

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**9th Day**

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

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

**ON ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**QUESTION: NO. 1 HIGHWAY EAST**

**Hon. C.G. Willis (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Speaker, in regard to the question which was raised yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the proposed development, proposed multi-million dollar development on No. 1 highway east, I stated then that I had no definite information. Since yesterday I have checked with department officials and learned that the department had been approached last summer by a lawyer of a property owner in this connection. It was indicated then that a million dollar development project was proposed for certain property but no details were provided and my officials indicated that when plans of this magnitude were firm, consideration would be given to additional access to the highway. I regret to inform the house Mr. Speaker, that no further representations have been made since last summer.

**QUESTION: APPOINTMENT OF HEALTH OFFICER**

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. At the emergency session last fall the question was given to the Minister of Health as to when we could expect the announcement of the appointment of a Medical Health Officer for the province under the Emergency Measures Organization. The minister stated at that time that an announcement would be made at an early date and I was wondering if the minister could now state when that announcement would be made.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, some discussions have now been held with the federal authorities on the matter

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

and we have agreed with them that there will be appointed a Medical Health Officer, if that is the term, for the purpose of heading up this work of Emergency Health Services in the province. This, as the hon. member may know involves the co-operation with the hospitals and the province.

### **QUESTION: HISTORIC SITES**

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to ask a question of the Premier. Is there now in Saskatchewan a Director of Historic Sites?

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. There is nobody as far as I know who is given this particular term. Some responsibility is assumed for this work by the Department of Natural Resources, acting on and with the advice of the Saskatchewan Archives Board.

**Mr. Foley:** — A supplementary question, I raised this because . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! You cannot have supplementary questions on a question, because then we are getting into a debate, we cannot have supplementary questions arising from previous questions.

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, there have been supplementary questions permitted before.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I realize we have allowed a greater latitude than what we really should do but we must try to keep these within the rules of the house.

### **ADDRESS IN REPLY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Berezowsky, seconded by Mr. Thurston; and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Snedker, seconded by Mr. Coderre:

**Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to again say to you that we are delighted on

your elevation to the office of Speaker. As mentioned before I sat down yesterday, we know of your impartiality and we know that you will continue to conduct the affairs of this legislature in a very able and impartial manner.

Mr. Speaker, I intend in the course of my address this afternoon to deal largely with the major problems facing the agriculture industry, particularly with reference to the criticism that this administration has received for placing a heavy burden of taxation on the people of this province. I wish in the course of my remarks to point out as clearly as I can where the responsibility lies for the economic circumstances facing the farm people of this province. My hon. friends opposite, for the lack of a constructive program to present to the people of Saskatchewan, resort to all manner of negative political tactics in the hope of creating confusion and resentment against beneficial services that have been provided by this administration for the people of this province. The Liberal party of Saskatchewan is rapidly gaining an unenviable political record because of their traditional attitude of condemning without proposing any constructive alternative to the beneficial program which they so heartily condemn.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Stew in your own juice, Toby.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Abolition of the purple gas tax . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . Ranting is not conducive . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . to winning intelligent well-informed support, nor is it enough to maintain party morale. If I recall, the hon. Leader of the Opposition when standing for leadership of the Liberal party advised his prospective supporters that if they shouted loud enough that someone was bound to hear them. He has been shouting louder and louder ever since. I must say he has great consistency in this regard.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I guess you can't hear now Toby.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — But he has been attempting in this manner to build up a winning psychology.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Can't hear you.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — More and more people are beginning to wonder when if ever they will hear constructive counter proposals to the beneficial services which he so constantly condemns.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — How about Turtleford and Weyburn?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, when shouting at the top of his voice in his address on Tuesday last he sounded more like a man floundering in cold, cold water needing a life preserver than a confident leader of an opposition political party.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You boys sound like there is a funeral going on over there.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Certainly Mr. Speaker, it is not a sign of strength or high morale when a party must resort to months of under cover persuasion to win over a person of another political party . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Who is going to persuade . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . in an attempt to prove that the party in opposition to them is losing strength. I might say more Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Baloney.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Two months before the hon. member in question decided that he would go over to the Liberal party and previous to that our Liberal friends in the constituencies affected were betting money, betting money that the hon. member Mr. Argue would defect.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Did you lose some Toby?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — So they had been persuading him tenaciously for two months and laying bets that he would defect.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — He felt his way out.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Two days before he did so I asked Mr. Argue if these rumors were correct, he was very evasive and said, don't worry, there is nothing to it. He attended the banquet that evening of the party which he formerly supported, and the next day vacated. I would say to you Mr. Speaker, that political morality in this province has fallen to a new low level as a result of this type of defect.

But now Mr. Speaker, that he has defected a great transformation has taken place, now he is held up as a possible saviour of the Liberal party from the vengeance in the next federal election.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — There will be some more too.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I believe they are going to be very sadly disappointed. The Liberal party and its free enterprise press and paid propagandists simply glowed with delight, now that they had found . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Bothwell wasn't very happy.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . a new recruit to bolster their wavering political morale. I repeat again Mr. Speaker, that this man deserted for specious and unjustifiable reasons and the party which he deserted will be stronger without him or his kind.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — When did you desert Toby?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — My friends simply forget that the farmers of this province have long memories. They will recall that some forty years ago the first farmers' progressive party was betrayed by its leaders who defected to the Liberals. The farmers of Saskatchewan will never forget this betrayal and the setback to that struggle for equitable economic treatment and justice because of that action. The farmers of Saskatchewan in their desperate struggle for survival in the 1930's gave birth to the CCF in this province, and in their determination to gain their objectives they set out firm guiding economic principles and social objectives which demanded the loyalty of their chosen leaders. They felt because of experience that these principles and worthy objectives were more important

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

than individual personalities. Above all else, it is overlooked that the farmers deserted the old parties because neither of them on the basis of their respective records could be expected to solve the fundamental problems confronting the agricultural industry.

Let us look at that record Mr. Speaker, let us look back to the 1930's, the chaotic economic conditions resulting in general depression, the unheard of unemployment, the bankruptcy of the agricultural industry of Canada . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Good old days.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . and the complete collapse of the free wheeling free enterprise system. Unguided, undirected by national government policies, it collapsed completely.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Can't hear you.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, it was not socialist planning, it was not because of labour problems that this came about, but it was because of the adoption of the established political parties and their adherence to the free enterprise philosophy. We recall, the hon. members opposite will have more to say as I go along and I dare them to refute any of the documents — any facts that I am going to present to them this afternoon.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — After the depression, February 1942, a mass farm delegation numbering some 400 travelled to Ottawa to present a petition signed by 185 thousand farmers and their supporters to a newly-elected Liberal government . . .

**Mr. McFarlane:** — All Liberals?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . asking for dollar wheat, something that was promised to them at the previous election but they were no more than elected than the farmers were compelled to travel down to Ottawa in company with businessmen and other interested people to ask that this promise be implemented.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Can't afford to go now.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — In April, more recently, April 1959 another farm delegation went to Ottawa, the greatest of all numbering

one thousand persons carrying a petition signed by 320 thousand farmers and their supporters, which was presented to a newly-elected Conservative government asking for retroactive deficiency payments on grain because of the low prices received under a previous Liberal administration.

Mr. Speaker, it was pointed out by this delegation that post-war price decontrols and subsequent inflationary farm costs and lower prices for grain had robbed the farmers of western Canada and the farmers of this province of the astounding sum of \$500 million in three year comparative periods and this statement is contained in the presentation made by this delegation to the government in Ottawa. When they said that because of inflation and lower farm prices the farmers of this province in the three year period, 1954, 1955, 1956 had lost this amount of money \$500 million on account of wheat alone compared to the three year period 1951, 1952, 1953. This delegation requested deficiency payments on grain delivered in the three crop years, 1955-56, 1956-57, 1957-58 inclusive. In order to restore the average price of grain for these three crop years to the average price prevailing during the previous eight year period 1945-1952-53 inclusive under a Liberal administration.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — They made this request because in the ten year period 1947-57 costs of goods and services used in the production of farm products went up by more than 50 per cent and the price of wheat in that same period registered a drop of 20.8 cents per bushel, for barley 27 cents a bushel, and oats 36.7 cents per bushel.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Good old Liberals.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What are you going to do for the farmer Toby, beside increase his taxes?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I will come around to the Leader of the Opposition too and say something about his attitude.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Let us get to it. What are you going to do for the farmer? We know what has been done twenty years ago.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Because at that time Mr. Speaker, 1959, the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat was the lowest in

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

western Canada agricultural history with the exception of December 1932 during the great free enterprise depression. These are the reason why . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You boys were in office here, you should know.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . they went to Ottawa because farmers were carrying an extra burden of 116 per cent increase in freight rate. It is peculiar Mr. Speaker, that free enterprise governments will do things that permit increases in tariff charges in freight rates on behalf of private enterprises but will not do anything for the agricultural industry.

Four; they went to Ottawa because farmer ratepayers and their local governments found themselves in the same cost-price squeeze inflationary dilemma.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the hon. members opposite that this was not a socialist mess at all. This mess was the creation of the Liberal party who were in power in Ottawa for over twenty years.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — The hon. Leader of the Opposition often makes reference to great debt burdens that are being placed on the people of this province. He says nothing in the support of any proposal that would make that burden easier so that the farmers of this province could pay for these burdensome obligations.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — Why don't you resign?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to you that he can expect more, should he by any chance of circumstances ever become Premier of this province, his headaches will not be over. But his headaches will not be attributed . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It will be a great mess to clean up, we admit that.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . to any services provided by this administration, or by any taxes levied by this administration whatever. His headaches will result from a continuation of either one or other of the old parties remaining at Ottawa in government.



Now Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand here a National Farm Forum Guide booklet and this particular Farm Forum Guide has to do with education and the burden of costs for education and projects the future demands for expansion of educational services and the cost thereof. In the first instance they mention this, that Canada's birth rate increased sharply in the past two decades. That there are now nearly 700 students for every 1000 workers in the labour force, that the cost of education will double in the next twenty years, while population increases by 50 per cent. I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition will mark this down because this is a legitimate demand for expansion of a certain service in keeping with the trends of the day. But here is the illegitimate reason for increased costs of these kind of services, this same pamphlet goes on to say that inflation has doubled the dollar cost of education since 1940. Who was in power since 1940? The Liberal party has been in power all these years and they added as a result of price decontrols a 50 per cent increase in the cost of educational services alone. It is for this reason Mr. Speaker, that I say that local governments and farmers are caught in the same cost-price squeeze created by the federal government administration at Ottawa and in this case the Liberal party.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — The Liberals have created this post-war mess and the record is clear Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Talk about Saskatchewan Toby.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — In 1959, the farm delegation went to Ottawa in the hope that a newly elected Conservative government might get them out of it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Steady now!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Instead the records now prove that the Conservatives made it worse. The fifth reason why they went . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Who are you going to vote for?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Because in 1959 the delegation had a good case for an increased price of wheat, because the basic

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

farm price in Canada was strikingly lower than that of seventeen wheat-producing nations of the world, including India, where farmers in 1957 received \$2.34 per bushel compared to \$1.40 per bushel received by Canadian farmers.

Mr. Speaker, we are constantly being told by our so-called free enterprise friends that the Canadian farmer must accept a lower price for his wheat because he is in competition with cheap foreign products in countries where living standards are lower, whereas the fact is that six of these countries with recognized below average living standards pay their farmers much more for producing wheat than Canada does. Why? Because these countries need food badly, are trying to improve their living standards and they know by experience that low farm prices will further reduce living standards in their respective countries.

When in Ottawa attending the last federal-provincial conference, the hon. federal Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Hamilton, who had just returned from Rome told us that some of these countries that I am speaking of expressed some fear and anxiety regarding a World Food Bank, because they feared that out of this might come cheap wheat in competition with their own which they are compelled to sell on the world market in order to get the necessary credit to industrialize and advance the economic position of their underdeveloped lands.

So Mr. Speaker, from any point of view it is peculiar that it is so readily recognized in other countries that it is desirable to pay people well for productive labour, whereas in Canada our farm population has been relegated to the position of a second-class citizen and is being rapidly liquidated off the land.

Mr. Speaker, not long ago we had a meeting of the dairy interests, including the labour people, the manufacturers and the farmers. The one thing that came out of that meeting and the one fear expressed was competition from cheaper similar products that might come into the province from outside and cheap substitutes as well. This was the consensus of opinion expressed at this meeting.

We had a meeting also with people involved in the broiler industry. Again the great fear was cheap competition from other products and farmers have been expected to out-compete one another to see who can produce the cheapest. Isn't this a silly economic philosophy within our modern environment, Mr. Speaker?

Now I come to the hon. Leader of the Opposition and he has left . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I haven't left.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . He is just coming back to his seat. At the dairy convention as he knows the dairy farmers of Canada are on record again, favouring a continued floor price of 64 cents lb. for dairy products. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, when he was flirting with the Liberal party in Ottawa said . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I still have the same attitude.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — He says he still says the same thing.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You bet!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . that there should be no floor price, and he says, you bet! I am glad Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of the province know his position in regard to price support.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The minister can't put words in my mouth, on a point of order Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — There is no point of order.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I have a point of order. Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Thatcher:** — My point of order is that the minister put words in my mouth, what I said was this, about the price of butter, I said that, . . . a point of privilege then. What I said wasn't what the minister said. What I said was that the floor price of butter should be brought down so people wouldn't eat margarine and the facts bear that out.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! That is not a point of order.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Oh, I think it is Mr. Speaker. Of course the minister doesn't know anything about economics. That is why he takes this position.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — We merely indicated his position was that he was opposed to continuation of those floor prices on butter. He would create greater economic problems if his philosophy was followed.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We would get people eating butter again instead of margarine, not like you do in your mental hospitals here.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Will the hon. Leader of the Opposition please refrain from these interruptions.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well if the minister won't talk all this . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — You will have a chance to ask a question at the conclusion of his speech.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on this very point, no member of this house is going to sit in his place especially when the radio is on and have someone misquote him and put words in his mouth and not be given the opportunity to correct it. Now if the standing orders of this house don't show that, then they ought to, and I suggest to you that they be changed immediately, because nobody in this house . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — . . . during the debate of the Address in Reply we must abide by the rules of it. If members want to change the rules that is a different thing, we cannot do it at this time.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Well they are changed right now.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I have reference of a statement made and recorded in Hansard at Ottawa.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Why don't you tell us what you are going to do about agriculture?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker — free enterprise propagandists. We have got quite a few opposite; the Leader-Post in the heart of Canada's wheat belt constantly opposes any steps

taken by any government however feeble to improve the income position of Saskatchewan farmers. Well he won't deny that. I have never yet seen this press ever write one single editorial that would improve the economic and social position of our farm people.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You have never given them a chance, you have never passed any legislation that will do the farmer any good.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Controlled farm income, by way of price increases or appropriate price deficiency payments which would help both farmer consumer and would also greatly strengthen the national economy.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Read closely.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — It is very peculiar that the same free enterprise spokesman who opposed farm government intervention and assistance to farmers raised no objection to the fact that direct cost of Canada's tariffs to Canadian consumers amounts to \$1,120,000 a year. This is tariff subsidization on behalf of Canadian industry . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We oppose that too.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . and this hits the western farmer the hardest of all, because western farmers are not only expected to carry this cost but must also carry the added inflationary cost resulting from price decontrols and free wheeling profiteering during the post-war period under a Liberal administration.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — To make matters worse, the farmers are expected to sell their products at still lower prices in a high cost protected domestic market and sell in an export market in competition with the treasury of other lands particularly the United States.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — And then pay all the socialist taxes.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, may I reinforce your plea if the Leader of the Opposition will not please, in the interest of some decency in this house, stop this incessant interrupting.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I raised this yesterday and if you try to claim that the minister is not reading his speech today, then I'll eat my shirt. I am getting sick and tired of having to listen to reports read by cabinet ministers off a piece of paper.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) read his speech the other day. I am following my notes carefully; I am not reading from a script entirely at all. Mr. Speaker, I propose to . . .

**Mrs. Batten;** — Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, while it is obvious that the hon. minister is reading his speech, I don't mind that but he shouldn't read the same speech he gave on provincial affairs last week; he should use a new speech.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — It is my choice to choose my subjects and apparently I am choosing the subject that hurts the hon. members opposite.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, these are the fundamental reasons that Canadian farmers are being cost-price-squeezed off the land to the extent of . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It is your taxes.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . 430 thousand of them in a ten year period 1949-1959. I am not reading this Mr. Speaker, it is off the cuff.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that farm delegations go to Ottawa. It is for these reasons that farm delegations go hat in hand to newly-elected Liberal and Conservative governments for intervention and help on their behalf, all to no end, only to return home disappointed to find that their economic position grows steadily worse year after year. It is of further interest to note Mr. Speaker, that in addition to this approximately \$1 billion, 120 million taken out of the consumers of Canada for tariff protection to industry, in the ten year period 1948-1958 the federal Liberal government provided \$400 million in subsidies to the industrial sector of the economy and in this same period of time under the Agricultural Price Support Act paid only \$100 million in support of agricultural products including the foot and mouth disease . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Wrong.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . outbreak which took the most of it, about \$80 million, if I can remember correctly. This is the way they fulfill their promises made to the farmers of Canada that never again in the post-war period would they have to accept low prices and carry this burden of high cost in producing farm commodities. Mr. Speaker, this is a ratio of 4-1 in favour of business enterprise under a Liberal administration.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — You would be lucky to get 4.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, another reason this delegation went to Ottawa was because they know this is where the jurisdictional responsibility rests for solving these basic economic problems. These delegations didn't go to provincial governments; they didn't blame labour bosses; they didn't blame socialist planning or regimentation; they went and laid the blame squarely at the door step where it belongs.

They weren't asking for much either Mr. Speaker, all they were asking for was 77 per cent of parity prices based, as I said previously on the period 1945-46 to 1952-53. This was refused by Mr. Diefenbaker, who no doubt was dazed by the huge amount of money western farmers lost as a result of Liberal administration. Instead of agreeing to provide at least part compensation for this great loss the farmers received a \$1 per acre up to \$200 per farm, one shot payment in the hope that this small payment might be sufficient to solve the political problem involved.

Now Mr. Speaker, as a result of the failure of the two old parties to implement a comprehensive marketing and farm income policy for Canadian agriculture that would ensure and guarantee sufficient income to our farm people to pay the total cost of the industry that it is expected to carry, the position of our farm people to pay the total cost of the industry that it is expected to carry, the position of our farmers has grown steadily worse. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we are being told that we must accept still lower prices and they suggest that the trend of farmers being liquidated off the land is a natural trend and this must inevitably continue because of mechanization of the industry. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, could be further from the truth.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

If the farmers of Canada received their fair share of the national income this would afford great new employment opportunities within the industry and other segments of the economy as well. Certainly, the present position of Saskatchewan agriculture would not be as serious as it is. Mr. Speaker, the fact that cash farm income in Saskatchewan for 1961 was higher than it was in 1960 because of additional sales of wheat and livestock doesn't mean that the position of the farmer is better. This is his gross income without subtracting his operating and depreciation costs. When these are taken off we find that net farm income in Saskatchewan has gone down to \$103.7 million compared to \$352.6 million in 1960. A drop of nearly \$249 million in net farm income.

