form of a project that in the future those areas would have easy and ready access for this type of project.

I believe when we think in terms of the fodder loan, if the preservation of the quality of the fodder is to be kept at a high level, then I think this fodder would have to be turned over; in other words, utilized by the farmers at least once every three or five years. I don't think it would be beyond the ingenuity of the people concerned to set up a scheme whereby that could be accomplished.

The areas, as I say, in the eastern part of the province where vast amounts of feed are needed, then there can be areas set up there. Then we have the other problem, Mr. Speaker, and that is one which is very prevalent this year. We have farmers in this province at the present time with livestock herds which are facing depletion. Once those herds are depleted, the farmers' source of income is gone. He won't be in a position this year or next year or the year after, to replace those herds. The unfortunate circumstances are these, that he isn't in a position to be able to go out and lay out the cash to buy the amount of feed he requires to carry those cattle over the forthcoming winter. so I say when we think in terms of feed bank reserves,

we must also think in terms of setting up a plan or scheme whereby farmers find themselves in dire need of the services of these feed bank reserves can, without too much trouble, receive some cash or a loan from the government whereby they can get some reserves and fodder to help carry their cattle over.

So to me, and to the farmers who must have the reserves and can't pay for them, to make the whole plan successful, then their position must be looked into also.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is one of the most pressing problems in the province today, and as I pointed out, because of the trend in livestock raising in the future, it will again be a depressing problem in the years ahead. We have pioneered in the experience of drought conditions, and in programs to alleviate drought conditions in this province. Instead of setting up and abandoning half-completed projects, these projects should have been carried through to their ultimate conclusion. We should never in this province let ourselves get into a position again, as we find ourselves this year, where feed and fodder is having to be brought in from all the other provinces to the east and west of us, without having utilized our own services and our own resources, to produce that fodder and feed.

Because I believe the importance of this program – it is with pleasure that I move this resolution for your perusal, which is on the order paper today.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? I understood the hon. member to say that hay storage depreciated after three years. I was wondering if he could tell us whether it depreciates wholly, or what per cent does it depreciate in its nutritive value in a year?

Mr. McFarlane: — Of course, Mr. Speaker, I didn't say that. I said that research scientists have stated that hay loses very little of its nutritive value in a period of three years, which is altogether opposite to what the hon. member has just stated.

Mr. Berezowsky: — That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. Cliff H. Thurston (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I want to say first that I too, like the mover of the resolution, am a farmer and represent a rural seat. I am keenly interested in this whole problem of fodder and fodder reserves. I am also interested in the best methods of achieving and maintaining these reserves. I want to say at the outset that I have never been in favour of the government itself trying to build and maintain these reserves. I feel it is too costly. I have always believed that the best place for reserves is right on the farm itself. I think all members can realize that if the government had to hire, and that is what they would have to do, the cutting and baling and the hauling of hay, the cost would be prohibited per ton.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the government followed the proper course in trying to deal with the feed and fodder situation. Over the years they have been giving assistance in various ways, and I think that is one of the duties of the government, not to try and do it themselves, but to try and give the proper assistance to the farmers whereby we ourselves can do this job. They have been giving assistance in many ways. One of the ways that comes to my mind in this whole fodder question is, they are giving assistance to farmers in obtaining good grass seeds, new varieties, mixed grass seeds, and I think that has been a tremendous help in the production of fodder crops.

I know as a wheat farmer what the development of new cereal grains has meant, and I believe it is just as important in grasses. In fact, I have an example of that in my own district. Three years ago the ag. rep. got one of my neighbours interested in seeding down a few acres of a mixed grass seed. I was talking to this chap just the other day, and he told me on that acreage which he had seeded down that the yield was a third up over the rest of his grassland. I think that is one of the things we have to attempt to do to try and increase production.

Also, the Department of Agriculture has been investing in small irrigation projects. It is true that during the wet fifties these projects didn't develop too quickly, but they have been paying off the last few years. As a matter of fact, on several small projects, at Ponteix, Bangor, Fedora, Chesterfield, Waldeck and Russell Creek, in this year 1961 they produced 11,000 tons of hay.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that shows what irrigation can do in a dry year such as this, that we could have some 11,000 tons of hay. I cannot help but think that if we were able to produce 11,000 tons of hay on these small projects, what might have been the situation had we had the South Saskatchewan River dam in completion. Mr. Speaker, I think we have all heard about Nero fiddling while Rome burned, but it looks to me like the former Liberal government fiddled for 10 years while Saskatchewan farmers burned. I want to agree with the mover that it is too bad that the dairy men east of Regina have had to go to Alberta the last three years to get alfalfa hay from the irrigated areas in that province. I would suggest that it is to the shame of the Liberal party that election after election we were promised this South Saskatchewan dam. I can remember quite well in 1945 when the former Minister of Agriculture reported in the press as saying: "Just the moment that materials and men were available, the South Saskatchewan dam would be proceeded with." Mr. Speaker, 12 years later when they were turned out of office, not one shovel full of dirt had been taken out for the dam, and it was left to the incoming government to make the agreement to get it going.

I say again it was a shame, and I would be ashamed to stand up in this House and talk about fodder shortages when we had a situation such as this.

There are many programs which I feel this government has done to aid the farmers in the production of fodder supplies. Time certainly doesn't permit me to go into all the programs, but I would urge, if they have not done so, that the members on the opposite side of the House to read the annual report of the Department of Agriculture. It makes for interesting reading, to find out just what the Department of Agriculture has been doing over the last period of years.