No wonder my Liberal friends opposite tried to detract attention from this basic fact and in their feeble attempt to somehow attach blame on the provincial administration for this situation, and even go so far as to suggest that the provincial government mitigate some of this heavy burden that has been placed on the farm people of this province by providing purple gas, tax free gas to farmers. This would go nowhere. It would do nothing but make it more difficult to provide the kind of communication and road services that the farmers in rural areas want. What I am saying is that the farmer is entitled and must have an increased price for his product if he is to meet these obligations.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — And it is the national government that has the obligation to provide him with sufficient income to meet these total costs, because it is they who are responsible for the inflationary costs the farmer is expected to carry, not only in his farm operations but his local government services as well. To me Mr. Speaker, this makes simply common sense.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You are the only one.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I would be pleased to be able to win over the hon. Leader of the Opposition to this philosophy or anyone else that is honestly determined to do something for our farm people.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You are helping them with your five per cent tax.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!



**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I would like to say just a few words in connection with the jurisdiction the province has in agricultural matters. In spite of these adverse economic conditions we have endeavoured within our provincial jurisdiction and resources to do everything we can to help the position of our farm people.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — All these new taxes, will surely help.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — There he goes again, I might as well answer him now, one of these new taxes that he mentioned and enumerated amongst 1100 or so, I don't know where he got all this . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Twelve hundred.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — He mentioned that we were charging farmers 75¢ a head for calfhood vaccination, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't know perhaps that previously the farmers paid the entire cost but now only pay 75¢ per head up to ten head and the department now pays all costs thereafter.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I said nothing of the kind.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — As a matter of fact, he mentioned this as being another fee Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I did not.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Well I will take the hon. member's word if he says he didn't say that but I took that he said that these were new fees being charged against the farmers. All that I have got to say is that previous to four years ago the farmers of this province paid all these charges and last year the province contributed some \$112 thousand for calfhood vaccination costs.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I said nothing of the kind. The minister can't put words in my mouth.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I should mention that in 1959-60 this administration paid over \$3 million to farmers whose crops went under the snow. Under the 1961 emergency program, and there is a variety of them, the total will probably amount in final analysis to some \$3 million. In the field of insect control and emergency assistance I would like to mention to the house that we have stored, and are taking the inventory risk on the storage of \$1¼ million worth of insecticide chemicals, including grasshopper extermination chemicals.

The agricultural machinery administration was the object of the hon. leader's continued criticism but Mr. Speaker, in this connection I would like to draw your attention to one fact, and that is this. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture had a convention recently and they recently made representation to the government of Canada, and in those representations they presented a resolution part of which, and I will read:

“Whereas the mechanization of modern farming represents the major expenditure in agriculture; whereas AMA in Saskatchewan is doing an effective job in consumer testing of machinery, as well as giving leadership to ensure adequacy of repair parts; whereas the results of the testing were of interest to all farmers in the prairies.”

And then goes on:

“Resolved that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture recommends that the farm organizations in the various provinces encourage governments to consider providing adequate fiscal support for machinery testing.”

One of the delegates from the Ontario Federation of Agriculture said that the Ontario Federation of Agriculture was also asking the Ontario government to set up a similar service. And I am hoping with some expectation that the federal government will participate in this very worthwhile program.

Now Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a bit more in the limited time still remaining about medical care. Mr. Speaker, I very sincerely regret the continuous provocative statements and outcries from the hon. members opposite in an endeavour to widen any difference of opinion

that might exist regarding an all-inclusive medical care program for the people of this province. They continue true to form as they have over the past seventeen and a half years to oppose every constructive piece of legislation that gave the government authority to provide better living, greater security and peace of mind in the more vital and important fields affecting the well-being of Saskatchewan people. The hospital plan was opposed, largely on the grounds that this was a local government function, and that an over-all provincial plan and centralization would result in socialist regimentation.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, that is not true, it is an absolute lie that we opposed the hospitalization.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — They publicly opposed the hospital plan and also opposed the power program as an infringement on the freedom of private enterprise and that this too would be fearful socialist regimentation.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It is a lie.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — And that the power grid and rural electrification program for Saskatchewan would be uneconomic and too costly and that the automobile insurance, accident insurance was the biggest hoax ever perpetrated on an unsuspecting public, that it too was socialist regimentation and an infringement on the so-called freedom of private enterprise. Today Mr. Speaker, these fundamental services for better and more secure living are so well accepted that even my friends opposite who continuously snipe away at them wouldn't even dare to clearly say that they would abolish them. This perhaps accounts for the fact that by devious means they now try to create bogus issues of fear and ill will regarding the medical care program. They are trying their best by these devious means to kill the plan before it is even given a chance to prove itself, its benefits or its shortcomings. They know that any shortcomings will be corrected and that like other good programs the people of Saskatchewan will never give the plan up once it has proven its benefits. They are apparently more worried about the success of the plan than its possible failure. May I repeat again, they carry out this type of campaign without regard to harmful effects on human values.

Let us look at this question in its true light. The facts are, we have had medical care services provided by local governments for years. We have witnessed a natural evolution of medical care from a local government

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

basis to a larger regional basis in southwest Saskatchewan. It is a proven fact that people like these services. We have voluntary group medical plans. The further facts are these plans place a heavy financial burden on local government and individuals and in most cases services are limited. Everyone in the province is not included for full medical care services. The objection has again been raised that it will be too costly. Well these services cost money; all services at the present time cost money, regardless as to how they are paid. I would like to point out that the people of this province have — and I am not complaining, people can spend their money as they wish — but the facts are that they have spent \$80 million a year on gasoline, \$46 million on liquor, \$80 million a year on new cars and trucks. That is \$206 million for these three items alone. Surely Mr. Speaker, the people of this province can afford fundamental health service and guarantee these services to everyone in the province without a means test.

**Mr. Kramer:** — They paid before.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — There are no short cuts. When the Saskatchewan Medical Association made its presentation to the Hall Commission it suggested that the future would demand increased expenditures for facilities alone in the order of \$67.5 million and that the annual operation and maintenance of those facilities when completed would be \$33 million cost for a medical care program.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of a comprehensive medical insurance plan before sickness strikes is sound. The alternative proposal suggested by the College of Physicians and Surgeons will be equally costly and will not ensure everyone without a means test. The government has offered medical care to all the people as a natural evolutionary process and to provide insurance that every man, woman and child should have granted to him, his God-given right to this kind of fundamental security and peace of mind. A provincial government plan provides permanency of this service in perpetuity and spreads the payments more evenly, and payments are made more easily on the basis of ability to pay. It is and has been the sincere wish of the government to provide these services for our Saskatchewan farm people and we are not alone in this wish.

Again I refer to a resolution passed at the last annual meeting of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and only recently presented to the Prime Minister of Canada and his colleagues in Ottawa on February 7, 1962. This resolution reads:

“Resolved that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture support measures to obtain a complete prepaid national insurance plan under provincial and federal government sponsorship and control to give full medical and surgical care at a premium that the lowest income group can reasonably afford.”

That is exactly what the government of this province is presenting to the people.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — It is not necessary for us to solicit support as has been suggested in this house, I think by the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner). We have not and we do not intend to antagonize doctors; we have in conscience exercised our prerogative to defend the plan against unjustified opposition from any quarters. Above all else, we have not instigated a hate-doctor campaign as has been suggested in this legislature, neither will we countenance any doctor hate-government campaign in an endeavour to widen any difference of opinion that may exist to prevent implementation of the plan. We have sought and will continue to seek the co-operation of the doctors in this regard.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Knife them in the back.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I believe the statement made by the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) bears out the fact that our friends opposite know this, but despite this fact have not given any encouragement to co-operation but by their attitudes and statements have discouraged co-operation. I make reference here to a statement made in this house by the hon. member for Turtleford in the last session when he got up in his seat and said,

“I would repeat again, will the Premier promise that the information I have quoted is correct, and I believe it to be, that two hours ago the College of Physicians and Surgeons passed a motion unanimously that they will not co-operate with the government in implementing a medical act which is now before this legislature, if in view of that, and if that is correct, will the Premier or Provincial Treasurer promise the people of this province that no new taxes will be levied for this purpose until the co-operation of the doctors and the medical profession is assured?”

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What do you want?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I rather feel Mr. Speaker, that this legislature has prerogatives in these matters as they do in any democratic government anywhere in the world. We have prerogatives in this field of activity particularly. He places on the records of this house in high glee statements of this kind which are not conducive to co-operation and understanding and indicates clearly the party that has been uncooperative to date.

**Mr. Foley:** — On a point of privilege . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — During the special session of the legislature I still feel that the college and its membership are responsible people and that they will recognize and respect . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . the prerogatives of this legislature.

**Mr. Foley:** — My point of privilege is this Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has attributed to me that I spoke of this in the house in high glee, I would ask him to withdraw that statement. I said that in all sincerity Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I cannot say that is a point of order, he is quoting from a past debate in this house, which is his prerogative.

**Mr. Foley:** — He has made an unfair implication of the manner in which I asked that question and I would ask that he withdraw that statement.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Well Mr. Speaker, if he is not in such high glee now I would be very glad to withdraw that statement. I still feel that the college and its members are responsible people and that they will recognize and respect the decisions and prerogatives of this legislature by extending co-operation in giving this plan a good try between now and the next general provincial election. If the plan

proves unacceptable to Saskatchewan people, they will then have an opportunity to exercise their sovereign rights to either continue or reject the plan in whole or in part. In the meantime the least that can be expected from any fair minded responsible citizen including members of the college and all who have the public interest at heart is honest co-operation, to give the plan a fair chance to prove itself. I am against domination of political parties, or governments by any group, be it labour, farmer, big business, professional, or any group who wishes to further its own interest at the expense of the general public good. True democracy Mr. Speaker, to me means the unselfish co-operation of everyone to the end that all may enjoy in fairness and equity the great gifts of good that Divine Providence has bestowed in humankind, the world over.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion and vote against the amendment.

**Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all in joining to take part in this debate I would like to congratulate you along with many members who have spoken before me on your appointment to the Speaker's Chair. I would also like to congratulate the member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) on representing the Weyburn seat after the by-election of December 13th.

Before I make any comments on the Throne Speech Sir, I would like to make brief reference to some of the things that have been said during the last 45 minutes by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. In his usual fine form, he has exhibited the thing that we have said over the years the members from the other side of the house have been guilty of. He has sounded like a coyote in the bush howling to all and sundry. In the 35 minutes that he spoke on the farm problem of this province, and the people in the country who are suffering from these problems, not once did he say what the government that sits to your right was going to do to better the farmer's lot. He didn't once suggest that any of the taxes that they have levied since the last election might have helped to contribute to this, but if he believes that the picture that he painted about the farmer's lot is true, and part of it may be true, then he must realize that between 1944-45 and 1957-58 the majority of the members of the House of Commons from this province were CCF

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

members, so surely this must prove one point, Mr. Speaker, that those CCF members, those 12 or 14 or whatever number there happened to be, didn't have too much influence on the agricultural experts at Ottawa. Now Mr. Speaker, this fact was one of the reasons why today the Leader of the Opposition had brains enough to get out — because he knew that you people had no influence on governments. This is also one of the contributing factors to the defection of Mr. Argue, a man who always was recognized by people of both sides of this house as a spokesman for the farm people. He sat there a little longer than the Leader of the Opposition, but finally he woke up too.

Before I comment on anything in the Throne Speech, I would like to say on this occasion that I appreciate very much having the opportunity to represent the people of the Yorkton constituency in this house. We happen to be one of the constituencies that is half rural and half urban and although half of the population of the seat that I have the honour of representing is an urban population we are still mostly dependent on agriculture in the Yorkton constituency, and I believe that I would be right in saying that the city of Yorkton is the health centre, the distribution centre, the educational communication, service, and religious centre of northeastern Saskatchewan. I think maybe the people of Yorkton can be quite proud in that we have more wholesale houses, more churches, more service stations than any other city of comparable size in this province, and I can promise the Minister of Natural Resources and the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) that at all times we are ready to give of our services to the suburbs of Yorkton — Canora and Melville.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Minister of Public Health. A few days ago I thought I would have to request some help from him, or at least hope he would do something about the mental hospital in Yorkton, and I am sure that not only myself but all the people of the Yorkton constituency and the constituencies around Yorkton are very pleased to hear the announcement yesterday that he has decided to go ahead with the mental hospital to be built in Yorkton this summer.

There is another problem that I should bring up that most of the people in my area of the province are concerned with, and this is in regard to vocational training. Though we have in the province today three vocational training schools I believe, one in the central south, one in the central west, and one in the central north. I believe on one occasion this last fall a



delegation from Yorkton city council, Yorkton Chamber of Commerce, came into the city of Regina to meet with the Minister of Education, in regard to the erection of a vocational training school in the city of Yorkton.

I think we have a very good case to have this vocational school built there, and I know mention was made in the Speech from the Throne about the vocational training program that this government has undertaken. I think the city of Yorkton, being in the centre of the towns like Kamsack, Canora, Melville, Wynyard in the immediate area is very deserving of some consideration when this government decides to build another vocational training school. May I suggest to the government, and I am going to give credit to the federal government, I'll give credit where credit is due, that a large portion of the cost of these vocational schools is paid for by the federal government, and I think this government should take advantage of this situation in the very near future. While I am on the subject of vocational training I would like to suggest to the government and the minister concerned that not only the population of our area makes this a good case for Yorkton, getting a vocational training school, but the inconvenience it causes the people who might be attending the vocational school in Moose Jaw or Saskatoon or any other centre of the province also makes our case stronger. I believe a resolution came from the Yorkton Winter Works Committee sometime this winter to have the rates changed so as to help those apprentices who are taking vocational training that they might be able to take fuller advantage of the training that is offered at vocational training schools in Moose Jaw and Saskatoon, and I hope, that the government would take into consideration this resolution that was submitted from the Yorkton Winter Works Committee.

While I am talking about problems of the constituency I would like to mention one problem that was brought up the other day by, I believe, the Leader of the Opposition, and this concerns the 5 per cent sales tax that was levied by this government effective January 1st, of last year. I would like to quote from a copy of the Leader-Post of February 1, 1962, and I quote:

“Eastern Saskatchewan border area merchants were assured in Regina Wednesday some effort will be made to correct loose ends of collection of provincial sales tax.”

Horace Predenchuk, head of a 24 man delegation of retailers from the area told the Leader-Post they had given this understanding in a closed meeting with the

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

Provincial Treasurer, Hon. A.E. Blakeney. It goes on to say this:

“The association was formed because merchants believed they were losing business to Manitoba merchants as a result of an increase of the provincial education health tax to five per cent.”

Further on it says:

“It was apparent from the presentation submitted this was a genuine problem involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, and including a loss of revenue to the Saskatchewan government. Estimates of business losses to Manitoba in various lines of business range from 20 to 90 per cent.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Provincial Treasurer to date has given those people of the eastern side of the province any assurance that anything is going to be done about this situation that exists. I would suggest that if he or the Premier of the province really understood the problem that exists in the border towns of Saskatchewan, that they would give serious consideration to something being done about it. We warned the government last fall when the education and health tax act was being amended that this was going to be a real problem. Wroxton and some of the villages and towns south of there, and the people who are in the dry goods business and people who are in the hardware business. They all find that their business is going down, in some cases 50 per cent of what it was in December of last year, and I suggest to the Provincial Treasurer that if he was very concerned he would take a trip out to some of these towns along the border of this province. On Saturday afternoon you can go into the village of Calder, one of the most eastern villages I believe in my constituency, and the streets are almost bare of cars, but you can go across the line into the town of Roblin and you can't get parking space. This did not exist three months ago, and you can hardly blame the people who live half way between Roblin and Calder, and the same applies to all the towns and villages along the border, not only on the Saskatchewan side but on the Manitoba side. I think it should be indication enough to this government the fact that we have built and strengthened in this province a Liberal border around the province.

Surely Mr. Speaker, the government must realize there is something wrong. On December 13th last when my friend from Weyburn was elected to this house, it was shown to the government that people on border seats believed there was something wrong in this province, and I suggest to the government that if something isn't done to correct this, although maybe I shouldn't be worrying about their lot, that this border that has been built around them is going to engulf them when they go to the people, if they have the courage to go to them in 1964, but I don't expect they will.

There are some other problems in my constituency that I would like to mention, some of them are in connection with highways, and I see the minister is not in his seat at the moment. I believe that last year he announced that the building of No. 52 highway that starts with the Touchwood seat, I believe it continues on through the Yorkton seat, is to be completed this year to connect up with No. 10 to Melville, and of course we are very thankful for that. I would hope that the construction of No. 9 from Yorkton south, will be commenced this summer — I believe this is the highway that three or four engineering surveys have been made on in the last eight or nine years, so I do believe the government realizes there is something wrong. I hope the Minister of Highways is concerned enough to consider this a real emergency and include this in this year's program.

I would like to mention also that there are fifteen miles of No. 10 highway from the junction of No. 8 across the Manitoba border — a piece of road that was reconstructed a few years ago— that is the only link between Winnipeg and Regina by way of Yorkton, that is not paved. I made a trip from Winnipeg to Yorkton last fall and it seemed rather strange to me with the welcome of the Saskatchewan sign coming off a road that compares to the road between here and Moose Jaw, coming off this kind of a road in Manitoba into a cloud of dust that you had to slow down to about twenty miles an hour to see your way, and I would hope that the government would consider very seriously getting a dust free top on this section of the road. And of course we have the road leading to Saskatoon which we hope in the not-too-distant future something will be done to make this a dust free road.

I might make mention when I am on the problems of my constituency something that is a real problem in my area of the province, and I believe one of the members on your right mentioned this the other day, and this is in regard to snow removal. I would suggest to the minister in charge of the Department of Municipal Affairs

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

that if the government wants to be a real help to the farmers of the province, that they could institute some kind of a program, and I am sure this program could be worked out, to help a snow plough club or help municipalities in the removal of snow from the roads in the wintertime. This is not only going to be a help to the people who are driving on these roads, it is going to be a help to the business centres throughout the province where snow removal happens to be a problem, and in my constituency this year it has been a real grave problem. We have a good many school bus routes that are not on highways, the school buses have had to stay off the roads at different times, and if there was some program that the government had that they might institute that would help the municipalities or the farmers in a snow plough club, to keep snow removed from these roads, it would certainly alleviate a real problem in my area of the province, and a great deal of the northern part of the province.

I might also mention that there has been something said here about the grid road program. The other day the member from Lumsden (Mr. Thurston) suggested there were no people who lived more than a few miles from an all weather road in Saskatchewan. I would like to suggest to him that there are people in my constituency who are more than a few miles from an all weather road. We are having trouble in that area. Some of the municipalities are not able to maintain the grid roads that have been built. I don't think there is anything wrong with building of grid roads, but the thing I see wrong in the province is this, the municipalities that need the roads are the municipalities that can least afford to build the roads, and in my constituency I know of municipalities who haven't got five cents in grid road grants in the last two years, and the reason for this is simple — the municipal council in these municipalities don't feel they can afford to build the type of road that is expected of them by the government in order to qualify for a grid road grant, and these municipal councils I think are using good judgment because they feel they can build five miles of road that is going to service five times as many people, the kind of road they can afford to build, instead of building one mile of grid road. I suggest the answer to a great deal of the road problem in this province today would be a system of unconditional grants paid to the municipalities on needs basis. These grants could be paid and several things should be taken into consideration in arriving at a figure for grants; the amount of highways that are in the different municipalities, the assessment of the

land, the cost of building roads in the area and so on, and I think the government should give more consideration and even before the grid road program is completed, to have unconditional grants given to the municipalities in this province.

I was going to mention the freight policy, although maybe I shouldn't now that the Minister of Agriculture has spoken. I think all the farmers of this province appreciate the bit of help they got from the Minister of Agriculture regarding freight assistance during the movement of feed last fall, but I would like to suggest to him that although in dollars and cents the amount of the freight assistance in this province may seem like a lot of money, compared to the help the government of 1937 gave to the farmers of this province it is very little. Taking into consideration the cost of feed today, the value of the dollar today as compared to that time, I know of people last fall who could not afford to put up the cash to hire a truck to haul their feed. These people on small farms just didn't have the money — if they had enough money to pay for the feed they did not have enough money to pay for the hauling, and in order to get the feed home they had to put up some money and wait until the Minister of Agriculture was ready to pay them. I think this was very unjust and especially to the people who needed the feed the worst.

Before I say anything about the Throne Speech Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on some of the statements that were made the other day by the Premier of the province. He mentioned, or he took exception, to remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition in connection with a TV show that he had made entitled the "Value of Paying Taxes", and he tried to leave the impression while he was speaking that members to your left, the Liberals of course, believe in the laws of the jungle. He practically said that we believed that every person in this province should pay for the building of his own roads, and that every person in this province should educate his own children out of his own pocket. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of the province didn't fool anybody when he was making some of these statements. I dug up some of the facts to prove that most of the statements or a good many of the statements that he made the other day were wrong. One of the things that he said, and he seemed to get great satisfaction out of it, was in connection with who we represent on this side of the house, and he went back to the 1952 election and he said, and I believe these were true figures, he said that in 1952, and he suggested it was a straight two-party fight, or almost a straight two-party fight between the Liberals

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

and the CCF, that the CCF enjoyed 54 per cent of the votes of the people of the province, and I think we got something like 30 per cent or 31 per cent, I just forget now what it was, but it was in the thirties. If the Premier wants to go back and look at statistics I suggest that he doesn't go back quite so far. If he just goes back to December 13th of last year, when he went to the people of Weyburn he got 45 per cent, and we got 55 per cent, and I suggest Mr. Speaker, that if he went to the people of Saskatchewan today that he wouldn't even get that 45 per cent.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — He would be lucky if he got thirty. I have a copy in my hand here of the Saskatchewan Commonwealth dated Wednesday, March 7, 1962, and in big bold headlines at the top of the page reads the following:

“Lloyd buries Liberals in mountain of facts.”

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Well Mr. Speaker, we are not buried very deep, in fact we have already kicked off the dust and I intend to read into the record the facts.

One of the things he mentions was in regard to taxation, and he took exception the other day to a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition, that we were the highest taxed province in Canada, and he used D.B.S. figures from 1961-62, but something that he did not do was include in the figures, the figures I have in front of me are the D.B.S., Saskatchewan figures based on estimates of last session and are for 1961-62, and the tax estimates were \$49 million, this total included education and hospital, gasoline and mineral and certain other small taxes of small amounts — it does not include hospitalization which amounts to \$13 million, and the increases which were made last fall, education and hospital tax of \$14 million, personal income tax of \$3,600,000 corporation tax of \$1 million, and medical care tax of \$6 million, which makes a total of \$24,600,000. Adding the estimates of \$49 million the \$13 million and the \$24,600,000 we have a total of \$87,530,000.

The figure that the Premier suggested was, I don't know where he got this figure, but he suggested that the per capita figure of taxation in the province was \$88. I don't know where he got this figure, but if we divide the figures which I have just given you which are your own estimates from last fall, and Dominion

Bureau of Statistics estimated figures, we have a per capita tax of \$96 per person, and just on the increases of last fall alone we have a per capita tax of \$27. Now I don't think Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is fooling anybody when he reads off figures or tries to juggle figures in his usual fine fashion.

One of the other statements that he made when he was speaking was in connection with the number of civil servants, and of course took great exception to the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition, in comparing the number of civil servants in Saskatchewan with the number of civil servants in Manitoba. He disputes the figure that the Leader of the Opposition used, and of course it was the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the figures for Saskatchewan show there were 7,239 civil servants in June of last year, and I have on my desk here a copy of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Provincial Government Employment for April to June, 1961, and the figures are this, and I don't believe this is biased, these are not my figures and they are not Premier Lloyd's figures, they are the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures — these people are not interested in either the Liberals or the CCF, they are interested in giving the facts, and as the Premier or the Saskatchewan Commonwealth suggest he buried us with facts, I would like to state the facts. In Manitoba there were 4621 people in the employ of the government and in Saskatchewan there were 7,239 people. Now in their own sessional paper last year, sessional paper 26, Public Service Commission monthly statement of August 31, 1961, it says there are 7,209 people in the employ of the government of the Public Service Commission. The Premier used the figures 6,800, but he had a very slick way of putting this statement. He says and I quote:

“The total positions in Saskatchewan in 1961-62 permanent employees are 6,800.”

Now this is a rather peculiar statement, Mr. Speaker, but this comes from a typewritten copy of his speech which I have on my desk, and merits some attention I believe, because he avoids giving the number of persons employed, now a good many of the people who are employed are employed full time but they are still not considered permanent staff. So he avoided giving this figure here so that it would not show the true figure.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — . . . some permanent staff.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — I think the Attorney General will get plenty

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

of time to review any statements that I make when I sit down. I haven't interrupted anybody to date.

He starts out to talk about total positions then he finishes his speech by saying permanent positions are 6,800. Well surely the Premier must know how many persons are employed if the person is employed full time they are an employee of the government, but this is typical of the socialist acrobatics of this Premier and of other members of the other side of the house, who will try to refute the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition and other members from this side of the house.

There is another statement that the Leader of the Opposition made the other day that the Premier took great exception to, maybe while I am on the civil servants I should mention something that the Premier said the other day. He said when you have more money spent, of course you have to have more people spending the money. I suggest to him that the opposite is true too, when you have more civil servants you have to have more money to keep civil servants.

There is something else I should bring to the attention of the house, I believe, after the statement that he made about the exception that he took to the Leader of the Opposition's remarks, he said that most of the added civil servants were in the field staff, and I believe he was right when he said that.

As you might recall in 1949 a position was created for the purpose of employing Mr. Tom Bentley, who had been defeated as CCF candidate for the 1949 federal election. Mr. Bentley was given the grand title of director of staff training, but what staff — the field staff, but what training — training in CCF political activities throughout the constituencies of this province. Just shortly after his appointment Mr. Bentley sent a memorandum to each minister of our socialist government, and I would like to read the memo to this house at this time.

“From Mr. T. Bentley to all Ministers:

“Re Field Offices — would you please supply me with the names of all the field officers of your department, together with their addresses, the areas in which they work by constituencies, if possible.”

T.G. Bentley, Director of Staff Training.



Well Mr. Speaker, I will agree with the Premier that a good many of them are in the field staff, and from the statement that I have just read, we can well understand why they are in the field staff. A good many of them are in the field staff organizing for the NDP in this province, and I think this is a disgrace to the government of this province. They can boast about the money they spend on public service and they can try and deny the fact that we have their enormous increase in civil servants, but I suggest to you Sir, that a great deal of the increase in civil servants or in the number of civil servants in this province is caused because they have too many people organizing on behalf of the political party of which the government opposite happens to belong to.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The point just made of course that there are great numbers of public servants organizing for political party in the pay of the government must be denied and is denied.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — I can't hear your point of privilege.

**Premier Lloyd:** — I have stated my point of privilege — you made a statement which is inaccurate — I deny it categorically — it is incorrect in every way.

**Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the house that what the hon. Premier just said is not correct. They appointed a magistrate to the court in Saskatoon and he was holding down an appointment with the CCF three weeks afterwards.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Snedker:** — . . . and I'll produce the press clippings to prove it.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — I think Mr. Speaker, that most people in this province, and especially anybody who happened to spend anytime in the Weyburn by-election, realize from the number of cars with government licenses on them that there were a good many civil servants who were active.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — That statement is untrue.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Anyway Mr. Speaker, the Premier also took exception or he made a statement I believe concerning cancer care, and he made the statement there was no cancer care before the Liberals got into power in 1944. He made the statement that a former Minister of Education speaking in his home town of Biggar, during the 1944 election campaign had said something regarding cancer care as it was provided by the Liberal government at that time, and I think he went on to say that some lady spoke to him shortly after this meeting a lady who had lost a son from cancer — and wondered about whether or not she could get the treatment or the doctor bills or whatever it was paid for, and I believe the Premier told her, or at least in a copy of his speech, he says he looked into the matter, phoned Regina I believe, and found there was no care. Now I suggest to the Premier the records should be made straight. On May 1, 1944, an act came into effect which paid for all diagnostic, all hospital and all medical care, and the only cancer care that was not paid for by this act was surgical care, and if the Premier's friend happened to die before May 1st it is not our fault.

Now Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on, but I do believe that the figures I have quoted here have proven that a good many of the statements that he made the other day were wrong. Something that I think should be brought to the attention of this house is the tax increases that have taken place in the last year or the last year and a half since this government took office the last time. We have the liquor tax, the diesel tax, the gas tax, the telephone tax, the municipal tax, hospital tax, the new income tax, and I could go on and on, but I think most members of this house have heard this before. The fact remains that we are getting socialization by taxation.

There was a statement made this afternoon by the Minister of Agriculture suggesting that the government has not tried to promote a hate-the-doctor campaign and I think maybe I should comment on this too. There has been quite a bit said about medical care in this house, and I took very little part on the debate on medical care

bill last year and said much less than some of the members on this side of the house, but I am going to take this opportunity now to put on the records of this house a few facts. When the Minister of Agriculture or any other member to your right makes a statement that they are not trying to promote a hate-the-doctor campaign they may be right, they may be right, but they just may be right; they may also be wrong. I would like to go back to the early days of this government, back to 1944 and 1945 and up until the time the legislation went through the house last fall, to give you some of the facts. You can remember I suppose, many members of his house can remember, that in the early days of this government, they imported to this province several doctors with the idea that they were going to have their medical plan. This was one of the Premier's fondest dreams and of course the Premier had a good many fond dreams during his stay as Premier of this province. This hurried up plan that Doctors Shepp formulated was shown to the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province somewhere back in the early years of this government and was turned down flat by the College at that time, and at that time the Premier asked the college if they could devise a medical plan that might be acceptable to them and give it to him to look over. At that time may I remind the house again, the Premier was the Minister of Health, and after some considerable time the College of Physicians and Surgeons did come in with a plan and they presented it to the Premier I believe, who was then Minister of Health, and he was ready to accept this plan at that time — a plan that was designed by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of this province, but at that time the Premier told the college that at the present time they didn't have the money to go ahead with the plan, so they would have to wait until some later date, and as time goes on there were different programs the government entered into, but of course they had to deal with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of this province in order to get the program working.

One of these was the program whereby the government would pay for medical care of people receiving supplementary allowance. As members like the Minister of Mineral Resources, the Premier, Minister of Co-operatives, and some of the older cabinet ministers will remember at that time that the College of Physicians and Surgeons agreed with the government to enter this scheme of paying for medical services for people who were receiving supplementary allowances, and they agreed to do this at a very low cost, at a very low cost to the government, which amounted to possibly around 50 per cent of the actual

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

cost of the medical services they were giving these people. I think the original cost was about \$9.60 per year per person. They also agreed for a very small amount of money to administer this program, and at that time this is the way the college was co-operating with the government.

All during these years when the government was working out different programs for the Department of Health, they assured the College of Physicians and Surgeons that at no time would they go into a medical care program in the province of Saskatchewan without first consulting the medical profession, and I believe that up until the time the Premier left the Department of Health, that they kept their word reasonably well, and I don't know whether it was pressure from the left wingers in the party or where it came from, but after he got out of the Department of Health things started to change little by little, and I am going to make a statement here and now that I dare any of the members opposite to deny, that not once from the time that Mr. Coldwell made the speech in the fall of 1959, when he announced there would be a medical care plan after the 1960 election in this province, until the time that the bill went through this house, did the cabinet meet with the College of Physicians and Surgeons to consult them as to what kind of a plan they wanted, and now they expect, Mr. Speaker, that the doctors are going to do anything they say. I will only say this, today it is the doctors, tomorrow it might be the teachers, who knows but what next week it might be the farmers.

This is the socialistic planning we have been getting from our friends on the other side of this house and it is costing this province a lot of money.

We have the Centre for Community Studies which as far as I am concerned was set up to indoctrinate people on the socialist changes they want to have in this province, costing thousands and thousands of dollars. We have the AMA which the Minister of Agriculture is so proud of I believe it was \$157,000 it cost us last year, and I have a return here that shows they tested 16 machines and they were still testing 21 1st year, 17 permanent staff, 5 temporary, 12 casuals, to test 16 farm machines and to complete tests on 21 others at a cost of \$157,000 to the people of this province. This government spent over a million dollars since they were elected studying the problems of rural people in this province.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . for or against.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — One of the commissions was the commission that was set up and brought in the same finding as the commission that had been set up before. All they had to do was read the book and rewrite the report, but I think the original commission brought in the findings that the government wanted them to bring in.

I have a speech on my desk here called “More Abundant Living” made by Premier T.C. Douglas on the debate on the Speech from the Throne in this legislature in 1960, and I have heard some of the members from the other side of the house telling us how we got more abundant living in this province.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Of course we have been getting more abundant living ever since this government got in, of course some of the members on the other side of the house won't like this but I am going to say this, Mr. Speaker, and these are your figures, I am going to give you an answer to a question I asked in this house last fall, if you say we have more abundant living when there are 24,435 people on social aid, when there were only 13,771 people on social aid three years ago, this is the kind of more abundant living we are getting.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Try some of the Liberal provinces — let's get some more quotations.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Last year and after the returns were received in this house we find there were one thousand less people receiving supplementary allowances in this province than what there were two years before and the figures total 15,001 people, and when I figure it out there were 7,754 or more than 50 per cent of them received \$5.00 a month or less and this government across the way was giving them more abundant living. I don't think that they are fooling anybody any longer. We have heard a good many descriptions during the last few days of what their philosophy stands for — the Premier calls it doing together, the Minister of Education who doesn't happen to be in his seat today calls it living in co-operation, and the junior member from Moose Jaw whom I am sorry is not in his seat at the moment, showed his true left-wing colors the other day when we heard him speak in this house,

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

and I am going to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of speeches that were made by the junior member from Moose Jaw who seems to me to be a real doctrinaire socialist is the kind of thing that is keeping industrialists out of this province.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Gallagher:** — He makes a speech and he condemns corporations, he condemns private enterprise, he condemns profiteering, and then we send the hon. member from Canora down to New York at a cost of \$381 and we expect we are going to get a pulp mill in the northern part of this province, the member from Moose Jaw would condemn the very thing that the minister from Canora was trying to get. Then we sent the member from Last Mountain to New York from September 27th to the 29th, to have a meeting with consultants in Swedish pulp at a cost of \$265. He was also interested in getting the pulp mill. We even sent the Premier to Toronto and he attended meetings with the Petro-Chemical Company which cost us \$169.75 to send him down there. Well I can only say that as long as we have people in the government of this province that will get up and make a speech and statements like the member from Moose Jaw city made the other day, we are not going to get anybody to start a pulp mill or a chemical plant in this province.

Imagine, the junior member from Moose Jaw had the audacity to quote from Mr. Abraham Lincoln, a man who spent his life working for freedom and liberty in this continent. He told us what a terrible sin it was to make a profit or to own industry. Well I would suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, that he read more of Abraham Lincoln's works and I would like to quote to him one of the things Mr. Lincoln says, and I quote:

“Property is the fruit of labour, property is desirable, it is a positive good in the world that some should be rich, so that others may become rich, and hence just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him without a house pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself. Thus by example this house of his own shall be safe from violence when built.”

and I could go further and quote from Mr. Lincoln:

“You cannot help the small man by tearing down big men; you cannot assist the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer; you cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man’s initiative and independence; you cannot establish security on borrowed money; you cannot help the poor by destroying the rich; you cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.”

and I promise the junior member from Moose Jaw that I will get a copy of these and have them sent over to him. Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne offered no relief from the continuing burden of debt and taxation that this government has imposed on the people of this province. It has promised no incentive for investment in industry to provide jobs for the young people of this province, and as might be expected after their marriage to the CLC they have nothing to offer the farmers of this province, and therefore I do not support the motion.

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join in this debate this afternoon.

First I would like to pay my respects to you, Mr. Speaker, and to compliment you upon your election to the office of Speaker. I believe that this is one of the highest honours that can be conferred by this house on any member, and I congratulate you upon your election, and I express confidence that you will discharge your duties in the same creditable manner in which you have represented the people of Wadena since 1945.

Mr. Speaker, I want also at this time to express congratulations to the new member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley). I enjoyed very much his maiden address here in this assembly and I say that in my opinion he offers considerable promise of being one of the most listened-to members of this assembly. I want to caution, however, my hon. friend from Weyburn that if he is going to avoid error then he ought not to try to emulate too closely the example of some of the members of his own party. I suggest that he has many examples from among his confreres on that side of the house that he should studiously avoid.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

He ought to remember that in this legislature members are capable of dissecting and analysing proposals and arguments put forward for their real, true, and intrinsic merit. He ought not to fall into the kind of error which we heard a moment ago from the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher), who expressed his view that this government ought to make unconditional grants to municipalities. Let us face the facts, Mr. Speaker, that if we believe the government ought to make unconditional grants to municipalities, then we are saying in effect that provincial taxes are not high enough and that they ought to be increased in order to benefit municipalities.

I would caution the member for Weyburn, Mr. Speaker, that some of his colleagues have set rather a bad example in connection with their attitude toward the medical care plan. The medical care plan in this province was endorsed by the electors of Saskatchewan, endorsed by the people of this province, and I would suggest that it would well behoove my hon. friends on the other side of the house, when they are in the house, to recognize this fact and bow to the decision of the people of Saskatchewan that we are to have a medical care plan in Saskatchewan. I suggest that they are fooling no one when they try to represent that they are in favour of medical care, but that they are merely opposed to the medical care plan of this government. We have seen all kinds of pretexts invented, put forward, for opposing the proposals of this government. The Liberal party learned some time ago, they learned to their sorrow in four preceding elections, in four successive elections, that it really doesn't pay to come out and frankly and flatly oppose the policies that are endorsed by the people of Saskatchewan. They have apparently now learned that it is much safer to criticize, to put forward untenable alternatives, — to oppose, to attack, — and at the same time to pretend they are in agreement with the general principles. This kind of thing won't fool many people, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. members really were in favour of medical care they would not now challenge us by saying that there should be a plebiscite. If they are in favour of medical care, it is quite obvious that the 41 per cent who supported the CCF as well as the 31 per cent of the electors who supported the Liberal party, makes a total of 72 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan, and that being so it becomes pure frivolity, pure vexatiousness, to say that there should first be a plebiscite on the question of medical care.