Mr. Speaker, may I turn for just a moment to deal with the emergency feed situation that we find this year. Contrary to what some may say, the government became aware of this earlier. Back as far as March 15, 1961, there was a meeting held in this city attended by the Departments of Agriculture, of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Alberta and the federal government. From that meeting they viewed the situation, and we were advised as farmers first, to feed oats on fallow for farms. We were advised at that time not to seed stubble crops. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that was good sound advice. I know in my own farming district, the only crops I saw affected by cutworms were those seeded to

October 24, 1961

stubble. The wheat in our area on fallow averaged in the neighbourhood of 20 bushels to the acre, whereby you went to stubble and it was down six, seven and eight. It stands to reason that if it produced that much more wheat it would certainly produce that much more oats.

Mr. Speaker, steps were taken to deal with this fodder situation. Assistance was given to the council and agricultural committee for regional meetings to review the fodder situation, and I suggest that the people closest to it are the ones best able to give advice to the government, and where the fodder was or the shortage. The great bulk of the majority of agricultural committees were actually formers. There wasn't a great deal of money, but there was \$3,000 allocated for this expenditure.

Early in the year assistance was given to the moving of livestock to pastures – two cents per head for cattle over one year, and one cent for cattle under one year. Ten thousand dollars was spent then and it was shared with the federal government. Early in the year when the haying season came around assistance was given to farmers in the moving of haying equipment to spots where the hay was. This, too, was shared by the federal government. Assistance was given, as we all know, in the bringing in of hay by rail, by truck, and by the farmers' own trucks. This too was a shared program.

There was assistance given to the moving of feed grain; assistance was given to the municipalities at half the cost of storing grain in the elevator. I think the big incentive to the producing of more fodder crops was the policy announced at the middle of July on \$5 per ton for cereal crops which were cut for fodder. I do know that in my own constituency a number of farmers did cut fodder, simply because they had this assurance that they would at least receive additional help towards putting up feed, particularly on those crops where it was marginal, but when this policy was announced it was decided to be cut for hay and stored for fodder.

I think one of the biggest services the department gave was in the listing of fodder. They had some 2,000 listings, which were circulated through the R.M.'s; given to the press and radio, and I want to pay a tribute to the press and radio in the good coverage that was given to these services. People who had extra feed or fodder listed these, and those people who required to purchase it were put in contact with where the feed was.

Mr. Speaker, to me I think we must deal with this problem in two phases – first we must have long-term policies that will try to build up an adequate reserve over the years. I have very briefly tried to outline some of these policies of the department in meeting this need, and secondly, policies to meet emergency situations such as we had this year. I believe the minister took every possible step to meet this emergency – not only in paying tribute to him, but I would like to pay a tribute to his staff for the diligent way they worked in this regard. I know I had occasion a time or two this fall to call in late in the evening, and the wife of one of these department men informed me he was in his office at 10 o'clock at night. He was in the office struggling with this problem, and I think we in this House owe a debt of gratitude to these people who put in the hours they did.

Mr. Speaker, I don't like making comparisons because you don't always know the circumstances, but if you wanted to compare aid which this government has given to the feed situation with that of Manitoba, to date I find that Manitoba has spent \$150 thousand on the drought situation, while in Saskatchewan the figure is \$1,154,000. Also that Manitoba is not giving any assistance for the movement of feed grain, and seed. I don't know what this would cost, but it can run into a terrific sum – the movement of the seed and feed grain.

Mr. Speaker, I have given some of my objections to what is asked for in this resolution. I have given a very brief summary of some of the policies which I believe will meet the long-term policy. I believe that these policies will do more to aid the farmer than just government fodder banks. Therefore I move an amendment, seconded by Mr. Meakes:

“All the words after the word “Assembly” be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

“commends the Provincial Government for its prompt and effective emergency program in meeting the severe drought situation and its long term policies directed towards solving chronic fodder shortages in Saskatchewan.”

DISCUSSION RE RULING ON AMENDMENT

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): —Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the amendment is out of order. I am sure that you will

October 24, 1961

agree with me that any amendment to a resolution that completely destroys the intent of the original resolution is out of order, and you are replacing the word “deplores” with “commend”, and I suggest to you on that basis alone that this amendment to the resolution is out of order.

Mr. Snedker: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur with what has been said by the hon. member for Moosomin. I understand this is a typical method of the gentlemen on the other side of the House with which they usually treat resolutions, and I carefully looked up Beauchesne last winter . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Snedker: — Oh, sure, you’d like to shut anyone up on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Snedker: — I carefully looked up Beauchesne, and I think if you will look it up everything that the hon. member from Moosomin said is borne out.

Mr. Speaker: — I think if you look up Section 202(13) it says:

“An amendment to alter the main question by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion is not an expanded negative and may be moved.”

Section (12) before that says:

“An amendment proposing a direct negative though it may be covered up with verbiage is out of order.”

but (13) says:

“An amendment to alter the main question by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion is not an expanded negative, and may be moved.”

The way I would interpret those words would be that if this motion, which has been moved by Mr. McFarlane, were negatived resulting in the same thing as you have in the amendment, the amendment would be out of order, but if it brings in some other idea that cannot be achieved by simply saying “No” to the main motion, then it would be in order. I don’t think you come up with the same answer by simply saying ‘No’ to the main motion; you cannot come up with the idea that is expressed in this amendment. It is my feeling that it is in order – that Part (13), Citation 202 applies in this case. That is:

“an amendment to alter the main question by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion is not an expanded negative, and may be moved.”