I would hope that my hon. friend for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) would not fall into the error of making



his case on partial proofs, making his case on giving to the house only a certain part of the facts, and concealing from the house or attempting to conceal from the house the whole story. You had an example of that this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) addressing this house, purported to criticize the figures used by the Premier and to say that the Premier had referred to the number of positions in the permanent public service for comparison purposes, — in comparing Saskatchewan with Manitoba, — and he said, this doesn't tell the whole story. Why, he says there are 400 other employees who are not members of the permanent civil service. That of course, is true, but if he was going to qualify the figure by pointing out some addition to it, some fractional addition he might also have pointed out that they contain a subtraction factor also. Some positions are vacant and are left vacant for lengthy periods of time, and it is possible for more than a hundred positions to be vacant at any given time. So, as a result the figure which the Premier used was substantially the most accurate representation that would be made on this point.

I suggest then it is fairer to deal with facts objectively, to deal with the plus as well as the minus, because if you don't, other members on the other side of the house have a way of rising and then adding these omitted facts to the story, and when that is done it only detracts from and discredits the arguments put forward by the members, and I am sorry the member for Weyburn is not in his seat so he could benefit from these good wishes and this good advice. I am confident however, that he will not fall too easily into the error of some of his colleagues in that respect.

Now Mr. Speaker, we have spent a good deal of time in this legislature discussing rather narrow and partisan issues. We have listened to sweeping predictions as to what will happen at the next election. So far as the members on this side of the house are concerned, we have no compunction about facing the electorate — we are prepared to face the electorate of Saskatchewan, to place our record before them, in the normal course of events and we are prepared to stand or fall by their decision.

Hon. members opposite like to talk about straws in the wind. They say the government has lost three government seats. Well, what are the facts? This is an example of overstating a case. The fact is, of course, that the constituency of Athabaska was not lost in a by-election, but in a deferred election. The Athabaska

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

election was held in conjunction with the provincial election, for all the fact that the voting day was a couple of weeks later, the nomination date was the same as in the provincial election or very closely after, and this was really part and parcel of the general election held in June, in the summer of 1960. What about Turtleford? Well Turtleford in the last house was a Liberal seat, and Turtleford remained a Liberal seat in the present house. It wasn't a loss to the government; the government hasn't won Turtleford since 1952. So that the only straws in the wind that my hon. friends are able to point to is the constituency of Weyburn. It has changed sides.

Well, I give credit to my hon. friend the new member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley), as a seasoned and experienced campaigner, with now three election campaigns behind him, and I am not surprised that he carried his election. After all he had tried twice against Premier Douglas. I am equally confident that if Premier Douglas had been running again, he would still be our member for Weyburn.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — There really isn't too much in the way of straws in the wind. This is an old and tiresome refrain, Mr. Speaker. Opposition members harp constantly about what they are going to do in the next election. I think the people of Saskatchewan would be more interested in knowing what they might do after they were elected. I think that the people of Saskatchewan are quite capable of deciding for themselves who they want to have represent them in this house at the next election. We would be more interested in knowing something about the policies which the Liberals would implement in the event that they were elected.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in this debate that we should consider more important matters than these instances of partisan advantage. I think we should look at this speech from the Throne, at the government's policies in a larger frame of reference. We should consider whether the policies which we are putting forward actually increase — whether they expand, or on the other hand whether they decrease the citizens' control over the community, over the society, over the world in which he lives. We should consider whether the policies put forward by the government effectively protect the citizens, protect his private rights against undue encroachments, against his private rights by the society and by the community.

Ever since the industrial revolution, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed in the western world, a growing concentration of capital. Today we have gigantic industrial empires, who exercise sole control over the drugs, the chemical, the automobiles, power, petroleum which we require in our daily lives. These corporations are virtually self-governed states within our country. In the CCF as in the New Democratic Party we have advocated measures designed to bring these economic powers under the control of the citizens. We have tried to subject these leviathans to the control of the state. In the main we have used three devices to achieve this aim.

We have in the first place advocated municipal or governmental ownership, and in this way making control of these monopolistic corporations subject to the control of the electors through their franchise. Secondly, we have attempted to encourage the development of co-operatives so as to place the control of industry in the hands of the people who use it. In both cases, we thereby restore to the community any profits which may accrue from industry. Thirdly, in that very large area where it is advisable and desirable to give scope to private enterprise, we have by appropriate legislation provided for more democratic control, by the employees, of their own affairs, providing labour legislation guaranteeing more effective and democratic means of protecting their own rights.

All of these devices, while securing more democratic control of the institutions of the community by the citizens have of course some limitations. But the “free enterprise parties”, as they are laughingly referred to, have no solution to this problem. They purport to say that this can be dealt with by imposing income tax. They say that this will level off differences in wealth and income, and restore democratic equality. This is the kind of thinking, Mr. Speaker, which makes it possible to say — in the same breath impose an income tax on General Motors of 51 per cent, and then to say that what is good for General Motors is good enough for the country.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition or free enterprise parties have never demonstrated that they have any policy to cope with this growing monopolization, this growing massiveness this growing irresponsibility of business and industry.

Now Mr. Speaker, there has been a growing and a corresponding increase in the activity of the state in recent years. This is partly a result of the increase in

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

the number of administrative tribunals and boards, agencies, which are needed in some respects to act as the counterpoise to the growing industrial power of private enterprise. This growing activity of the state is also, I have no doubt, partly the result of the growing demand made upon the state for state-run, state-provided roads, power lines, gas lines, state-provided education and hospitalization and medical care.

In the early days of the industrial revolution it was said by Mills and Locke, practiced by Thomas Jefferson when the state had no real function or purpose except to provide national defence and to punish criminals. In those days the citizen who escaped the press gang and the criminal who escaped the criminal courts really had no complaint about intervention in his life, or any curtailment of his liberty by the encroachment of the state.

Now however, in the second half of the twentieth century, where an individual wishes to build a garage at the back of his lot, he comes up against the zoning regulations. If he wants to go out in his meadow and shoot a grouse for dinner he must be aware of the Game Act. If he wants to carry on certain licensed occupations he must comply with the licensing statutes of the province or the municipality. If he wants to practice a profession he must comply with the bylaws of his profession, set by the profession, subject to penalties and fines for disobedience.

While it is fashionable to get up and deplore this growing multiplicity of regulations, human ingenuity and the demands of our constituents combine to require us to pass new ones at every session of the legislature. So recognizing the fact that the volume of law is constantly growing . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, we should call the hon. member to order.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Recognizing the fact that this body of regulation and restriction is constantly growing, it is, I suggest, a challenge to democratic governments to evolve devices to protect against the abuse of the law, to protect against injustice at the hands of the incompetent or the over-zealous public officials.

A government with no social program, a government of laissez-faire, a government of my hon. friends who sit

on the other side — this kind of government has no real problem because if it has no philosophy of dealing with social problems, and the administrative machinery to deal with them is unnecessary. On those rare occasions when a Liberal or a Tory government bestirs itself long enough to do something, if it commits some breach of the rights of the citizens — well it is such a rare and isolated instance that the passage of time heals the wounds and no great public outcry arises.

There is no problem of “right of way” acquisition with a government that doesn’t require right of way. There is no problem of expropriation when a government doesn’t build roads, power lines, gas lines and so on. But on the other hand when there is burgeoning governmental activity, then the isolated individual complaints multiply into a large political problem area. There are indeed Mr. Speaker, examples which can be called to mind of constituencies that have turned against the government because the government had not evolved some method of providing machinery for the correction of individual grievances and individual complaints of abuses. This has meant that the present government has had to experiment, to search diligently for devices to maintain the rights of the citizen. The record shows that Saskatchewan has led in almost every respect, every government in Canada, in protecting and enlarging the civil rights of its citizens, and providing for the relief against bureaucratic abuses.

Sometimes hon. members opposite and others — who neither understand this problem, nor care about encouraging the growing democratization of the community, twist us on this side about the large number of committees that we call upon to assist us in the formulation and carrying out of government policy. Probably the most conspicuous example of this policy is the public discussion which has been going on in recent years on the subject of municipal reorganization. This discussion — this public debate, this dialogue that has been going on publicly commenced in the early 1950’s when the Royal Commission on Agricultural and Rural Life held hearings in scores of rural communities throughout this province and heard from farm people themselves what their problems were. This commission was told that most of the complaints made by rural people were that the municipal services were not adequate. Complaints about local government predominated at rural hearings. As a result the royal commission recommended that the government should consider some mode of reorganizing local governments. In December 1956, as a result of this recommendation, the government decided to call together the leaders of municipal governments of this province to a conference, and after Premier Douglas gave assurance

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

to these municipal leaders that no drastic changes would be made in the form of local government without the consent of the people concerned, this conference agreed to set up a continuing committee to give further consideration and study to the problem.

This continuing committee representing in the majority, as it did, the real leaders of local government in this province, finally came to the conclusion that certain changes should be made. The committee recommended that wholesale reorganization should be undertaken at as early a date as possible without holding any local plebiscite.

Governments, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, are more responsive to the demands of public opinion than the independent commissions and committees. As was pointed out last week by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley), Premier Douglas in 1959, gave the unequivocal assurance that there would be no local reorganization without a vote of the people concerned. As I understand it the position of the government has not changed since that time, although attempts have been made by the Liberal party and others to try to represent that the position of this government has not been clear. I realize that some hon. members may have partisan political motives for trying to leave this erroneous impression. I am sure however that the people of our province are not deceived. They know that this government has always advocated the widest possible consultation with local people on changes which affect them. They know that this government provided, for example, in connection with school units, for plebiscites where they were sought by local people. The test Mr. Speaker, of this method of doing things is evidenced by the fact that now countless hundreds and thousands of people in Saskatchewan are reasonably conversant with the issues involved in local government reorganization. If a basic change is made in the form of local government in our province, it will be as the result of thorough public discussion and will not be the result of any compulsion on the part of the elected government of this province.

I could go on to recite numerous other instances, where the citizens have been brought into consultation with the government. The Law Reform Committee is an example which may not occur to many members. It is a voluntary organization, consisting of practising lawyers in this province. It was set up on the invitation of the government a few years ago, and it is renewed from year to year for the express purpose of channelling advice and recommendations from the legal profession to the government through the Attorney General.

I am not going to weary the house by reciting some of the beneficial legislation that has come onto the statute books of this province as a result of that very helpful and very useful liaison with the legal profession and with the courts.

The example referred to a little earlier in this debate, of the meeting held at Melville, when the government said to the people there that “we would rather go there to hear your problems and discuss your complaints, than to put you to the trouble of coming here to do it.” We believe that the telephone issue at Melville is not solely the property of half a dozen people who might like to come and meet the government in the cabinet chambers. Issues which affect the welfare of the community of Melville are of interest to all the people of Melville. This government was determined to spread as far as possible this process of consultation. I realize Mr. Speaker, that there are some people who don't believe in democratic consultations and deliberations and who resent the successful application of this principle for the solving of governmental problems.

So it is no mere accident that we have had all these devices and techniques of public consultation. It is the result of deliberate policy by this government because this government believes in social control of public institutions.

In 1947 Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan was a leader — again a leader in this field by pioneering a Bill of Rights. In that year Saskatchewan passed its Bill of Rights which in 1956 was expanded to include not only the Bill of Rights, but a Fair Employment Practices Act and a Fair Accommodation Practices Act. Much good has been done by this legislation in our province to eliminate racial and religious persecution. These statutes are not chiefly valuable because of the number of prosecutions that are based upon them. We do not measure the success of this type of legislation by the number of prosecutions and convictions, rather we measure its success by the growing acceptance of the principles of human equality among all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the other provinces in Canada are even now only slowly beginning to emulate this legislation. This government at a very early time in its history began to recognize — did recognize — that there may be a problem of civil rights in the cases of those private citizens who were charged with serious criminal offences, who might be at disadvantage because they were unable to supply themselves with defence counsel. In

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

1946 the government commenced providing defence counsel in criminal cases where impecunious accused persons were before our superior and district courts. This provision was extended in 1957 to include impoverished accused persons in all the courts, including the magistrate's court. The only exception to this coverage at the present time is in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, where the local bar associations, feel that it is better if they provide this service and as far as I know they are doing so to the satisfaction of the courts and to the people who come before them.

We gave further attention to the magistrate's courts in 1957. We were mindful of the fact that Magna Carta, granted by King John in 1215 at Runnymede, guaranteed to all his subjects that they would have the right to be tried in a court presided over by judges and magistrates learned in the law. An analysis of the figures in 1956-57 showed that of all the cases heard in Saskatchewan in that year 26 thousand were heard by untrained Justices of the Peace, compared with 14 thousand only about one-third of the total, heard by trained magistrates. We thereupon greatly extended our magistrate's courts. We increased the salary so that we could attract top-notch people to these appointments. We encouraged the police force under the control of the province to use the magistrate's courts in preference to the Justice of the Peace where it was possible. We advised the municipalities and others having their own police forces to do the same. The result is that today — last year — out of 64,900 convictions, or cases heard — 56 thousand or more than 85 per cent were tried by our provincial magistrates.

At the same time we tried to add to the dignity and facilities of our magistrate's courts because we believe that accused people are entitled to be tried in dignified surroundings, in proper surroundings. This is an important element of the rights of accused persons. The result is that now in the 90 or 100 communities where our magistrates regularly sit, adequate facilities are provided.

We are not resting on our laurels in this regard, Mr. Speaker, we are constantly giving further consideration to the need to further improve our magistrate's courts — to increase the salaries so that we can continue to attract qualified and eminent people to this court.

In 1952 Saskatchewan was the first province in Canada to grant to its citizens the right to sue the Crown



without the consent of the Crown, without a fiat. While suits against the Crown are quite rare, the mere fact that the Crown officials know that the Crown might be sued does, I suggest, help to cause them to be more cautious and more careful in the use of the powers which the government vested in them. Here again was an important first for Saskatchewan.

I was surprised to note in the Leader-Post of February 5, 1962, the headline "Lawyers Lacking Some Civil Rights." The opening paragraph of the story is as follows:

"Lawyers discussing civil liberties were reminded Friday, that even they lack some. If they are disbarred for example no court will hear an appeal."

This of course is not the situation in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Law Society of this province have long enjoyed the right to appeal to the court against disbarment. This right has been added to in 1948 by giving to disbarred or disciplined members of the law society the right to complain to the Attorney General and giving him or the government the right to carry the appeal on his behalf. This is the kind of power which helps to corroborate the fact of the interest of the government in the principle that there shall be no discrimination based on any unfair ground against members of the profession. At the same time Mr. Speaker, those rights of appeal were extended into the 20 or 25 other professional acts on the statute books of this province. I was surprised that a newspaper in Saskatchewan published this story, emanating from Toronto, with a great deal of prominence and without even apparently taking the trouble to enquire of our own professional organizations whether or not this condition prevailed in Saskatchewan. The inference contained in the headline was indeed that it applied to every part of Canada.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to interrupt the hon. member now to bring to the attention of the hon. members that it is now 5:00 o'clock, and this the 6th day of the resumption of the debate on the Address-in-Reply. In accordance with Standing Order 33, the amendment on the Address-in-Reply must be disposed of today at anytime before and not later than 9:30 p.m. I would therefore advise the house that if the question is not put on this amendment before 5:30 the house must sit tonight, at least until the amendment is disposed of.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may resume . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Aren't you through yet?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I was just pointing out Mr. Speaker, these rights of appeal were incorporated into Saskatchewan statutes by this government.

Mr. Speaker, there are other groups in Saskatchewan not enjoying professional status, such as those who require a license under one of the 20 or more provincial or municipal licensing bylaws. These people have somewhat the same problems as members of the profession. I refer to electricians, hotel keepers and so forth. All except one or two of these licensing provisions were passed by the previous government and were on the statute books in 1944. At that time not a single one of these statutes provided for any right of appeal by any licensee against arbitrary or dictatorial power of the minister or the appropriate government official.

I acknowledge that the matter of licensing is a very sensitive and a very delicate area because there is a continuous public interest in maintaining some public control over the right of persons to engage in these licensed occupations. Very often there are considerations of an urgent public nature which do not lend themselves satisfactorily to precise legal definitions. In such cases the minister or the public official must act and must take responsibility before the public for cancelling such licenses where it seems to be desirable in the public interest. There are some areas where it would be undesirable to require publication of reasons for cancelling of a license because it could result in more injury to the unsuccessful applicant than it would benefit the public good. However, in the interests of protecting the civil rights of the citizens, this government has attempted to explore these areas where the rights of licensees may be defined by the rule of law. We therefore provided in several of these statutes a right of appeal against termination of license, against the arbitrary cancellation of licenses by the minister or the government official. The provision of an express right of appeal was provided first in the Real Estate Agent's Licensing Act of 1953. Later on, the Commercial Agent's Act in 1958 carried this right of appeal and the Securities Act of 1959. I will make no reference to the Retail Merchant's licensing Act at this time.

In connection with the Securities Act, it should be pointed out that dealing in securities is a highly specialized profession, one requiring special training and a good deal of experience, a good deal of skill, and these qualifications I suggest are necessary, not only from a point of view of the successful carrying on of the profession from the salesman's point of view, but from the point of view of protection of the public. The ignorant salesman can often do more harm than the dishonest or fraudulent one. This is an area where a great deal of public damage can be done by unskilled or by unscrupulous promoters. Dishonesty in this realm may deprive a citizen of his life's savings and may as in the recent case in British Columbia result in amassing a large fortune in a few months. Hon. members will have noted the case to which I refer in the province of British Columbia. In this highly sensitive area, Mr. Speaker, it is very important that securities commissions have enough power to adequately protect the public, but it is also important that they shall exercise these powers under the rule of law. Securities Commissions and their officials ought not, we believe in this government, to exercise their powers in any willful or arbitrary manner. They ought not to act upon mere hunches or suspicions, but only upon grounds that can be firmly established by the legal rules of evidence. There is only one way, we have found in Saskatchewan, to ensure that result and that is to provide that decisions of the commission are reviewable by the Court of Appeal, not only on questions of law but on question of fact as well. Saskatchewan was the first province in Canada to institute this kind of provision in one of its administrative acts. This provision was placed in our Securities Act in 1959.

At the time that we decided to pioneer and explore in this new area — in administrative law — we decided that we would take one other step to provide not only that the applicants — licensees, brokers — would have the right to appeal against an adverse decision to the courts, but also that he would have the right to demand and to receive written reasons for his unsuccessful brush with the Securities Commission. This gives dissatisfied applicants the right to present to the Court of Appeal a chance to analyze those reasons to see whether or not the commission acted on right and lawful grounds in making the decision which was made.

I do not know Mr. Speaker, how far these principles can be extended into the operation of the other administrative acts — other administrative tribunals — but I can only say this that almost the only two

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

complaints or criticisms which we get from the public on the operations of administrative boards are first — there is no right to appeal against wrong decisions, and secondly that no reasons are given for such decisions. These two causes of complaint are impossible in the securities administration of this province. I would hope that if these techniques prove to be beneficial over the years — and two years is rather a short time to test them — that we might be able to extend some similar provision into the constitution of other administration tribunals. I would hope that this piece of pioneering done by Saskatchewan will be emulated in other provinces in Canada for the protection of the civil rights of the citizens of these provinces.

I come now Mr. Speaker, to refer to an area which has been receiving increasing government interest and concern. I refer to the area of expropriation — compulsory purchase as it is known in England. Much has been said about expropriation in this house and on the hustings. Much of it is irrelevant and even untrue.

I would refer you to the statutes of 1961, the index of the Table of Public Statutes page 476. There you will find all of the expropriation statutes of this province. The City Act, the Community Planning Act, the Expropriation Act, Expropriation (Rehabilitation Projects) Act, Highways and Transportation Act, Irrigation Districts Act, Municipal Expropriation Act, Municipal Telephone Act, Pipelines Act, Power Corporation Act, Public Health Act, Public Works Act, Saskatchewan Railway Act, Rural Municipality Act, Rural Telephone Act, Saskatchewan Government Telephones Act, Village Act, Water Users Act — Every one of those except three Mr. Speaker, were passed by a previous government before 1944. The Municipal Expropriation Act was passed in 1946, I believe, and it has merely consolidated the powers already contained in the Village Act, the Town Act, and the City Act. The other one — the Pipelines Expropriation Act — well Mr. Speaker, anyone can see why it was unnecessary to have a pipelines expropriation act prior to 1954, because there were no pipelines and there was no problem. This merely points up as I have said earlier the greater need for measures of public protection when a government is active with an active economic and social program. Then the only other one, I said there were three is the Crown Corporation Act. Section 8 of that act provided for the expropriation of businesses, and that was repealed in 1957 because it was found to be unnecessary.

His Honour's speech, Mr. Speaker, suggests that the expropriation proceedings of this province in

common with all of the other provinces in the Dominion of Canada, are today archaic and mediaeval in their concepts. They are based on the assumption that somehow the right of the Crown is paramount, and at all times and under all circumstances superior to the rights of the individual. Running through these acts is the principle that the Crown simply takes what it needs and what it wants and then recourse is left to the individual to seek compensation in the courts or from some other statutory tribunal. Undoubtedly something can be said for this arbitrary and one-sided approach in times of grave national emergency, or when the vital interests of the community are in jeopardy — when the survival of the state depends upon immediate, even though arbitrary actions. One can imagine that in times of war or in times of grave national disaster for example when conflagration is sweeping a city. You would hardly expect the defence authorities to negotiate with the owners of property before blasting a fire guard through the built up area. These are areas that come under federal jurisdiction.

With governments who are merely building roads, and I say this in no sense derogatory to the Department of Highways, governments who are doing these things of a local character — things which are merely a public service rather than a matter of grave national emergency — building roads, power lines, gas lines, governments carrying out the host of welfare measures in connection with hospitalization, medical care plans and so on, it would, I believe, be consistent with the urgency of the situation if sufficient advance planning could be done that arbitrary expropriation could be avoided.

On the other hand there may be cases, even in these areas, where there is urgency for immediate public action. In such cases it may be possible to enforce some other kind of control, — to require the government agencies to establish before an independent tribunal the urgency of the matter and to receive authorization for the taking, without previous settlement of compensation. Perhaps in these cases it can be arranged that the expropriation agency or the “taking” agency would obtain a prior Order-in-Council or a prior order from the courts or from a judge in chambers based upon some prima facie case of urgency of public importance.

It is the intention of the government as forecast in the Speech from the Throne to assign this whole area of study to a Crown Solicitor who will do the task of consulting, of meeting with the various

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

agencies of the crown and the various local government authorities and interested private and public organizations, such as the Bar Association, the farm organizations etc. with a view to redefining the civil rights of the citizens, as against the crown in expropriation proceedings with a view to clearly delineating those areas where the interests of the community should be dominant over the interests of the citizens and to define as fairly as possible and with as much precision as possible the rules which should apply in computing the compensation due the owner.

This I suggest, Mr. Speaker, will be another first for Saskatchewan. I suggest that this province, demonstrates again its interest in the rights of the citizens, as against the overwhelming powers of the state. It demonstrates I suggest that this government is primarily concerned with individual liberties and with individual rights and privileges.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, at the end of His Honour's speech there is a paragraph dealing with the Mechanics' Lien Act.

“This act was first passed in the province in 1907. My government now believes that it is now appropriate to review this legislation in the light of modern economic conditions. The Hon. Harold F. Thompson has been commissioned to hold hearings on the question and to formulate recommendations.”

Mr. Speaker, the principle behind the Mechanics' Lien Act does not owe its origin to the British common law, but rather to the New England states of the early American union. Sometime in 1790 this kind of legislation was passed in two of the New England states. Its principle was imported into the law of Manitoba and Ontario by statute in 1873. Basically this act is designed to provide security for the suppliers of material and labour used in the construction of improvements upon land. This act gives to the supplier a lien against the land itself, which he may realize upon by the sale of the land on order of the District Court. Out of the sale proceeds he may recover payment of the amount of his claim.

The act provides that this lien shall take absolute priority over all claims only in those cases where the lien is filed in the Land Titles Office, within thirty days. The owner's liability extends to include the people who supply the materials and labour to the contractor, up to a maximum of 20 per cent of the value of the contract. The owner may, indeed he shall, under the act, withhold 20 per cent of the contract price as the building progresses, and until 30 days after the building is finished, at which time he shall pay out of this trust fund any unpaid claims by material men, sub-contractors, or wage earners, up to the limit of the 20 per cent. Any of them who may not have been paid by the general contractor are thereby insured of protection for their wages and for the price of material. If the owner complies with this provision, reserving 20 per cent to pay these claims, he has then discharged his obligations under the act and need pay no more.

There are other and more complicated provisions of the act, which I will not go into at this time. It has been said that this requirement, that the owner withhold 20 per cent of the contract price, places a hardship — a burden — upon the contractor and upon the sub-contractors, because it means that the contractor must pay his workmen in full, in due course, even though he doesn't receive payment from the owner in full — even though he received only 80 per cent until the project is completed. It means that the contractor must pay the sub-contractor in full — that the sub-contractors must pay the workmen and suppliers of material in full. This gives rise to the necessity for a good deal of dissatisfaction on the part of the construction industry. The burden which this places on the construction industry is, I think, best illustrated by a case that came to notice last year in connection with the construction of the penstocks at the Squaw Rapids Dam. Here the general contractors, Perini, (Quebec) Incorporated, first tendered for this work and was awarded the contract at a price \$9,955,604. Subsequently they offered to rebate \$200 thousand if the power corporation would agree to withhold only 10 per cent, instead of the statutory 20 per cent.

It should be pointed out of course that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, as an agency of the crown, is not bound by the provision of the Mechanics' Lien Act and is free to decide for itself whether it should make a hold-back, but I think everyone will agree that public policy would dictate that the power corporation at least hold the workmen and the suppliers as well protected as

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

if they were a private corporation, and in the event that the contractor did not pay these legitimate claims, I think the power corporation would feel bound to pay them, even though not required to do so by law.

In consideration for reducing the hold-back from 20 per cent to 10 per cent the corporation saved \$200 thousand on this contract. This reduction amounted, as I have already suggested, to 2 per cent of the contract price. Now, no one can say whether the reduction would have been more than 2 per cent, perhaps it would have been 4 per cent — if there had been no hold-back at all. No one can say how much of this \$200 thousand saved is a real saving, because of course one must offset against this the cost to the corporation of interest on this money, if they did not hold it back. Even assuming the cost to the industry of complying with this act is only one per cent, this still represents a burden of \$3½ million on the people of this province as a result of having this act. If it should be found on inquiry that this provision in the act can be altered, or if in some way it can be brought into line with modern conditions, with less burden to the industry, then any saving the industry will enjoy would be an advantage to all the people of the province.

I do not propose to go into any more detail about this legislation, except to say, the government has had numerous representations on this point from many organizations. I would point out that the government has been aware of this problem for some time, as far back as 1959 the government raised this matter at the annual conference of uniformity commissioners. At the 1960 conference this brief extract from the minutes, will I think illustrate the position of the government of Saskatchewan on this matter at the 1959 conference. I read from page 64 of the proceedings of the 42nd annual meeting of the Conference of Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation:

“At the 1959 meeting, following a discussion of the report submitted by the Saskatchewan Commissioners with respect to the above mentioned subject, the following resolution was adopted in 1959.

“Resolved that the Saskatchewan Commissioners be asked to continue their study of this subject and to submit a report thereon at the 1960 meeting of the conference, and that the British Columbia Commissioners be requested to submit



a report also on the situation in their province.”

“In the said report, it was stated that the Attorney General of Saskatchewan had appointed a Law Reforms Committee, and that the committee was considering the preparation of a draft Mechanics’ Lien Act, that it could recommend for adoption by the legislature. In view of these developments the Saskatchewan Commissioners considered that it was inadvisable to proceed with the preparation of a draft act for submission to the conference at that time and therefore recommended that the further consideration of a model uniform Mechanics’ Lien Act be deferred for at least one year. We have recently been informed that the Law Reform Committee has come to the conclusion that before a satisfactory Mechanics’ Lien Act can be drafted information and representation should be requested from the legal profession and other interested persons. Since the Law Reform Committee as constituted cannot do this, the committee has recommended to the Attorney General that a special committee with particular knowledge of these problems should be appointed to receive such information and representation. We have been further informed that while the government of Saskatchewan may consider establishing such a special committee, there is no likelihood of any steps being taken in this respect this year.

“It is therefore recommended that this subject be dropped from the agenda for the time being with the understanding that the Saskatchewan Commissioners will make a further report when they consider that circumstances are such that it would be advisable to prepare a draft model act for submission to the conference.”

It may be therefore that as a result of the work of this commission, we can not only get legislation in this province, but have some hope that similar legislation will be adopted in all of the other provinces of Canada.

I should like however to give this assurance at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the government does not contemplate taking any action which might remove or weaken any necessary elements of protection to working men engaged in the construction industry. So far as the

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

rights of working men are not protected by other more recent and perhaps more effective legislation, then any protection which they enjoy under this act, will I am sure be continued. The government is pleased indeed to be able to obtain the services of a jurist so eminently qualified for this study as the Hon. Harold F. Thompson. We hope that out of the hearings of the commission, and out of these deliberations will come a new Mechanics' Lien Act for all of the common law provinces of Canada.

Now Mr. Speaker, since I cannot complete my remarks before 5:30, I would suggest we call it 5:30.

The assembly recessed at 5:30 p.m.

The assembly resumed at 7:30 p.m.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, before resuming my remarks I would like to make a word of explanation to you and to the hon. members and a word of apology if I may. I must say that I have always been under the assumption that the general rule of the house prevailed, that the speaker who caught the Speaker's eye had the floor, except during radio broadcast time, and I must say that I had understood that the hon. member who was supposed to speak this afternoon was intending to get on five minutes before four o'clock and take advantage of some radio time. When he didn't do that, when he was unable to do that, I assumed that was the end of the understanding. I want to say, however, that I apologize most sincerely for any embarrassment it may have caused to any hon. member, that I rose to my feet when the hon. member was intending to do so, and had arranged with the whip so to do. I want to make it perfectly clear that this misunderstanding was entirely my own and is not in any way attributable to any failure on the part of the whip on the government side, and I want to say that I regret very much that my precociousness resulted in the hon. members taking the action which they did. I also want to say that I have been thoroughly chastised by my colleagues and I hope my hon. friends will accept my apologies . . .

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, when I asked to call it 5:30 I was on the point of making some reference to the problems in the enforcement field of the Securities Act. I want to report to the house that in 1961, after

experimenting with some reduction in the staff of the Securities Branch, the combination of the position of the Director of Enforcement and the position of Registrar, that we again expanded the staff in 1961 and reinstated the two separate positions, and recruited a new person to that agency. I am pleased to report to the house Mr. Speaker, that the general situation in the field of Securities Act enforcement is continuing to improve. Saskatchewan's reputation as a province having a vigorous system of law enforcement and as a province requiring the highest degree of accountability on the part of securities issuers and brokers and salesmen, is paying off in 1962 as in 1961. We have had no large scale illegal promotions in this province during either of the last two years, notwithstanding the fact that there has been a general upward trend in the general field of securities promotion.

This upward trend is illustrated by the fact that the number of licensed full time and part time brokers has increased from 73 in 1960 to 75 in 1961. The number of security issuers licensed in this province has increased from 25 in 1960 to 26 in the same period last year. The number of salesmen licensed in the province has increased from 439 to 589. The number of investment dealers has increased from 10 to 12.

In the area of processing and accepting prospectuses for filing there has been a similar small but satisfactory increase. The number of mining association prospectuses increased in 1960 from none to one in 1961, a very substantial increase percentage-wise.

The number of industrial prospectuses pursuant to section 39 increased from 66 to 90. I suggest this is some measure of the comparative level of industrial activity in the two years. The number of investment prospectuses accepted for filling increased from 21 to 26 in 1961. At the same time the number of prospectuses which were processed and which were refused by the commission or abandoned by the applicant increased from three in 1960 to seven in 1961.

The revenues of this branch from fees for registration has increased from \$43,470 in 1960 to \$50,399 in 1961. At the same time the operating expense of the agency has increased from \$26,700 in 1960 to \$30,822 in 1961. These statistics reflect I submit a very satisfactory but normal growth in investment activities. This represents a constant and steady upward

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

rise in the level of investment activities which commenced in Saskatchewan in the early 1950's.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more and more widely understood that the work of the securities commission does not include responsibility for insuring that companies are successful, that companies make a profit, that investors get their money back with dividends. The purpose of the securities commission is becoming better recognized as an agency to ensure that the Securities Act is observed, to ensure that stock promotions are carried on according to the rules prescribed in the act and the regulations. People are coming to recognize that it is possible to invest money in a speculative venture, and to lose every cent of it, and still for the law to be scrupulously observed nevertheless.

Some complaint was made in this house and again today in another place, some interest has been shown by several members, in reference to the financial affairs of a firm known as Crescent Dairies. Mr. Speaker, I would not take the time of the house or go to the trouble of dealing with the affairs of one very small fish in a very small pond, if it were not for the fact that this company has been referred to, this promotion has been referred to already on two separate occasions in this house. Several members have indicated an interest in knowing the true facts of the situation.

I should report to the house that last March I first received a letter complaining of losing money in this promotion. I directed the securities commission to make a thorough inquiry. The commission did and they published, or they prepared a report under date of June 19, 1961, and since this report Mr. Speaker, is a public document and since it is on file and available to the shareholders who asked for it, I think it is appropriate, since several members of this house have asked that I deal with it, that I read this report. There are three pages but I think it will place the facts regarding this particular company squarely on the records for members to peruse at their leisure if they wish in the Hansard.

“The company was incorporated in July of 1958, in Saskatchewan. Its business has been and is the manufacture, purchase and sale of dairy products. Its authorized capital is \$250,000 divided into 25,000 common shares with a par value of \$10.

“The company filed a prospectus with this Securities Commission in February of 1959. The most significant point in that prospectus is, in my view, the plain disclosure that from this ‘first offer of securities by the company’ (the language quoted is from page 4 of that prospectus) the company hoped to gross \$122,500 (from a proposed sale of 12,250 shares \$10, less 20 per cent commissions) and to net \$98,000. The plans reflected in the prospectus (at p.5) demonstrate a clear and seemingly very reasonable need for the entire net proceeds of the proposed stock offering, viz., \$98,000. By the spring of 1960, however, the company had managed to raise only \$40,300 (see its audited balance sheet, properly certified by its own chartered accountants and see also near foot of page 2 of Crescent’s prospectus of May 3/60) from the sale for cash of 4,030 shares @ \$10. These modest gross proceeds of Crescent’s offering, instead of the desired \$122,500, resulted, of course, in Crescent’s having only one third of the capital necessary to enable the company to carry out its business venture. Despite the grave handicap which inevitably resulted therefrom, the audited “Statement of Trading and Loss & Gain Account” for the period Nov. 1/59 to Mar. 15/60 showed a modest gross profit and a net loss for that period of a size sufficiently modest to suggest that adequate financing could achieve that which was at all stages shown in the prospectuses to be the corporate goal, viz., the creation of a successful small dairy company. Crescent decided to make a further effort to raise the needed capital.

“The company filed its second prospectus with this Commission in May of 1960. It is dated May 3/60. The offering this time (see p. 2 of the prospectus) was of 18,770 shares @ \$10, to net (after costs of selling) \$163,275. In addition, it was proposed to borrow an additional \$50,000, towards a new factory. It is significant, in my view, that \$40,000 of this total was, in effect, to pay for existing realty and personality which would have been paid for in full had the first offering of shares been well accepted by the investing public and \$23,275 was to provide working capital. The remaining \$100,000 was to be used

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

for construction and equipping of the new factory. Unfortunately for the future of the company, only about \$40,000 cash was realized from the sale of shares on this second offering. Another 5,000 shares were sold during the 2¾ year corporate history in consideration of such property as a house, automobiles, and dairying plant and in lieu of payment of such indebtedness as commissions, salaries and plant improvement services (see detail on page 9 of Wagar report of May 30/61). The \$50,000 was never borrowed. In all, then, during its 2¾ year history Crescent Dairies has received from the investing public only about \$80,000 (before payment of the 20 per cent selling commissions), whereas it needed more than double that amount plus a \$50,000 loan.

“The principal assets acquired by the company at its inception from its promoter, Raymond Resky, were realty at Waldheim (a dairy) upon which an independent realtor placed a written valuation of \$22,725; dairy equipment upon which an independent evaluator placed a written valuation of \$6,450; a truck and about 7,000 pounds of cheese worth about \$2,800. For this property the promoter received reimbursement of his \$3,000 cash outlay therefore, assumption of his \$27,000 indebtedness thereupon, plus 2,000 shares worth \$20,000. In the result, he made no cash promotional profit from this transaction but could have a substantial stock profit if, and only if, the venture prospered. The two written evaluations were received by this Commission before the first prospectus was accepted for filing, together with a Solicitor’s certificate of title as to both realty and personality. The foregoing information has seemed deserving of detailed listing by reason that (I am informed) harsh suggestions have been made that the promoter and former President of Crescent Dairies, Raymond Resky, “unloaded” almost worthless realty and chattels upon Crescent. In fact, as I have already shown, Resky received 2,000 shares of stock worth \$20,000 as his promoter’s interest and no cash advantage whatsoever. Moreover, the Securities Commission escrowed all but 250 shares of this stock and to this day Resky has profited from the promotion to the extent of only \$2,500 (i.e. the proceeds of his sale of these 250 shares) plus his modest salary of

\$20,324.93 for almost three years' work (i.e. a salary of about \$7,000 per year). Resky had to take much of his salary in shares (1,102 shares worth \$11,020) and he apparently liquidated them at their cost to him (i.e. at \$10). In my observation he has been unjustly abused and reviled.

**Examination of and Commentary Upon Chartered Accountant Wagar's Report of May 30/61**

"I direct your attention first to Exhibit B, the 'Statement of Operations for the six months ended April 30/60'. You will note that the essentials of the unhappy financial history of Crescent Dairies are there presented very clearly . . . its total dollar sales of cheese and cream were substantially less than the cost of these products, before meeting the general overhead. The expenses which made up the overhead in question seem reasonable (see listed on Ex. B), both item by item and as a total. The expenses for share sales and organization (also listed on Ex. B), appear reasonable too. However, the combination of a selling loss of \$11,757.66 (by reason of the fact that the cheese and cream cost that much more than their actual sale price) with expenses totalling more than \$17,000 produced a six months' operational loss of \$29,002.90. Where a company raises from the investing public a total of only about \$80,000 cash (i.e. the total cash sales of stock in the two share offerings), before stock selling commissions are paid, and requires fixed assets costing \$88,502. (see Wagar's balance sheet, Ex. A to his report), it is self-evident that its economic chances are small or non-existent, in my submission. Where, additionally, in its early and formative years it commences losing money at the rate of \$58,000 annually (even though the period of the operating loss is as short as six months), economic collapse is likely to occur without reference to the efficiency of its management, I suggest. Crescent Dairies has not collapsed, however, and at April 30/61 its assets still exceeded its total liabilities by \$22,499.01. However, since all but \$7,225.13 of its assets are fixed assets, its financial condition is obviously parlous indeed. It could seemingly

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

at any time be thrown into bankruptcy by its bankers, its trade creditors, its employees, certain of its shareholders who have lent money to it, the persons and companies who have sold its major realty and personality to it, or any of them.