Mr. McDonald: — Let me put it this way to you. Do you mean to tell me or this House that it is within the law of this House for an amendment to be made to a motion, and if that amendment is carried, then you are placing the mover of the original motion who intended to condemn someone for doing something, in the position of praising him?

Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous, and I ask you to give further consideration in view of this fact. Surely you are not going to place the member in the position where he has to vote against his own motion? This has happened time and time again in this House, and, Mr. Speaker, I beg of you to reconsider it. I don’t think there is any authority on the face of this earth under which you can rule this amendment in order. This is like asking whether you’ve quite beating your wife or not. Mr. Speaker, I plead with you to reconsider your judgment on this matter. I think the amendment is out of order, and I submit that we have conceded many times in the past to a Speaker’s ruling, accepting amendments to resolutions that are out of order, and I submit that this, and all amendments of this type where you completely destroy the original meaning, and replace it with the exact opposite is out of order.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of order here, if the amendment is ruled in order then there is no reference made to the lack of fodder banks, which is the gist of this resolution, deploring the fact that the

government has seen fit to set up fodder banks. The amendment, as I see it, would erase all of that and make no reference to fodder banks. It is not adding to the resolution or contributing in any way, but merely striking the whole thing out as if he brought in a resolution of his own, commending the provincial government for the whole over all agricultural policy. This is dealing with a specific instance, or a specific portion of the agricultural policy – the lack of setting up fodder banks. For that reason I cannot see than any amendment which would forbid discussion on this phase of an agricultural policy would be in order, because it wipes it out completely.

For that reason I cannot concur that this amendment would be in order.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I was going to add one remark here. Without having a copy of the proposed amendment in front of me, if I recall correctly he mentioned the drought situation, which is entirely removed from the topic of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) and is in fact a completely separate matter. As I understand it, if this government wishes to move some resolution with regard to their handling of the drought situation, they are perfectly free to do so. For them to take the opportunity of attempting to completely negate and mutilate a resolution from the opposition is certainly a travesty of justice in my opinion, and I hope you will rule accordingly.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. members are putting forth arguments which would completely destroy the whole principle of democratic debate in a legislature. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Let us look at this picture. Two members of this House, the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) and some other member who seconded this motion, had presumed that the House will accept a certain statement. That is what has happened so far. It stands to reason that the House must have the right to say, "No, we cannot accept that statement but on that subject, this is the statement that should be made."

Mr. McCarthy: — Vote against it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — This is the principle behind it which is so important, and is supported by the ruling which you quoted to us, Mr. Speaker,

that a motion can be changed; this particular example; instead of ‘deplore’ to ‘commend’ in my time in this legislature has been done hundreds of times.

Mr. McCarthy: — It’s been done, but it’s never been legal.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I think it is good, provided that you arrive at an objective which is not just the narrow and exact opposite of what is contained in the motion. I think you are right in your quoting of that rule, Mr. Speaker, that the legislature must have this right to amend a motion by saying “No, we completely disagree with what the motion has said”. We, the members of the legislature – maybe two members on this side of the House, and the members over there then must have the right to test the House on another proposal by saying this House completely disagrees with that proposal in there, and with the proposed action but we not only completely disagree, but we propose that other action should be taken. If the proposal which was made by the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) was adopted by this House, it would really restrict the flexibility in this House.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, it would do no such thing. If members opposite feel this . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You spoke on it once on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! This debate is on a point of order, I don’t know whether a member can speak more than once in a debate of that kind or not. It would have to have the consent of the House, I think. This is not actually a debate, in that respect. I think that the hon. member could . . .

Mr. McDonald: — That’s all I wanted say, Mr. Speaker, was the suggestion put forward by the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources is utterly ridiculous. If he is opposed to this motion, and apparently he is, then he can vote against it, and all his colleagues if he can convince them – they can vote against it. But I would like to refer, sir, to Citation 202(12) and I submit that that is the ruling of Beuchesne and covers this particular position.

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister condemned this amendment out of his own mouth when he said they completely disagree with it. Well, if you completely disagree with a motion, you cannot amend it, because an amendment is a change – it is not a complete disagreement. If you completely disagree with something the only thing you can do is to vote against it, according to the rules. An amendment means that you are accepting the basic motion, but you are changing certain things in it. You are going along with the main motion. That is the very essence of what an amendment is. Whereas the minister says they completely disagree with this motion; therefore they have no business amending it whatsoever.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, at home in my house I have the parliamentary rules and regulations of the United States House of Commons. I have the one for the British House of Parliament given me by a gentleman who was secretary of the municipality. I have the one that is used in the House of Commons and during the long evenings and so on, I have read more of it probably than anyone else in this House, and there is one principle that is inherent in what you are discussing now. You can amend anybody's motion: you can add to it, you can alter it, and you can do many things, but you cannot negative that motion. A motion cannot be negated.

I just want to say that, previous to your term of office, Mr. Speaker, there have been some of the most outrageous, most scandalous rulings of the Speakers of this House that there has ever been in any legislative assembly of Canada, I am sure. I say this, taking full responsibility for what I say, and I think it is time that those rules and regulations should be enforced in the manner they should be.