“This is all of the comment which I need offer upon the general economic condition of the company. I next review the content of the twelve numbered pages of the Wagar report of May 30/61 (having thus far confined my attention to Exs. A, B and C thereto, the financial statements).”

Now I am not going to read all of this but I will just conclude by reading the last two paragraphs.

“This report upon his enquiries directed at reconciling cheese sales with cheese production clearly demonstrates that there has been neither theft of cheese nor embezzlement of the proceeds of sales thereof. On the contrary, this report shows how it has been possible for the company to be so very unsuccessful, in its second year, without any dishonesty upon the part of its management . . . Mr. Wagar has calculated the costs of cheese production at 39¢ per pound, exclusive of office overhead and selling expenses, while its average sale price was about 35¢ per pound!

“The section 36 financial examination which has been carried out by Mr. Wagar reflects failure due primarily to inability to raise enough capital. The fact that the cheese was manufactured and sold for much less than its cost could stem exclusively from this insufficiency of capital. This commission and its auditors may not and do not weigh or inquire into the efficiency of corporate management. No misconduct warranting action by this Commission has been discovered.

I recommend that this report to you, together with the Wagar balance sheet, reports and financial statements, be made available to the company, for its guidance and assistance, on condition that the Directors agree to show all of them to shareholders during ordinary business hours, on demand.”



Now, Mr. Speaker, I urge in references to this matter and to matters of this kind, that all hon. members have a duty to assist in the enforcement of this act and of the criminal law. If hon. members are aware of violations of the act, I feel it is their duty as public-spirited citizens to either direct the complaint to the police or the securities commission, so that proper criminal proceedings, if any are indicated, may be taken. If hon. members would remember that it is impossible for the securities commission to watch over the shoulder of every person engaging in the securities trade at all times, if they would remember that virtually the only method of prevention of stock fraud we have is the prosecution and punishment of offenders, then I am sure everyone would realize how important it is that steps be taken as soon as possible to pass on to the authorities any information that comes into his hands regarding fraudulent stock promotions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer briefly to one other aspect of the securities industry. During recent years it has become increasingly apparent that a revolution is occurring in the pattern of investments. Relatively larger sums of money are becoming available for the purchase of equity stocks particularly in well established corporations. Much of this money is coming from a multitude of small investors who neither have funds to spread their investments over a large portfolio, nor have experience in investment management. Here the so-called mutual funds can and do fill a real need and a genuine purpose. While virtually unknown a decade ago, mutual funds have enjoyed tremendous prosperity in the last ten years or so. This may be largely due to the fact that equity stocks have enjoyed the longest continuous rise in the stock market's history. This has resulted in the "old timers" in the mutual fund business growing by leaps and bounds and it has attracted some newcomers to this field.

Now the operation of a mutual fund is a very sensitive area. It raises not only the usual problems of care and prudence in the management of monies in the fund, but it also raises some very ticklish legal and ethical questions, particularly for the people whose responsibility it is to direct and manage these funds. Here you have the pooling together of millions of dollars, large sums of money placed in the hands of the board of directors of the mutual fund, and the directors must act as trustees for this fund. They must invest it wisely, not solely to gain earnings by way of dividends and interest

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

but invest it so it will achieve substantial capital gain for their investors as well. The mutual funds themselves have no other place to turn to recruit this kind of management, this kind of directors, except to the leaders in the financial community. These people take on responsibility for helping to direct the course for the mutual funds, and yet each of them has of necessity large financial interests in a multitude of Canadian companies and it is very important and they consider it very important, that they never allow themselves to get into a position where there is a conflict of interest between their private interests and the interests of the mutual fund.

When you consider the vast opportunities that present themselves in this kind of operation for “slick dealing,” for conflict of interest or secret profits, — opportunities which do not lend themselves to ready detection, — then I think we must admit it is remarkable indeed, humans being what they are, that there has been no problem in this area of defalcation, or defrauding, of the investors in Canada to date. The opportunities which present themselves in this field, however, have not been lost in the minds of some less high principled operators in the securities business. In recent months there is some evidence that this field is being invaded by the “quick buck artist” and the “big bonanza boys” of the speculative stock industry.

This first came to the attention of the Saskatchewan Securities Commission six or seven months ago. There is nothing illegal that you could actually put your finger on, but some indications, some suggestions, that some of the less desirable elements are moving into this highly tempting field.

Last year at the annual conference of Canadian securities administrators, the leaders of the financial community assembled in this city. Saskatchewan took advantage of the opportunity to draw to the attention of the industry that there was this prospect, there was this danger, that the mutual funds industry ought to have some kind of self-policing protection.

Governments so often fail to detect an incipient fraudulent scheme until after people have had their fingers burned. This is an area which through the alert action of the Securities Commission we are forewarned to some extent. Now the government could come to this house with vigorous legislation aimed at the regulating of the mutual fund industry. It would be virtually

unworkable, however, because in the first place the mutual funds all have their head offices in other provinces, and only sell here incidentally. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to adequately protect the investor on a provincial basis. So by raising this matter with the industry last summer, by alerting them to the dangers, by warning the responsible elements of the mutual fund industry, that something should be done by themselves to police their own industry, we feel we may have been able to be helpful to protect the investment of Canadians.

In this connection I would just like to read a brief editorial comment that appeared in Saturday Night, the March 3, 1962 current issue. It is called:

“Policing High Pressure”

“The Mutual Fund industry has announced that it intends to form a self-policing association. Such an announcement is welcome, since there is need to keep any segment of the investment industry as healthy and honest as possible.”

Further on:

“But there have been complaints recently that the selling of mutual funds has, like that of some other investments become quite high pressure.”

This is one of the symptoms that the profiteers may be getting into this area.

“If a self-policing organization can weed out these fraudulent operators we are all for it. But the organization will have to be well informed, resourceful and tough. If it is not the public will demand a less interested method of control than one which an industry, on the face of it can set up for itself.”

We may be sanguine to expect that the industry can and will police itself in this respect, but we have the example of the investment dealers association which does an excellent job. We never get any complaints about high pressure selling, about any other dishonest or shady activity on the part of members of that organization. This is because of the vigorous control and the intelligence of supervision which this association exerts over its members. So I say in Saskatchewan we will be watching with interest just what steps the mutual fund industry does take to protect its investors from the fraudulent

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

element and if it takes no action by next summer, Saskatchewan will again raise the question of the desirability of having uniform provincial legislation in the various provinces of Canada to cope with this matter, and as I have already indicated this is the kind of matter that can't be adequately regulated by legislation in any one province alone.

This illustrates and points up once more the urgent need for some kind of amendment to the constitution permitting dominion regulations in this field, so that it will be possible to have more effective control for the protection of the public. Saskatchewan has taken a role there too in urging this kind of legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I finish I would like to draw attention to the last two paragraphs of the Speech from the Throne, dealing with the proposal of the Government of Canada to amend our constitution. I intend to deal only briefly with this matter, but not because I consider it one of secondary importance. Indeed I consider it the most important issue facing Canadians at the present time. Every Canadian who wishes to see our nation in a position to deal without hindrance or restraint with the problems that will come up from year to year in our future — every citizen who looks forward to the progressive development of our country — will want to see the adoption of some reasonably flexible mode of amending our constitution.

Today we hear talk about the need of providing national machinery for the orderly marketing of farm products. Indeed even as long ago as the thirties. Canadians were so far convinced of the desirability of producer controlled marketing boards for natural products, that the government of that day passed such legislation. The Natural Products Marketing Act was referred to the courts and was held to be ultra vires on the grounds that it encroached upon provincial powers.

There is talk today of the desirability of a national system of contributory old age pensions. Well, this also depends upon an amendment to the constitution.

There is talk about establishing a national labour code to provide a basic floor below which minimum labour conditions will not be allowed to fall, so that no one part of Canada may by reason of depressed labour conditions, act as a drag against progress everywhere else. This would require a constitutional amendment.

As I have already indicated there is need for some kind of national legislation to provide greater security from security frauds. Lawlessness in this field, whether it be in any province in Canada, reflects adversely against the economic development of every other province, and also reflects adversely on the reputation of every other province, and makes it more difficult for the sale of Canadian securities in foreign markets. So every Canadian has an interest in some kind of national securities legislation.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, putting the problem briefly and perhaps oversimplifying it, the constitution of Canada can be amended by an enactment of the Imperial parliament at London. Such amendments are made in practice only on petition of the Parliament of Canada.

As a matter of practice the Government of Canada asks the provinces their views on any such proposed amendments before passing a petition in the Canadian parliament. But in the only instance in the history of our country where the exclusive power to deal with a matter, and I am referring to unemployment insurance, — where the exclusive power to deal with a matter was transferred from the provinces to the dominion, not all the provinces expressed consent.

So it is now proposed to change this situation to make it more difficult to get amendments to the constitution by requiring all provinces to consent to any transfer of powers from the provinces to the dominion. This is what we mean when we say, the proposed amending formula places the constitution of Canada in a “strait-jacket.”

Here in Saskatchewan we are in the very happy position where there is no — as far as I know, — partisan disagreement on this principle. I have gone over the position taken by Saskatchewan at previous conferences and I believe that our present position in this regard is entirely consistent with Saskatchewan’s historic role.

If the proposed amending formula is adopted it means that henceforth no future amendments to our constitution would be possible to transfer from the province to the dominion or indeed vice versa without the unanimous concurrence of all the provinces in Canada. Even in the face of a determination by the parliament of Canada and the majority of the nine of the ten provinces, the nation would be thwarted by the recalcitrance of one province.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

I do not intend to take the time, Mr. Speaker, to fully review Saskatchewan's position. I would like, however, at this time to table a letter which I wrote on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan to the Hon. D.D. Fulton, Minister of Justice, containing Saskatchewan's reply to his letter of January 18th, asking us for our views on the federal government's proposal.

I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to draw attention of the members to a paper that was distributed here on Friday, outlining or summarizing the position Saskatchewan has taken at the four conferences that have been held to date. In that statement is annexed a copy of the draft proposal of the federal government, also a copy of the amended resolution that has passed by this house last year on March 28, 1961, and also a copy of a resolution of the Association of Canadian Law Teachers on the subject of constitutional reform. I suggest that it will be much more convenient to the members to find this position reviewed in writing than to have to listen to it described in a lengthy report in the assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say in conclusion that I will heartily support the motion to adopt the Address-in-Reply. I want to congratulate the mover and seconder for the splendid addresses that they delivered. In supporting the motion I want to say I support the Speech from the Throne, because it proposes a further advancement in the welfare of all our citizens without losing sight of the necessity of preserving the individual liberties of the individual. It proposes to push forward to open new frontiers of individual liberty and freedom, without at the same time succumbing to that fatal disease suffered by our predecessors, — of inertia for fear of doing something wrong. Mr. Speaker, I believe this Speech from the Throne sets forth the government's policy which goes right down the middle of the road. Social advance without encroachment on individual liberties, extension of freedom of the person without thwarting the desire in the community for an advancing social program, is worthy of the support of all hon. members. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, without reservation or hesitation will oppose the amendment and support the motion.

**Mr. Robert Perkins (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, I would ask for permission to say a few words in support of the resolution before us at this time. First, allow me to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this assembly. The honour could not have fallen on more deserving shoulders, and the

responsibility could not have been given to a more deserving individual. I wish to take this opportunity too, to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I had intended, if I might, to thank the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who placed this cigar on my desk yesterday, celebrating the birth of a daughter. I would like at this time to wish the young lady the very best of health and happiness. I can only say I trust she may not pick up any tastes from the atmosphere that her father appears to delight in circulating.

I would also like to add my humble welcome to the newly elected member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley). I have to admit that I was one of those who spent several days down in his constituency trying to induce his neighbours to keep him in Weyburn and not allow him to come to Regina. Apparently they were quite keen to get rid of him so we will be honoured with his presence on the opposite side of this assembly.

I can agree with the Weyburn member's suggestion he made while giving his address when he advised us that we should listen to our constituents and get all the information and advice we could from them. In this connection I would like to relate an incident that happened while I was visiting two of his elderly constituents just before the by-election. I went into a home and there were two elderly ladies there. I think they were old age pensioners. When I told them in whose interests I was canvassing, they said, "well we had intended to vote for Mr. Staveley, but since he was on the radio he seems to have become so abusive that he doesn't sound like Mr. Staveley at all." "Why", one of them said, "he sounds just about as bad as Thatcher."

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Who won the by-election?

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — Needless to say I had to assure them that I didn't think that was possible.

I would like to say a word or two about the constituency of Nipawin. This constituency which I have the honour to represent is largely devoted to agriculture, although the harvesting of forest products has become an

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

industry of considerable importance. Our area was also hard hit by the prevailing drought of last summer and harvested considerably less than half a grain crop. Logging of timber that was damaged in the extensive forest fires of last summer has served to take up some of the slack of employment caused by the short crop. The logging this winter is providing employment for quite a number of people.

This area of Nipawin constituency and surrounding district continues to supply a major part of the registered grain harvested and processed and sold in this province. In a normal year there are large crops, hundreds of thousands of bushels of grain and large quantities of grass and seed shipped out of this area to practically all parts of the world. The gleaning and processing of this yearly crop is developing into a fairly important industry, and the installation of several efficient and up to date seed cleaning plants both co-operative and private, are not only providing a good deal of employment but also encouraging diversification of farming methods in the area. Concrete products are manufactured in large quantities in our area in an up to date plant in Nipawin. There is a rapeseed processing plant in the process of construction and due to go into operation for next year's crop. The large alfalfa dehydrating plants are operating to full capacity in season, one co-operative and one private, and these also are helping the employment problem caused by the shock of the disastrous drought we had this past season.

Incidentally I would like to mention at this time that the processing and manufacturing of the products which I have mentioned are nearly all shipped out of the district by trucks. I would like to respectfully propose to the Minister of Highways rebuilding of No. 35 highway from Tisdale to Nipawin, the oiling of No. 55 from White Fox to the junction of No. 2 north of Prince Albert, as well as the rebuilding of No. 23 from Carrot River to Crooked River. These roads have for a long time borne well above the provincial average of traffic, and they deserve attention at the earliest possible time. They are of the greatest importance to most of the district and the provincial economy as well.

Mention is made in the Throne Speech of the improvement of highways and grid roads in this province, and I wish at this time to express the appreciation of the constituents of Nipawin for the efforts that have been put forth in this direction. Not too many years ago, not more than twelve or fifteen, it was impossible



to come from our home at Codette to Regina without negotiating dozens of mud holes right on the so-called highway. At the present time we can come from our home town to Regina, except for 20 or 25 miles that are in the process of blacktopping, on either blacktop or oiled highways. I am quite sure that many of the members in this legislature can recite a similar story.

There is another thing I would like to mention too, a project which has brought increased activity to our district, I refer to the building of the dam on the Saskatchewan River at Squaw Rapids, where for the first time the mighty Saskatchewan River is being harnessed by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to provide power for the expanding needs of the people of this province. This undertaking provided employment last summer for 1500 to 2000 people and the resultant payroll certainly had a quickening effect on the entire business life of that part of the community. In spite of the seriously short crop and the resultant effects on the farmers' spending power, many merchants have reported that business is thriving, many have told me that retail sales are at an all time high. Encouraging announcements have also been released lately in the Financial Post, that an amalgamation of the Kelsey Lake developments and Irex Iron Mines into a company known as the Choiceland Iron Mines will clear the way for further property and market studies under an agreement with Gunnar Mines. So much for some of the things with which I think the Speech from the Throne has a bearing on our local conditions.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to comment briefly on the speeches made in this house last week by the Premier and also by the Leader of the Opposition. I would refer especially to the word "socialist" which was mentioned so often by the Leader of the Opposition, in fact also by some of the other members on the opposition side. I kept track of it. I am not sure how accurate I was, but according to my computation the Leader of the Opposition mentioned the word "socialism or "Socialist", at least 45 times in his speech.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Don't you like the word?

**Mr. Perkins:** — This practice is also being indulged in Mr. Speaker, by the Liberal press in this province, and it is well illustrated in an editorial last Thursday in the Leader-Post under the heading "It Smells no Sweeter."

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We like to be called Liberals, don't you like to be called socialists?

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Mr. Perkins:** — On reading this one wonders — can the Liberals have no memory? Can they not remember the election of 1944 — when they used the scare slogan “Don’t vote Socialist — there will never be another election if you do — they will take away your land and chattels — your home won’t be safe.”

Then the following two elections fought on misrepresentation and fear propoganda. This current campaign of fear and defamation by the Liberal press in this province, and many of the spokesmen for the same groups, is in my opinion an underhanded way to seek political position.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. member? Is he objecting to me calling his party or he himself a socialist? Is he taking exception to the fact that we are calling . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Perkins:** — Wait until I get a little further on in my speech. The reason I am stating these facts is that he is harping on the word “socialist”.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Isn’t that what you want?

**Mr. Perkins:** — I would like to ask him what he means by it? For the past eighteen years the Liberal party has consistently attempted to undermine the efforts of the Saskatchewan people to build a better province under the CCF.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — Now they are doing exactly the same under the CCF section of the New Democratic Party.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — For years the Liberals have cried “Wolf, Wolf” spread falsehoods, spoken consistently in an attempt to instill fear of what they called socialism amongst the people of this province. Their efforts have been in vain. Recently there has been a new voice added to this partisan view. I predict he will be as unsuccessful

as those sitting opposite us. One has only to go back to May 1944 and read the Saskatchewan Liberal paper published by the Liberal party — he will find such headlines as these “No more private property — expect dictatorship will be necessary to make a change — land owners vitally concerned — socialism is a threat to their freedom — collectivization of agriculture is CCF plan today — family farm threat — and so on.

**Opposition Member:** — What was the date?

**Mr. Perkins:** — May, 1944.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — The Premier is back.

**Mr. Perkins:** — Mr. Speaker, what does the Leader of the Opposition mean when he shouts the Liberal party will wipe socialism out of Saskatchewan? What does the Liberal press mean when they ridicule this idea of people working together? Do these people mean they are against the people retaining through their democratically appointed government, the control and uses of power resources in their province? In other words would they sell the power corporation to private interests, or give it away?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We would clean it up.

**Mr. Perkins:** — If they believe this, why don't they come out and say so.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We would clean it up.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Perkins:** — Do these people mean they are against the people working together through their democratically elected government to supply themselves with health services, or would they scrap the Saskatchewan Health Services Plan? Would they give away or sell the ambulance service that the people have provided for themselves to private interests? This power of people working together can mean more than just governmental activity. This power of people working together referred to in the Premier's speech can also be taken to apply to co-operatives. The co-operatives of this and other provinces are rendering an inestimable service to the people of this province, and are a prime example of people working together.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Co-operatives aren't socialists.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Mr. Perkins:** — This campaign is going on right now. This campaign is now being waged Mr. Speaker, by similar enemies of group action, namely the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and the Northwest Line Elevators Association, who are spreading the charge that co-operatives are evading income tax. This is another clear cut attack on the principle of the people working together.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — We of the CCF section of the New Democratic Party know full well that the co-operatives are well able to forge their own weapons in this attack. We know they do not expect nor ask for assistance from any political quarter.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — They are not socialists.

**Mr. Perkins:** — But the fact remains that the opposition which they are encountering come from the same direction and often from the same group as does ours.

Another area in which a good deal of undue opposition is being generated is in the decision of organized labour groups to amalgamate with the CCF in the formation of the New Democratic Party. Charges are made that Labour has absolutely no understanding of the problems of the farmer. Also that rising labour costs are the chief factor in the rise of the price of farm machinery. A little study will show that neither of these assumptions are true. I would like to read one or two excerpts from a speech made by Mr. William Dodd, executive vice-president of the Canadian Labour Congress to the national farm forum in Winnipeg on March 18, 1960, and I will only read a small part of it. He starts out by saying that the art of propaganda is busy at work trying to drive a wedge between workers and farmers. Then in the third paragraph he says,

“It would be idle for me to pretend to a knowledge I do not possess on farm problems generally, or on the particularly complex problem of the rise and fall of farm prices.”

Then he goes on to say that you couldn't expect farmers to understand all of either the problems or the remedies suggested by the labour people, nor would you expect the labour people to understand all of the problems and their methods for solving them that are encountered by the farmers. Then he goes on to say:

“This acknowledgment of the privacy of each other’s decisions absolves neither labour nor farmer from the responsibility for taking into account each others problems. When unions demand and get substantial wage increases or exert pressure for political solutions to some of the city workers’ problems, the leaders of labour have an obligation, to consider the effect of their actions on farmers and other citizens. Similarly when farmers seek measures of trying to raise farmers’ income, they must also consider the effects of such measures on the prices of farm products to the city workers. The consequences and demands for higher wages and the tax burden imposed on the Canadian people as a whole. We are not here to talk about the problems of labour generally. This is a farm forum and the subject is confined to those aspects of labours’ activities which affect the farmers.

“At this point I want to thank the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce for providing labour with the opportunity of telling the farmers where organized labour stands in relation to their problems, and to tell them ourselves for once, instead of through the medium of an editorial in the Winnipeg Tribune, or the tenderly solicitous speeches of the Liberal members of the Saskatchewan legislature.”

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — Then he goes on to say that the current position of the congress is laid down in a resolution adopted at the last convention of the congress held in Winnipeg in 1958. This is the resolution:

“Resolved that since the continued decline in farm income is of grave importance to all citizens of Canada, the convention supports in principle the program of the organized farm movement for parity prices, which is intended to secure fair prices for farm products, to ensure an adequate return for the labour of the basic producers.”

It is an illustration, as you see, of the unqualified support given to the farm community by labour, yet leaving to the farmers the choice of the specific reasons. Then he goes on to give the different choices that are open to both farmer and labourer and he ends with:

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

“Out of pure sympathy, if for no other reason, we have a sincere desire to contribute in whatever ways we can to the easing of the farmers’ burden. This is also because we understand their difficulties. Changing consumer habits have unquestionably affected labour as much as farmers.”

Technological obsolescence and the resulting displacement of workers is something else which has affected workers since the beginning of the industrial revolution. Difficulties in export trade are shared by both farmers and workers. Farmers may have the vagaries of the weather to contend with but workers would have the vagaries of the business cycles and seasonal unemployment to contend with. This and several other statements which I have read, and conversations which I have had with labour leaders and people fairly prominent in labour unions recently have led me to believe that labour is not as ignorant of farmers’ problems as we have been given to understand.

I wish now to mention something in relation to farm machinery prices. In a statement compiled from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics from 1945 to 1957 it is shown that the price of farm machinery rose in that period by 94 per cent. These figures are taken from the DBS. It is shown further in this pamphlet that the proportion of labour that goes into the manufacture of farm machinery dropped between 1945 and 1957 from 65 per cent to 48 per cent. A drop of 15 per cent in wages as the proportion of farm machinery in that period. Added to this is the fact that the stand taken by organized labour on the basic questions such as public ownership, health and educational matters are very similar, and present, it seems to me Mr. Speaker, a broad field for agreement. This all goes to indicate, I think, that farmer and labour have many interests in common and they are reasonably well constituted for joint political action.

We in Saskatchewan must continue to demonstrate the same progressive determination that has consistently been shown by our pioneers.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Perkins:** — In spite of our great natural obstacles, the great distance from potential market, our severe and extreme climate, with its resultant drain of people who

have made their money here and go to sunnier climes to spend it, we must continue to exploit our great natural heritage in the best interests of our people and humanity as a whole. Believing in these principles, Mr. Speaker, and in the program as outlined in the Speech from the Throne, I will support the motion and oppose the amendment.

**Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, at this late hour, I find it hard to find words to say in congratulation of your appointment to the highest office in this building, without repeating some words that have already been said. Let me say that as one who has known you for many years, and one whom I feel has come close to you and become a close friend, I know and I am confident that you will continue to bring honour to this office, as your predecessors have done before you.

Before going any further I wish to congratulate the last speaker, for what I think was a good common sense speech . . .

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — . . . brought right down to the level of the ordinary person like myself and I know that his constituents if they could have heard him tonight would have been very proud. I would like to also go down the line and congratulate the mover and the seconder for the job they have done, and I know that this is never an easy job. The mover and the seconder have a great responsibility, and I know that their constituents too are proud of what their members have done in this debate.

I would like to add my congratulations to the new member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley). I, like the last speaker, was one of those who went down to the constituency endeavouring to see that he stayed in Weyburn, but you know as in all democratic processes, sometimes we win and sometimes we lose. This time we lost and next time we are going to win.

Before getting into my speech I would also like to say, and I know that I speak for all the members of the house, how glad we are to see back with us the Minister of Natural Resources, and the Minister of Co-operatives — back to normal good health, and it is nice to see them in their seats.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — Ever since I came into this house, it has been my habit that each year I could rise and give some report of the condition of the people in Touchwood constituency and because it is a rural seat, it has always been my habit to deal with the state of agriculture. Through the years I have been labelled a pessimist at different times when I said that the Touchwood constituency basically is small farmers, and that gradually the small farmer was being pushed out. I believe, it was six years ago, in my first debate in this house that I said that unless something drastic was done to change it, ten years from then the face of agriculture in Touchwood constituency would be changed to the point that we would hardly know it. What we went through in 1961 in drought and the lack of pasture, and the lack of water certainly has added to the hardship of the small farmer. We are basically a people of mixed farming. We depend on our livestock to supplement our returns from grain, and we certainly have found it hard — the farmers of this constituency — to make ends meet and to scratch up enough feed to keep our herds intact through this winter.

I want at this time, as I did in the last session, I want to say a word of appreciation on behalf of the people of Touchwood constituency for the prompt action of the provincial Minister of Agriculture and the federal Minister of Agriculture. Certainly the warnings that they issued in June, in which they scared farmers into starting to think about cutting their crops, was a good one. I know myself, I needed this warning, and it was only by cutting my own crop completely down that I have been able to pull my herd through this winter.

I want to say that this year proved the necessity of a crop insurance. Within my constituency we have a number of farmers who took out crop insurance last year. Certainly these farmers were the lucky farmers of Touchwood constituency. I only wish that all of the farmers had done it, including myself. I was unfortunate in being in an area in which we didn't have enough applications. Those farmers who did have crop insurance were lucky. They did receive their payments, and certainly they are the first to admit that this was a great help in finding enough money to scratch up enough feed to keep their herds going this winter.

One other thing that I feel obliged to say a few words on Mr. Speaker, are the lay-offs that have



happened at Fort San. Certainly, I think all members will be glad of the great progress that has been made in the eradication of tuberculosis. Certainly, I think the employees of the Anti-Tuberculosis League are the first to be happy with this technological advance. But the sudden decision of the Anti-Tuberculosis League to lay-off, with only a short warning of six weeks, thirty employees on the 1st of January, has led to some hardship. I certainly hope that something can be done to help these people who have been laid off already to find their way into the channels of the labour market in the coming months. I think there are two parts to the problem. There is the immediate problem of finding these people employment, and of course then there is the problem of what this government is going to do with the buildings. I hope that within a few months this government will be able to make some announcement as to the making of good use of these buildings, either in the way of old folks' homes, hospitals or making some positive use. At the same time, these people who would otherwise have to go out into the labour market will have jobs for them to keep going.

I want to say a few words to the Minister of Highways. I want to point out to him as I have pointed out before, that I feel that there is one stretch of highway No. 35 should be either oiled or blacktopped. The traffic on that stretch of highway from the valley to the junction of 22 on a Sunday in the summertime is certainly a death-trap. With the holiday traffic, the dust conditions are very bad and I certainly hope that when he announces his program that something along this line will be in store. I also want to give him a word of appreciation from the people along No. 52 highway that it is now being rebuilt. This highway, as the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) mentioned this afternoon, is a market highway for the people to go into the city of Yorkton from the district. A large area of the eastern part of my constituency use Yorkton as their shopping centre. I say on behalf of them, 'thank you'. I might as well go through the whole list. I hope that he can see fit to continue the rebuilding of Highway No. 15 towards the city of Melville (I am sorry the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) isn't here; I won't make the same mistake that my friend the member for Yorkton did this afternoon). I will say the city of Melville. I know the hon. member is a little touchy on that. There is one other problem that I think the Department of Highways is going to have to face up to in the very near future. With the increased traffic on highways going through the villages and our towns, dust conditions are bad especially in a dry summer like

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

last summer, and I say this not only for the Touchwood constituency, but I say it for the whole of Saskatchewan. Many of the residents of the villages and towns last summer were smothered in dust nearly all summer.

I wish now to go to another subject, Mr. Speaker, a subject that has been battered around in the last session and it has been battered around again this year in this session. I want to deal for a few minutes with the medical care program. I want to say that I am certainly glad that at last the government can give a firm date when this plan will commence. This medical care program is going to be not only a big help to the people of Saskatchewan but to the governments of Saskatchewan — the local governments of Saskatchewan. I think the R.M.'s and urban municipalities have good reason to look forward to the fulfillment of the plan being put into being. I would like to quote from the submission of the Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association — page 2.

“Assuming that municipalities can ensure their indigent people, it is quite evident that a medical insurance plan would help solve the dilemma that many municipal councils find themselves in from time to time. Such a plan would ensure councils that their responsibility towards their indigents could be properly carried out and at the same time would minimize the possibility of budget deficiencies due to uncontrolled medical expenditures.”

Especially those municipalities, and I have one or two of them where we have large groups of underprivileged and poor people, and the groups of Metis people and where the municipalities in the past have found that the medical care of these people can become quite a burden. Certainly a medical care program will assist the municipalities in this regard. As one reeve of one municipality said to me — from another standpoint, if we get the medical care program this means that without raising our budget we are going to have another \$6 thousand to put on roads. He said this is what we are paying presently for medical care for our indigent people.

I want to say that the municipal governments — local municipal government — are getting impatient with the doctors, and they are hoping that something will be done soon — that the doctors get down to arbitration with the government. Another reeve said to me last Saturday, I hope they are going to get down to bargaining with the government. I think, if I may say, there has been

quite a discussion in the house as to compulsory medical care versus voluntary medical care. I just want to put on the records of this house, the stand of several different organizations that are interested, and have been interested to present briefs to the government. The Saskatchewan Farmers' Union — page 9

---

“In conclusion we reiterate our support for compulsory prepaid medical care program for Saskatchewan, as a positive step towards providing the humanitarian needs of all the people, and raising the general health standards of our province.”

The Regional Boards of Health said on page 14 of their brief:

“Health service undertakes to provide care on a universal basis and it will involve the expenditure of large amounts of public funds, and must be administered by a public body responsible to the legislature. This principle applies to administration at the local level as well as the provincial level. Regional health authorities which directly or indirectly represent the electorate of local government must be involved.”

The Canadian Public Health Association said in part:

“The health benefits should be available to all residents and the financial support should be compulsory.”

It seems to me that one of the great arguments for compulsory medical care is that it takes the worry of large bills from the residents of this province. I might say Mr. Speaker, that at the end of the year in adding up my own account I find that I spent for myself and my family \$370 for medical care. I have a neighbour whose medical doctor bills last year were \$1200, and as a small farmer, he finds this money completely impossible to pay. I certainly don't think we are taking anything from the doctors. We would be giving them a secure income, and they won't have the worry about collections. I feel that they will have more time to spend in preventative care.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak too long tonight. One aspect that the opposition has been trying to pound away at, each one of the members who rose,

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

endeavoured to do the same thing. They talked about taxes and that taxes were too high. I don't think we can judge whether taxes are too high or too low, unless we study them in relation to the services that a ratepayer gets for those taxes. B.C. has a five per cent sales tax, but they have no medical care. We are going to have medical care. Ontario has three per cent on nearly everything that is sold including food stuffs, but they have no medical care. Quebec has 5 per cent, and they have no medical care.

**Government Members:** — Six per cent.

**Mr. Meakes:** — Six per cent, pardon me, I feel if the people of Saskatchewan want services and feel that the people of Saskatchewan do want them, then they will be willing to pay for them. They want a grid road program, which this government has contributed millions and tens of millions of dollars towards in the last few years, they don't mind paying for them. They want highways, and the highways have been rebuilt in this province over the last fifteen years — they don't mind paying taxes when they can go out and get on dust-free roads. They don't mind paying taxes if they are going to have the air ambulance to fall back on. I would like to ask members of this house, who in this province doesn't want a hospitalization scheme, and who doesn't want the increased educational grants? We all want these things and certainly taxes are the only way in which they can receive them — by paying taxes.

There has been quite a bit of talk about socialism and my friend the Leader of the Opposition really abused it. The member for Nipawin (Mr. Perkins) said it was mentioned 40 times. I went over the speech and I want to say that this was very conservative in his figure; my count was closer to 80 times  
...

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Are you ashamed?

**Mr. Meakes:** — I am not ashamed, and if my hon. friend will just keep quiet a minute — I was just going to say that I am not ashamed . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Why raise it then?

**Mr. Meakes:** — Give me time and I will tell you why. Because my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition would like

to have the people of Saskatchewan think that this is a dirty word — this is something undesirable, and certainly my hon. friend — my conservative-member friend is far behind the time — far, far behind the time. People in pretty well all walks of life are accepting the fact today that democratic socialism is a desirable thing. I am just going to call to witness one man . . .

**Mr. Foley:** — Why didn't you call your party that?

**Mr. Meakes:** — I am going to call to witness His Holiness the Pope, John XXIII, in which in his latest letter — encyclical he said . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — . . . Roman Catholic church.

**Mr. Meakes:** — I want to say to my hon. friend, that I am not Roman Catholic, but I am prepared to give credit to anybody who will come out and make a straightforward statement such as he did.

**Opposition Members:** — The first time I ever heard the Pope was a socialist.

**Mr. Meakes:** — I quote His Holiness:

“The certain safeguards observed will not restrict private individuals freedom. Instead it can increase personal initiative, promote the expression and the development of personal characteristics, and satisfy the demands of social justice.”

Of course my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, I don't think he worries too much . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . doing together.

**Mr. Meakes:** — You can call it doing it together. This is exactly the same thing as doing it together. If he wants to say that socialism is doing things together that is fine with us. I am sure that no member on this side of the house will deny this.

My hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition in his speech to this house made several statements and one of them that I thought was a dilly. He said that the

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

reason that municipal taxes are so high is because of the stinginess of this government to municipalities. Well now, if he were to take a look at the statistics, and I am not going to burden him with a whole lot of figures, but if he examines the bureau of statistics he will find that municipal taxes are no higher in Saskatchewan than in most other provinces. Not as high as some of the Liberal provinces.

**Opposition Members:** — What page is it on?

**Mr. Meakes:** — The Liberal government . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Are you quoting yourself there Frank?

**Mr. Meakes:** — He said the Liberal party would reduce taxes. I want to ask him if he is going to reduce taxes? I want to know what services he is going to reduce?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We are not going to reduce services.

**Mr. Meakes:** — This is the highlight now. He is going to reduce taxes, but he is not going to reduce services.

Then he went on, and I want to deal with this just for a minute or two. He went on and he listed the way a Liberal government was going to save money. Now I want you to remember that he said that he isn't going to reduce services. They would reduce the cabinet — the first thing. Well my answer to this — in my experience in this house for six years, certainly my view is that the cabinet ministers of this government work hard, and I am sure that if by some freakish chance he became the Premier, he would find out that the cabinet minister work plenty hard.

**Opposition Members:** — Which ones?

**Mr. Meakes:** — Then he went on and he said the next thing he would do is reduce the budget bureau. I want to say to him Mr. Speaker, that I don't think there is one government in the Dominion of Canada that hasn't got a budget bureau. I don't know just how he would get along without a budget bureau. Of course he is going to pull a budget out of the sky and he is going to pull a budget out without a budget bureau, without somebody to help him do it.

Then he went on and he said that he would do away with the planning board, or he would look at the planning board. Well, I am not going to burden my hon. friends, but if he wanted to read again from Pope John — Pope John points out that planning is a very necessary part of government. My hon. friend may laugh, but if he wants to read this . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That is what cabinet ministers are paid for — to do a little planning.

**Mr. Meakes:** — Then he goes on and he mentions the purchasing agency. I went to the trouble of looking up the report of the purchasing agency, and last year ending March 31, 1961, the purchasing agency saved for the people of this province \$515,123 by bulk purchases.

**Opposition Members:** — How?

**Mr. Meakes:** — By taking the price of the different bids, then taking the others and averaging them. Suppose there were five, and they accept the lowest one, they take the other four and average them. They don't take the highest, and they don't take the lowest — and find the difference. They saved \$515,123.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That is real socialist arithmetic.

**Mr. Meakes:** — Okay, it is socialistic arithmetic.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! If the member wishes to answer questions he will indicate by sitting down.

**Opposition Members:** — How many small town businesses did you put out of order.

**Mr. Meakes:** — If you take the last sixteen years — if you take the savings from 1946-47 up to this date it is \$6 million that has been saved. My friends can laugh at this if they like, but nevertheless this has been the saving. This is how my hon. friend is going to increase services and not increase taxes, by doing away with these expenditures, these wilful expenditures of this government.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

Then he went on and he mentioned he would do away with the Bureau of Publications.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What did I say? I said you spent 37 times more than the Liberals did.

**Mr. Meakes:** — . . . he looked at these things and then at the end he said he would at least look at them and analyze them. He discussed the Bureau of Publications, and all I have to say about it is this. There would be a lot of people mad, and not only CCF'ers, I have a lot of Liberal friends who enjoy the publications they receive every two weeks or every month from the Bureau of Publications. He would find that he would have to put them back or he wouldn't be very popular, if by the slim chance that he ever became the Premier of this province.

Then the next thing he attacked was the Agricultural Machinery Administration. I know that he said this was his own view and I want to say that I am sure that my hon. friend, the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), who I believe is going to follow me, doesn't agree with him. At least he has said before in this house . . .

**Mr. McFarlane:** — How do you know he is going to follow you?

**Mr. Meakes:** — Well he asked . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Well, we never know in this house who is going to follow.

**Mr. Meakes:** — I want to say this about the agricultural machinery administration. Every year there are more and more farmers in this province who will not buy new machinery until they have read the report of the agricultural machinery administration. My hon. friends over there can laugh, but nevertheless the Department of Agriculture of Alberta, and the Department of Agriculture of Manitoba are very interested in this piece of legislation and they would like to get in and help finance this administration.