If this is the ruling – why then we have been choked off; we can't do anything. Let me point this out to the member, the Minister of Mineral Resources who spoke a few minutes ago. Every member of this House has the right to bring in a motion, and debate it. You can vote it down. There's no question about that. But you cannot come along and say, "We strike out the whole thing except this," and then put in your own motion. That is a negative resolution; it is not amending it.

Mr. Ross McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I'm not holding myself up as an authority on Beauchesne or anybody else, but I think I do have some general knowledge pertaining to debate. Certainly you cannot, I don't think, as a general principle, negative a motion. You can change it, sure, but when you strike out a whole motion, take our 'deplore' and replace it with 'commend' you negative it right there — it is a negative motion. It has been done in this House hundreds and hundreds of times, and I have objected to it, but if you are going to carry this, there is no point in an opposition member moving a motion, because they have done it hundreds of times. They just strike out everything but the title, and move their motions. You must realize the position it puts a member in who has moved a motion. Here he has a motion, standing on the books in his name, that is absolutely opposite to what he wants — no connection at all. Yet he is put in the position where he either must vote against his own motion, or else vote for something to doesn't want, and I do not think that British parliamentary procedure was ever set up on that line. After all, these procedures have been set over a long period of years, over a long experience, and I think we should be very careful to carry them along.

There is one cardinal principle, that you cannot negative a motion. You can vote against it, that is the proper way, but these people over there have not the courage to do it, and they have amended hundreds of motions in this House to negative them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong the argument, but would like to refer to the motion as it is. You may call me out of order, but I hope not, because I think that I can bring my point over much closer to the facts. The motion deplores the failure of the government to establish and maintain adequate fodder reserve banks. In amending a motion, we probably could change the word 'establish', but the word 'maintain' which is the body of the motion itself has been established by the minister of Agriculture on several occasions that there is no feed bank. In changing that, you actually change the complete meaning of it. We are deploring the government because there is no feed bank. Now, you cannot commend the government because there is no feed bank. The whole body of the motion is completely changed. How can anyone vote for a motion that we have established; and we have discussed on that basis?

Do give us your consideration, Mr. Speaker. As I say, I won't repeat what the others have said, but the whole body of the motion is not deploring the government for not having established reserve banks, but for not having maintained them. We said 'established': they may have established them in 1956 or prior to that, but it has not been maintained and that is the meat of the motion.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I think it is proper parliamentary procedure, and it is the intent and purpose of the procedure to provide an opportunity to members of the House to either express an opinion or an assumption. The hon. members opposite have had that opportunity of expressing their opinion and the assumption, that the government had not provided fodder reserves. If I were to ask for a definition as to what they mean by fodder reserves, I am at a loss at the moment. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) defined it but he was indefinite in his definition of fodder reserves.

Mr. Speaker, my point is this, that if that is correct, if certain hon. members have a right to a certain assumption and to express that assumption by way of a resolution, then those who have an opposite opinion also have a right to express their opinion as to whether the assumption is correct or not. That is what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, and this has been done hundreds of times in this legislature.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! As I said a moment ago, I do think we can have this discussion continue.

Mr. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I did want to say this: if the hon. members opposite do not agree with our opinion as expressed in this resolution, they can bring in another resolution if they wish, other than completely negate our resolution.

Mr. Speaker: — This has been a very interesting discussion. I really have appreciated that there are a good many things that are to be said about this matter of bringing in words of commendation with regard to an amendment. Mr. Beaudesne does mention this, in regard to amendments to the Address-in-Reply and

he does say that such a thing should not be done in that regard. The government should not bring in words of commendation to nullify amendments to the Address-in-Reply, because it does take away from the opposition their rightful opportunity to express their opinions. He does not, in any place I have found in the book, carry these same ideas completely over to other motions. What I have said here in regard to citation 202(12) and (13), I think is correct.

If this were an absolute negation of the original motion, and did not add anything else, it would definitely be out of order, but I do believe it does substitute another proposition with an opposite conclusion, which Mr. Beauchesne says in Citation 202(12) may be moved.

There are other objections which have been raised. One was that it puts the opposition members in the position of moving a motion, and having it stand in their name on the records, yet with a completely different meaning which they intended in the first place. I can appreciate their feelings in that regard, but we must remember that yesterday the hon. Minister of Health had a motion in his name which would have been completely changed, had the amendment to it been passed. It would have stood under his name on the books with an entirely different meaning to that which had had intended.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It is the property of the House – not . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The change gave an entirely different meaning to that which stood in the name of the Hon. Mr. Erb, and if it had been passed would have been entirely different from what he had intended, and I don't think you can use this argument in regard to any motion, because when it is amended it brings in an idea which is possibly entirely different from the intention of the original mover. We cannot use that as an argument against moving amendments that change the sense of a motion.

The principle of moving amendments that change the entire sense of a motion standing in the name of a mover, yet with an entirely different meaning, I don't think can be substantiated as a sound reason.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, if you will refer to Citation 202.

Mr. Speaker: — Citation 202 reads: “An amendment which could produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negatived is out of order”. That is exactly what I have said. If this amendment only did negative the original – if the same result could be achieved by voting ‘no’ to the original motion, I would say that it would be out of order, but I do maintain that this amendment does bring in a different idea, “to commend the provincial government for its prompt and effective emergency program in meeting with severe drought situation and long-term policies directed towards solving the chronic fodder shortage in Saskatchewan.”

The original motion is the opposite to that in that it deplors the failure to establish adequate fodder reserves and recommends the consideration of this government that immediate provision be made for establishing and maintaining fodder reserve banks in this province. If you said ‘No’ to this, you would still be saying nothing about the long-term policies directed towards solving chronic fodder shortages in Saskatchewan, or you would say nothing about the prompt and effective emergency program in meeting this severe drought situation.

I am quite convinced that I am on solid ground there. There is one more thing which I want to say in regard to the relevancy of it, which I think was a good point and which was raised by the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). I do think that this matter of the effective emergency program of the government in dealing with the severe drought situation, and its long-term policies towards solving chronic fodder shortages in Saskatchewan are definitely on the same subject as fodder reserves. I think with these things all in mind, I will find it necessary to rule this motion in order, and accept it.

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question on this? What would be . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I made the ruling at this time, and I must ask that you accept the ruling as definite. We have had plenty of discussion in this regard . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Now that you have made your ruling, Mr. Speaker, the debate is now on the new amendment and I have not yet spoken to

the original motion. I wish to talk about reserve banks. Now how can I do it under the motion as amended, because I have not yet spoken in this debate?

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, if your ruling is to be taken as the proper ruling, not only for this legislature, but for other legislatures, it means that no member of this House — let me say this, Mr. Speaker, no member of this House can get up and move a resolution deploring the government for anything, without finding himself as the mover of a resolution which in the end commends the government. This is fantastic, and surely as the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) has said, now you're not even allowed according to your ruling, to debate the resolution that was placed before us, because we have a complete negative. Now we have to stand up and commend the government — that is utter nonsense.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The question the hon. member from Maple Creek has just raised — I have not as yet made a ruling in regard to that, so I do not think it can be contested as yet. It would appear to me that the debate would necessarily have to be on the amendment, but I do not think that the debate on the amendment should preclude anyone mentioning the fodder reserves, because I think they are on the same subject. I don't think I would call a person out of order for mentioning fodder reserves, when they are making comparisons between fodder reserves and what is being done under the present program. I would declare this amendment in order, and the debate to be now on the amendment.

Mr. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Snedker: — Mr. Speaker, I will appeal this to the House and I have a right to do it.

Premier Douglas: — You can appeal it, but you can't . . .

Mr. Snedker: — That's your socialist attitude to farmers.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) has appealed the Speaker's ruling. The motion before the House is shall the Speaker's ruling be sustained?

October 24, 1961

Mr. Dewhurst: — Which ruling, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — What are you appealing, the ruling regarding . . .

Mr. Snedker: — The whole thing from end to end. Mr. Speaker, I've got a motion on this order paper . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! This cannot be discussed.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You're not running the legislature.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: —The speaker is standing up; sit down.

Mr. Speaker: — Are you appealing my ruling in regard to admissibility of the amendment?

Mr. Snedker: —Yes, the admissibility of the amendment.

Premier Douglas: — You're appealing from it.

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the House is shall the Speaker's ruling in regard to the admissibility of this amendment be sustained? Will all those in favour say yes; all those opposed say no.

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

YEAS — 30
Messieurs

Douglas	Willis	Thiessen
Dewhurst	Thurston	Snyder
Williams	Blakeney	Stevens
McIntosh	Erb	Kluzak
Brockelbank	Stone	Dahlman
Lloyd	Whelan	Michayluk
Walker	Thibault	Semchuk
Nollet	Berezowsky	Perkins
Cooper (Mrs.)	Johnson	Peterson
Davies	Meakes	Brotten

NAYS — 16
Messieurs

Thatcher	Cameron	Boldt
Batten (Mrs.)	McFarlane	Klein
McCarthy	Gardiner	Coderre
Barrie	Foley	MacDougall
McDonald	Guy	Snedker
Danielson		

Mr. Speaker: —The debate is now on the amendment.

Mr. McCarthy: — My did I understand you to say that the debate is now wholly on the amendment?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes.

Mr. McCarthy: —That again is a new ruling, because we have had rulings that we were discussing both. I think you are right in your ruling this time, but I don't think you were right before.

Mr. Speaker: — The reason that I ruled some other debates to be on the motion as well as the amendment is because they were what was known as an alternative amendment which just happens to be in the Citation that is in front of us. Citation 201 says:

“The object of an amendment may be to effect such alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who, without such alteration, must either vote against it, or abstain from voting thereon, or to present to the House an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question.

“This may be affected by moving to admit all the words of the question after the first word “that”, and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case, the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment, but includes the motives of the amendment and of the motion – both matters being under the consideration of the House as alternative propositions.”

October 24, 1961

Those motions we were dealing with yesterday were of that type; they removed all the words after the word "That" and in the ruling, I was not too sure that they were properly alternative motions. I did rule, in accord with this paragraph, that the debate to be on both the motion and the amendment. But this one is not a motion of that type. I do think, however, the amendment is sufficiently wide to allow a certain amount of discussion of fodder banks as was in the original motion.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, before we proceed, I wonder if we could have a copy of the amendment?

Mr. Speaker: — I believe we could proceed, and we could have a copy made. I could read the amendment again and try to get it clearly before the assembly.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the hon. members moved to adjourn the debate. This would give everybody a chance to get a copy of it in the Votes and Proceedings tomorrow if they agree to adjourn the debate, and give everybody a chance to study it.

Mr. Speaker: — That motion was made to adjourn the debate at practically the same time as the motion . . .

Premier Douglas: — Yes, but we're now back on the motion . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) has moved to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Cameron: — No, it's only five o'clock. What are we going to do for half an hour?

The question being put on the adjournment motion, it was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 30
Messieurs

Douglas	Willis	Thiessen
Dewhurst	Thurston	Snyder
Williams	Blakeney	Stevens
McIntosh	Erb	Kluzak
Brockelbank	Stone	Dahlman
Lloyd	Whelan	Michayluk
Walker	Thibault	Semchuk
Nollet	Berezowsky	Perkins
Cooper (Mrs.)	Johnson	Peterson
Davies	Meakes	Broten

NAYS — 17
Messieurs

Thatcher	Cameron	Klein
Batten (Mrs.)	McFarlane	Horsman
McCarthy	Gardiner	Coderre
Barrie	Foley	MacDougall
McDonald	Guy	Snedker
Danielson	Boldt	

MOTION RE INCOME TAX REGULATIONS

The Orders of the Day being called for the following motion by Mr. Snedker:

“That this Assembly respectfully requests that the Government of Canada amend the Income Tax Regulation to provide that farmers’ income from drought-forced sale of livestock shall be held non-taxable pending purchases of replacements.”

Mr. Snedker requested that the said motion be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! We have the pertinent Standing Order with regard to the situation:

“Questions put by members and motions not taken up when called may, upon the request of the government, be allowed to stand and retain their

precedence. Otherwise they will disappear from the Order Paper. They may, however, be renewed.”

The motion has been called. The government has not expressed its desire to have the matter stand. If the mover of the motion does not proceed with it, it will have to be dropped from the Order Paper.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, we have no desire to compel the hon. gentleman to go ahead, but I think there is no opposition to the resolution, so I don't know why the hon. member just doesn't move the motion and let's pass it, and get it out of the way. There isn't any point in standing it when there is no opposition to it. Anything can happen.

Mr. McCarthy: — Sure, it could be amended exactly the opposite . . .

Mr. Speaker: —There is not any question before the House . . .

Mr. Danielson: — It is just a matter of proceeding, and I think every member has their right to say what he thinks about it. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the government over there is putting into effect the steam-roller motion here . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — Why don't they do something? Have they got cold feet?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the government has no objection or no wish to compel the hon. member to proceed. My feeling was there is no opposition to the motion on this side of the House. We are prepared to vote on it now, but if the hon. member wants to hold it on the Order Paper, rather than having a vote on it, and getting it passed, then of course we are prepared to accept his wishes. I personally can see no reason why, if he doesn't want to make a speech, he cannot just move it and let us pass it?

Mr. Speaker: — I would gather from the Premier's remarks that he is willing to have the motion stand?

Premier Douglas: — Yes, if the hon. member does not want to proceed.

Mr. Speaker: — The motion then will stand on the Order Paper.

SECOND READINGS

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

That Bill No. 1 – An Act to provide for Payment for Services rendered to Certain Persons by Physicians and Certain other Persons – be now read the second time.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I am of course happy to be able to take part in the pleasant atmosphere which prevailed here this afternoon. I had introduced my remarks last day, and had expressed some amazement at the reaction which the medical care plan had evoked from members opposite. At that time I didn't have the advantage of having before me the news reports of statements made by hon. members opposite, but I think it is the duty of a member of this House to draw attention to inconsistencies and discrepancies in the argument put forward by members opposite, so that the public is in a better position to assess the merit of their stand on these issues.

I would draw attention, first of all, to something that was said by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). That hon. member started out his speech without having the benefit of any advice from his colleagues, because apparently he didn't know that the new party line now on the opposite side is to support this bill when the chips are down. He described the bill as "a piece of diabolic legislation." Of course, this means that the hon. member for Athabasca, unless he is willing to get into bed with the devil on this matter, he cannot possibly support this bill, but I am sure this discrepancy or expression of opinion of his was made before the matter had been settled by the Liberal caucus. This illustrates the hopeless state of confusion on the part of some of the hon. members, as to what attitude they are going to take on this question.

Mr. Thatcher: — We are not confused – you are.

Hon. R.A. Walker — When I am finished quoting, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the hon. member if he can repeat that statement. So the hon. member for Athabasca has condemned this legislation as a piece of devilish invention.

The hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) and the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) ought to get together. I don't know whether they attend the same caucus or not, but they ought to establish communication with it, because they take the view that there ought to be a regional system of health care. But both of them have on various occasions claimed, because the burden of local governments were too great for local government to cope with, they have on occasion said that the provincial government ought to be relieving local governments of some of the burdens which they now have. Apparently the state of confusion is so great that now they come into the legislature and suggest that this very expensive item of medical care ought to be divested by the provincial government and imposed as an extra burden on local governments.

This comes rather inconsistently from them in view of the previous statements they have made on the subject.

The hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) and the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) both deplored the fact that this legislation proposed to set up a commission to administer medical care. There is something apparently evil about setting up a commission for medical care, but in the case of the hon. member for Saltcoats, the thing that is wrong is setting up a commission is that this makes the medical care plan too much subject to government control, government interference. The hon. member for Melville on the other hand, takes just exactly the opposite view. He says we are giving to this commission powers that should only be exercised by the legislature itself.

Mr. Speaker, to hear it described by hon. members, you would not know whether it was fish or flesh – they criticize it in complete antagonism; how completely opposite points of view.

Mr. McCarthy: — You wouldn't know, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — And as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, while they both criticize the legislation because it is going to set up a commission, the hon. member for Melville praised the 1944 statute, respecting health insurance, which provided in section 4 that it was to be administered by a commission. Under that act it was called a Health Insurance Commission, “which shall consist of such number of members as they may, from time to time, be determined and appointed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, under that legislation, would decide whether there would be one member on this commission, or 21 members. They gave the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council far more sweeping powers than were proposed under this bill, Mr. Speaker, where the size of the commission is fixed by statute.

So, these hon. members condemned the setting union up of a commission and at the same time a hark back with praise for the 1944 Health Insurance Act. This is the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, the kind of inconsistency, which only betrays the lack of sureness on their part, as to what their real attitude to this question is going to be. Anything at all to keep the debate going, but everything possible to conceal the opposition’s recognition of its true advantages.

The hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) has been heard to say that we ought to get along with medical care – we’re practically dragging our feet; dilly-dallying on the question – that there would have been medical care in this province had it not been for the delaying actions of the present government. But at the same time the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) says we haven’t allowed sufficient time for study of this question, and that we are hurrying the matter; that we ought to give more time for the people of Saskatchewan to consider this whole question, and perhaps a better scheme could be worked out.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, there ought to be some more coherent approach to this question by hon. members who purport to criticize the legislation. For all the fact that there is a wide variety of criticism, inconsistent and incoherent, we have waited in vain, Mr. Speaker, for any constructive suggestions that might be adopted by the government and incorporated in the medical care plan.

Mr. McCarthy: — You wouldn’t recognize them anyway.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) hasn't contributed anything to the debate except a few mumblings under his breath which I am sure will pass for a burp in the records of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we are told by the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) that the Liberal party is the party that originated all the health programs in this province; that it is the Liberal party that deserves the credit for our health measures which we have adopted up to date. We have reminded him that, in 1919 the Liberal party made an undertaking, a pledge to the Canadian people that it would implement a national health plan if it was favoured with the support of the electors in Canada. Nothing happened; no progress was made on this pledge, this undertaking. Then again, in 1945 a similar pledge was made by the Mackenzie King government. The hon. member for Melville apparently disregarded these broken pledges. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have grown so used to seeing Liberal promises broken, dishonoured by the Liberal party when it was in office, that they have come to pay little attention. I cannot help but feel that most people would be little impressed by his argument that the Liberal party was the author of the health program in this province.

Mr. Danielson: — Tommy Douglas said that . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I'm sorry that the hon. member isn't in his seat, because he allegedly said that the 1944 legislation put on the statute books of this province was put there for the purpose of providing the people of Saskatchewan with a medical care program.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I never made that statement.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — That statement isn't true.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Denials of this type may be made at this time with the consent of the member speaking, or at the close of his speech, but they cannot be interjected . . .

Mr. Danielson: — I was just correcting him when he credited me with saying something I never said . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, it was not the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) I was referring to; if I did refer to him it was a slip of the tongue. I was referring to the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) and I said that he and other members of the opposition were trying to create allusions that the 1944 legislation . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You mentioned the member from Arm River as making that statement.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Well, the record will show – but I already said, Mr. Speaker, that if I mentioned his name I did so by a slip of the tongue. I didn't intend to mention his name. But hon. members opposite have tried to create the illusion that it was unnecessary for this government to pass a medical care plan, because there was already legislation on the statute books of this province, put there by the Liberal government in 1944 which could have been implemented. I say, Mr. Speaker, that that legislation was put there in 1944 because an election was imminent; it was put there purely as window-dressing . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Just like you're doing now.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The government of that day had no intention of implementing a provincial medical care scheme . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh how do you know?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . Regardless of what the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) has said in this House – the government of that day had no intentions of implementing a medical care scheme. If the hon. member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) was around, he would know that that is so; that the Liberal party when it was in office, had never introduced legislation for medical care with the intention of it being implemented in this province. The hon. member from Cannington knows that is so. What I am saying is true. The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) who was a member of his House at that time, knows that when that legislation was introduced in 1944, there was no intention of introducing, of implementing a provincial medical care scheme at that time.

Mr. Danielson: — How do you know?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I know that my hon. friend will be honest in this House, and admit that he knows that.

Mr. Danielson: — That's the same old story we've been getting from the CCF for 17 years.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The whole House voted for it, and the whole House knew that there would be no medical care plan set up on a provincial basis as a result of that legislation. For the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) to try to get up in the House and say the Liberal party, if it had been returned to office in 1944, it would have implemented a medical care scheme in this province, based upon that legislation, is a hoax, pure and simple, and he knows it, and so do other members opposite.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's just part of your imagination.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It is not a question of imagination. Everybody knows.

Mr. McCarthy: — You can't prove it.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I certainly can prove it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I just draw attention, Mr. Speaker, to the records of the House of that year. In 1944 the Speech from the Throne at that time referred to this legislation, and I suggest that if my hon. friend from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) won't believe me, perhaps he will believe the records of the Speech from the Throne as prepared by the government of that day – the Liberal government. This Speech from the Throne clearly establishes that that government never intended to implement a medical care plan based upon that legislation of 1944. I will read, if I may, an extract from that speech:

“Much progress has been made in Canada in the development for national health insurance.”

Apparently my hon. friends opposite, and the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) was helping to peddle this propaganda from Ottawa that there might be a national health program:

“The Federal government has announced its intention to establish a national plan, and to enter into an agreement with the provinces for this purpose. Legislation will be submitted to you, authorizing governments to enter into such an agreement to provide health insurance for the people of Saskatchewan.”

So I repeat, Mr. Speaker, there never was any intention of providing a medical care scheme in this province, based on that legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the attempt has been made here to create the impression that people of Saskatchewan do not really know whether they want a medical care scheme. Well, my hon. friends opposite were in office in 1944, and they set up a social security and health services committee and that committee presented a report to the legislature. That report deals with this question. It says:

“As already noted, representations made to the committee of last session have indicated almost general agreement that the province alone could not submit a health services plan of the nature and scope desired by the people of Saskatchewan.”

So there is no question about what the Liberal government of that day intended to do about health insurance. They simply said then as the Leader of the Opposition says now, it is too costly and it cannot be afforded by this province.

Hon. members should be more frank with the House and make clear that they are not in favour of a health scheme.

Mr. Danielson: — We brought in the legislation at that time. I asked Mr. Douglas, in regard to certain items . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, there isn't any doubt what the position of the Liberal party was at that time, and I suggest that those of us who have memories haven't any doubt as to where it stands today.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that the CCF have tried to foster the impression that there is such a thing as free government services.

Mr. Thatcher: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — We have been accused of having built up demands in the minds of people for services, and to feel from them the necessity of paying taxes to provide these services. The Leader of the Opposition says “Hear! Hear! Apparently he still takes the view that the government has tried to spread this fraudulent idea that there is such a thing as Santa Claus in the economics of running a province, and I would just ask that the hon. member keep this in mind when it comes to voting on this and other questions that will have to be decided in this legislature. I would ask that he remember that you can’t be for a medical care plan, and against the means of providing it at the same time. The hon. member asked yesterday, during someone else’s speech, “Are you in favour of the 5 per cent tax” – I think he asked it of the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) who was saying that he was in favour of a medical care plan. The Leader of the Opposition is still trying to perpetuate the hoary myth that he can be in favour of the medical care plan, without casting a vote in favour of the tax increases.

Mr. Thatcher: — I haven’t even spoken yet. I’ll tell you whether I am in favour of one or not.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The hon. member did speak . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — I’m not in favour of the 5 per cent tax, I’ll tell you that.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The hon. member did speak. He didn’t get up – he doesn’t usually get up off his seat to speak, but he nevertheless speaks with great verbosity. I’m sure that the hon. member wanted to be on a firm basis with what he said that he is better advised to speak sitting down – a broad basis.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member really means that you can’t have something for nothing. Then if he votes for this . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Ask the Premier over there. He can tell you – we can have it free.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . medical care bill, he will have to vote for the tax measures which would support the program contained in the bill.

Mr. Thatcher: — You just watch and see.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The hon. member has not acquired any credit in the country by suddenly dropping the mask of opposition to the medical care bill that has been apparent to the legislature for the last few days, and quietly voting for the legislation, unless he is prepared to vote also for the means to implement this legislation.

Mr. Thatcher: — Bright ideas!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about the bill itself, but I wouldn't want to speak on that subject when the members of the opposition are so eager to hear me, and as it is almost 5:30, before I enter into the main body of my remarks I would like to at this point ask leave to adjourn the debate.

(debate adjourned)

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I believe it has been agreed by the Whips that we will not sit evenings this week, and if that coincides with the wishes of the members, then I will move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to be very sure this time on what we are agreeing. We are agreeing that we won't sit nights, period. But we are not agreeing that we won't sit next Monday or Tuesday, or that we will adjourn the House until the 13th. Now, I don't know whether this was in the agreement or not. I would certainly hope not, because we wouldn't want to be agreeing to that.

Premier Douglas: — No, I wasn't referring to that question, but since my hon. friend has raised it, if I may, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to put a motion on the order paper tomorrow that when the House adjourns on Friday, it will stand adjourned until November 13. I would think that if by Friday it looks as though we could finish up by Tuesday . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Not a hope.

October 24, 1961

Premier Douglas: — Well, that is what I would say, if there is no chance of finishing up by Tuesday then I wouldn't think there would be any value in amending it to make it Tuesday, but if the hon. members want to make it Tuesday, that can be discussed between the Whips, and if it seems to meet the wishes of both sides we could then amend it to make it Tuesday. As matters now stand, the government is suggesting that we adjourn Friday until November 13. The question can be discussed when the motion is introduced on Friday.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Premier one more question. Would he mind telling us why the 13th instead of the 6th? Why the extra week? If he prefers not to say at this time — I don't understand why the extra week.

Premier Douglas: — I can say it now. It is not really in order, but if the House will permit me — it could better be discussed when the motion is before the House. But, as hon. members know there is a convention of our party on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd, and my term of office as leader of that party ends with that convention. Our provincial leaders are elected from year to year; therefore it seems to the government and members on this side that following that convention, whoever is going to take my place should have at least a week in which to swear in his cabinet, to be prepared to meet the legislature after I have turned over the reins of office. It would be most inappropriate for me to sit in the House when I am no longer the leader of the party. It seems to me whoever is leader of the party ought also to be Premier of the government.

Mr. Thatcher: — May I take it from that then, Mr. Speaker, also in resigning your seat . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — That is a matter for me to decide.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think we can continue this discussion indefinitely.

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