Then he went on and he worried about the number of civil servants. All I want to say is this. If we are



going to have the services that the people of this province want, we are going to have to have civil servants to administer them. The day of administering without civil servants is long passed. I am sure that my hon. friends will admit this, that we can't have, for instance, a hospitalization plan unless we have people to administer it. I am sure that my hon. friend isn't going to be able to produce more services with reduced taxes by doing this.

Then he went on to talk about a certain individual who proceeded to leave the New Democratic Party. On this I have very little to say. I just want to say this . . .

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — First of all I want to say that I give any man the right to change his political affiliations or religious affiliations or any other affiliations. But, I am sure my hon. friends over there are worrying far too much about the New Democratic Party and what is going to happen to it. I say this, we may have lost one farm leader, but as long as we have men like Joe Phelps, J. Schultz, and the present Minister of Education, and the member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), all of whom have been farm leaders of this province for years, we don't have to worry about losing one lonely farm leader.

I know that my friends across the way are getting impatient to vote on the amendment, so I will sit down, but before I do I want to, just in case they don't realize it, I want to assure them that I am not going to support the amendment, but that I will support the motion wholeheartedly.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, first Sir, I would like to, as all hon. members want to do, and that is to express my congratulations to you Sir on being elevated to the high office as Speaker. I had intended to say a fair amount this evening and to continue tomorrow. I don't want to be in the position of having to stop at 9:30 for an amendment, and stop again at 10 and then stop again at 3:45 tomorrow afternoon, so I am going to try and make only one stop and that will be before 9:30.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

These are a few observations I would like to make about some of the remarks that were passed tonight. I was most interested in the second last member who spoke, the member for Nipawin (Mr. Perkins) when he took the Leader of the Opposition to task for using the word 'socialism' so frequently. He said you know you are attempting to vilify the government. To me, Mr. Speaker, that was a new interpretation of the word socialism — to be used in such a derogatory manner as that.

I can remember listening in on the radio in 1944, just after this government came to power and the former Provincial Treasurer, C.M. Fines. I heard him on the radio that night and he said this ushers in the dawn of a new day for Saskatchewan. It has established the beachhead of socialism on the American continent.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — They were proud in those days. They were very proud of this. Now the same member says that the Throne Speech makes this evident, that it sets down a policy that goes straight down the middle of the road. Quite a change.

**Hon. Mr. Willis:** — No deviations Alex.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Then I heard the member who just sat down say when he made reference to the NDP, "well I have very little to say about this." I notice that the other members who have spoken were likewise very discreet in what they had to say about the NDP. I wondered why? I think that the Premier set the pattern. He has a new policy and he calls it togetherness. Now they are the party of togetherness. We the people working together will usher in another new dawn for the province of Saskatchewan.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I wondered Mr. Speaker, what sort of a party they are going to come up with tomorrow or the day after.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Keep on wondering.

**Mr. Cameron:** — They have had so many now.

Turning to the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, I feel like the other members that made it so obvious that there is very little if anything in the Throne Speech to talk about. They didn't mention it. Of all the members that I heard, I only heard two that even uttered the words "Throne Speech". I think there is a very good reason behind that. I think Mr. Speaker, it is the most difficult task to discuss this Throne Speech in a manner in which a Throne Speech should be discussed. I think there are reasons for this. I think that the lack of substance in the Throne Speech debate reveals the purpose and the design behind the Throne Speech debate. This Throne Speech was designed, drafted carefully, in order to reveal nothing, to promise nothing, and to detract from all the problems facing Saskatchewan today. This lack of substance in the Throne Speech, I think, makes it the most revealing Throne Speech that this government has ever tabled in this legislature. Why? I want to give you my reasons for it. Because I think today, this Throne Speech, reveals clearly the extent to which this government is wallowing in the sea of stagnation.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — It finds itself unable to extricate itself. This government, Mr. Speaker, is bereft of ideas. It is sapped of all its energy and it finds itself hopelessly unprepared to face the problems that we have today in the province. They recognize this plight and knowing that, in desperation they turn to what they thought would be a new wonder drug name "NDP". They thought that a shot in the seat from this new wonder drug would remove the senility and restore the vigors of manhood.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Today Mr. Speaker, you will find that they are very disillusioned. They are more despondent than ever because they found that this NDP instead of giving them a new lease on life has become an albatross about their necks in Saskatchewan. That is why they are worried.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Why are you worried?

**Mr. Cameron:** — The only member that I heard in the Throne Speech debate that as yet isn't disillusioned was the junior member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder). He still is submitting himself to the full treatment. I would say to him that under the NDP he knows who his new bosses are. He brought

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

the voice of American Trade Unions to this legislature of Saskatchewan and received a sympathetic understanding that has never been accorded them in the Congress of the United States.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, this debate is growing to a close and I have sat in my seat waiting to hear members reveal what action this government plans to alleviate some of the problems facing the people of Saskatchewan today. But I listened in vain. I listened to hear some explanation of the program to deal with seed and feed and other forms of assistance to the drought area. I waited in vain from the minister this afternoon.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You will hear.

**Mr. McDonald:** — When?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I waited in vain to hear something about the critical problems in the field of education. The impasse that has developed between the teachers and the trustees of this province. Nothing has been said. I had hoped some accounting would have been given as to the progress that has been made in regard to a reorganization of larger school boundaries. Nothing has been said. Yet, for two years, they have been out in the field organizing and redrafting the unit boundaries, and it is time that something be done to bring this to a conclusion. I can cite you cases in my area, and I am certain they would be applicable all over the province, where school units today are in a position where they can't plan a construction program for next year or the year after, because they don't know what schools are going to be in their unit and what schools are going to be in the other unit. They are not in a position to make great capital expenditures on a number of schools here when the boundary lines — proposed boundary lines show they are going to be in the next unit. Those are problems that are facing the larger unit school board today, and it is bogging down the whole program. I would suggest that if you haven't finished the complete survey, at least in those units where you determine best where the boundary is going to be, make it so these unit boards can get on with the business of education.

I hoped Mr. Speaker, that someone would have dealt in some measure with the manner in which we might assist unemployment in Saskatchewan. Again I waited in vain. If unemployment was mentioned at all in this debate,

it wasn't more than once or twice. There is no program brought forth, and it wasn't even given recognition. When we realize that 70 per cent of our unemployed in the province of Saskatchewan are boys and girls in their teens and early twenties, then I ask is there no one on the government side prepared to speak up in a voice on their behalf to plan some type of program in order to qualify these young boys and girls for the skilled positions, as they are so needed today in order to ensure employment. Surely this legislature should be considering a program designed to that extent. They have offered nothing in the way of assistance to solve any of our unemployment problems.

I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the program that was submitted to the government, representing I take it to be the program of the NDP for relief of unemployment in Saskatchewan, that not one of them saw fit to bring this program to the attention of the legislature. Since they didn't do it Mr. Speaker, I am going to take the responsibility of doing it.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — They never brought their agricultural program in either.

**Mr. Cameron:** — These are excerpts from the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour to the provincial government, December 20, 1961, which they feel with their specific recommendations will ease the unemployment crisis in Saskatchewan. They preface their brief with a few pertinent remarks. They said, dealing with unemployment:

“The Federation is aware that any other government, for instance a Liberal one, would undoubtedly allow the situation to become worse. We are convinced more than ever before that private enterprise cannot solve the unemployment problem, that government action and government planning only can do this.”

Then recognizing that fact, they proceed to lay out a plan of government action for the province of Saskatchewan. These are some of the interesting recommendations — I am not going over them all, but I am picking out some of the key recommendations submitted to the government for its consideration.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

first they suggest that the government inaugurate a full production insurance scheme, an insurance scheme of full production. They suggest that this insurance scheme can be financed by a tax on private enterprise, for works to be planned by the government, so as to ensure full production and employment. You will note Mr. Speaker, that private enterprise can't solve the problem, but private enterprise should be called upon to supply the money for the government to solve it with.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Their second recommendation is to establish a provincial financial institution. In brief I would assume a provincial bank. The purpose of this would be to funnel into public investments in Saskatchewan, the pension fund, the life insurance and individual savings. In brief to aid the unemployment, to establish a provincial financial institution which would gather unto itself all of the pension funds, the life insurance funds, and the individual savings of the people of Saskatchewan in order to use them for a program of expanding public works.

Then they said further that they recommended to the government that they institute a pay roll tax on employees. What for? To provide for an increased number of labour inspectors to be sure the labour legislation is in force.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Whether I agree with these or not Mr. Speaker, they are at least concrete proposals submitted to this government. The NDP believes they have the answer to the problem of unemployment in Saskatchewan. They submitted it here in this brief, but apparently the government, as I said, have very little to say about the NDP. Apparently they intend to say little and to heed them even less.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to the citation of Beauchesne 131, where under the anticipation ruling, we cannot permit too much debate on an order on the order paper, and the member is aware that we have a motion on the order paper dealing with unemployment, so I hope that he will not go too much into that field.

**Mr. Cameron:** — No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Socialist dictatorship.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement.

**Mr. Snedker:** — I will withdraw the statement but I will now speak to the point of order. This is the Throne Speech debate, and the man can speak on anything under the sun.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Under Beauchesne the rules are quite clear — the rules of anticipation, that if there are bills on the order paper, then they cannot be discussed on other motions. Bills take precedence, motions next, amendments — in that line. We have to try and go by the rules of Beauchesne.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Not on the Throne Speech.

**Mr. Speaker:** — On the Throne Speech, or the Budget Speech. It is very clear and I have checked it on several occasions. I don't want to rule a member out of order. I am just asking him not to go too far because I believe that he has a point to raise, but I don't want him to anticipate the discussion of the resolution on the order paper.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of discussing the motion if there is one on unemployment problems. I am dealing with unemployment as a problem — a critical one facing the people of Saskatchewan. I am merely pointing out that the government apparently has no program for unemployment, and they have refused to even bring to the legislature for discussion the program of their own political party, the NDP. That is as much as I was saying about labour.

Having said that, I would like to make just a remark or two about the medical care program. I heard speaker after speaker get up and accuse the Liberals of being violently opposed to any prepaid medical care plan, and using obstruction tactics and doing everything in their power to prevent an agreement between the doctors and the government, not in any hope that the medical plan would be a success, but in a desperate attempt to make sure it would fail.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I resent those insinuations. I come from an area in which we pioneered prepaid medicine in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — I come from an area that set up a prepaid medical plan that is recognized as the greatest prepaid medical plan on the North American continent.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — I would point out Mr. Speaker, that that was done under a Liberal legislation set up before you came into power.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — They talk about the people of Saskatchewan being ready for prepaid medical insurance . . .

**Mr. McFarlane:** — . . . pay attention to your duties to the securities commission.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I would say to you that the people of Saskatchewan are ready for a prepaid medical scheme. Shouldn't they be ready? They have pioneered the field more than any other province or any state in the United States itself. They have pioneered in municipal plans; they pioneered in every type of medical care.

What they are looking for today and what these resolutions that were spoken of in here a few minutes ago were endorsing is not the government's prepaid medical plan, but they were an endorsement of a prepaid plan. I want to point out this Mr. Speaker, that we made our point abundantly clear that so far . . .

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — Do you have a means test?

**Mr. A.C. Cameron:** — No we have no means test in Swift Current and you should know it. We pointed out in the debate last session that the Liberal party stands firm on any prepaid



medical plan in regard to the principles that should be incorporated in it and we enunciated these principles that there should be no interference or nothing that would upset the patient-doctor relationship as it existed in the prepaid medical care plan at Swift Current. We said that insofar as possible, that fees of doctors should be placed on basis of fee-for-service and that when condition arose where some other means appeared to be more practical that such a means would be worked out after proper consultation and full endorsement by the medical profession. We pointed these out as some of the cardinal principles and we said that the cardinal principles of any prepaid medical plan must be with the aim in mind of improving medical care and striving for qualitative medicine not quantitative medicine. Thus we maintain that any prepaid medical care plan which would cause in any way trained specialists in the medical field not to participate or to leave the province is not a good prepaid medical plan, because it will lead to quantitative medicine not qualitative medicine. And we say this that the responsibility for the impasse that exists between the doctors and the government today must rest squarely on the shoulders of the government itself.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — We in Swift Current didn't find the doctors this great big bad wolf that you portray them; we have been able to negotiate with them; we have a relationship there that has been preserved with the co-operation and the support of the medical profession. Why couldn't it be done in the province-wide basis? Why are you just now beginning to say to the doctors, as the minister did the other day, we have now opened the door for genuine negotiations. Because when you brought the bill in you closed the door to negotiations.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Because the first press statement that was issued after that bill was passed was to the effect to the doctors, we are prepared to sit down and to discuss and to negotiate matters pertaining to health and the whole field of health care. But the bill has been passed and we will not negotiate changes in the bill. That was the time the door was closed.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Are you boys ever wrong!

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You are giving the story about Swift Current.

**Mr. Cameron:** — If you had been sincere in an earnest attempt to build upon the experience that you have had in Swift Current over seventeen years and in other prepaid . . . I told you who had started it, it was brought in under a Liberal legislation and we started it and set it up and operated it.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — And I don't mean we as the Liberal party. I mean we the people of the Swift Current Health Region. It was set up and it was operated by an independent board, independent of politics, without any strings attached and the only way that this government swung into it was to give us a measly 5¢ or a nickel on the dollar assistance.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — That is one reason why that plan has been so successful, because it was worked out by men and women who knew the worth and the value of prepaid medicine, and who were prepared to put their heads together in the spirit of co-operation and to work themselves with the medical profession in designing the plans that would be acceptable to both those supplying the service and those receiving it, and they have carried it on ever since. When you talk about your impasse with the doctors, you cannot wiggle out of your responsibility in that field itself.

I am sorry that I haven't more time but I said I would quit at 9:30 in order to take the vote, Mr. Speaker, I am in a quandary again . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Come back for more tomorrow Toby.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I think possibly you would want to clear the amendment before I adjourn the debate.

Amendment (Mr. Snedker) negatived on the following recorded division:

**Yeas — 18  
Messieurs**

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

**NAYS — 32  
Messieurs**

|               |            |           |
|---------------|------------|-----------|
| Lloyd         | Davies     | Perkins   |
| Meakes        | Willis     | Thiessen  |
| Williams      | Thurston   | Snyder    |
| McIntosh      | Wood       | Stevens   |
| Blakeney      | Nicholson  | Dahlman   |
| Brockelbank   | Stone      | Michayluk |
| Walker        | Whelan     | Semchuk   |
| Nollet        | Thibault   | Kluzak    |
| Kuziak        | Berezowsky | Peterson  |
| Cooper (Mrs.) | Kramer     | Brotten   |
| Strum (Mrs.)  | Johnson    |           |

Debate on main motion adjourned by Mr. Cameron.

**SECOND READINGS**

**Bill No. 1 — An Act to amend the Marriage Act**

**Hon. Mr. Davies (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, in giving a brief explanation of the principle of this bill, I should say that the Marriage Act, as we are dealing with it at present was amended in 1953. At that time procedures for the solemnization of marriage upon authority of a license or publication of banns were provided for. The procedure of banns of course was already provided by a number of churches and they have followed their own customs in this respect over the years. Since the 1953 amendment which mentioned the publication of banns, a number of religious denominations that have not in their own practices any customs laid down, have asked the government if they would mention in the act some minimum procedure for the publication of the said banns and on getting this request we endeavoured to draft something that would be in minimum form. This has

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

been submitted I may say to a number of the clergy of both the Protestant and Roman Catholic denominations in Regina and seems to be satisfactory.

The second main change that is mentioned in the bill is a procedure whereby the marriage commissioner may perform the marriage ceremony in other than the office of the judge. I think quite obviously the office may not be the best place for the performance of the ceremony. This amendment simply gives the marriage commissioner the right to make a change and have the ceremony performed in other than the office of the judge. With that brief explanation, Mr. Speaker, I think any other matter could be debated in committee and I would therefore move that Bill No. 1 be now read a second time.

**Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt):** — Before the hon. member sits down I would like to ask him just one simple question, and that is the names of which churches asked for this amendment.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not quite clear on precisely what bodies did ask for it but I can tell the hon. member this, that these amendments were placed before the following Reverend Gentlemen: . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — That is not the question Mr. Speaker, who wanted it?

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — As I have explained, Mr. Speaker, the changes have been requested by a number of religious bodies and I can't now as I said give the hon. member the names of these denominations. However, they don't have practices for publication of banns in their own customs so they have simply said, because there is a confusion in their minds, that they would like to have laid down in the act some minimum form for the publication of banns.

Now we didn't think this to be unreasonable, they haven't had the practices previously and they now wish to have some form of publication of banns for themselves. It isn't unreasonable that we should state them in the act.

So on getting this request we drafted changes for banns and again submitted these amendments to the bodies that have conformed to the practices as a matter of custom of submitting banns. These were as follows:

The Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Regina of the Roman Catholic Church, the Anglican Diocese of Qu'Appelle, the Secretary of the Saskatchewan Conference of the United Church of Canada and the President of the Manitoba-Saskatchewan District of the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod, as well as the President of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I would like to add a question to that Mr. Speaker, before second reading is moved, if all the proposed changes were included, I understand that one with regard to the registrar's office was never mentioned in the letters to the churches and I would like to state to the minister that the complete changes in this act were never placed before the officials of the United Church because they had no idea that this change in the registrar was going to take place.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The member may speak to the bill but he must not make a speech on asking the minister a further question before he takes his seat.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** — To his question I can only say that I think I said that the material on the publication re banns was presented to the church bodies. I made no mention of anything else.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is moved by the Hon. Mr. Davies that the Act to amend the Marriage Act be now read a second time. Is the house ready for the question?

**Mr. Snedker (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Bill No. 1 which we find before us, I understand from the minister that the changes in regard to the publication of banns were requested by some religious bodies, some of whom were in the custom of publishing banns some of whom were not. I also, if I heard him correctly, understood him to say that other changes that were made in the act were not requested by the religious bodies. Now I would draw your attention to one of the changes that was made in this amendment. Under the old act, before its amendment, a commissioner appointed for that purpose by the Lieutenant-Governor-In-Council, in other words by the government, might conduct a marriage for a fee of \$5. The man who was to do this job was an appointee of the government, and of course that has all the connotations of political patronage which anything this government does, has.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Sounds reasonable, Jim.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Now I understand the act is to be amended, by striking out all the words down to and including the word commissioner in the second line and substituting the following. “Marriage may be solemnized by a marriage commissioner,” note an appointee of the government, “And contracted in his office or some other place that he may select”. May I draw your attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that under the old act, before the amendment, the only place that a marriage commissioner could conduct a marriage ceremony was in his office. If the amendment which is before the house is passed, he will be able to conduct a marriage ceremony any place that he sees fit. He can marry a couple in his office; he can marry a couple on the street; he can marry them in the park; he can marry them in a hall; he can marry them any place at all. Now all this is leading Mr. Speaker, to an encouragement of marriages by commissioners. This has the effect of encouraging marriages by commissioners in or out of offices as the case may be in order that they can get their fingers in the pockets of the public for an extra \$5 each for these government employees. That is one of the reasons that this amendment has been slipped in here in the guise of being an amendment to the act which was asked for by certain religious bodies in the province. I don’t think any religious body in this province asked for any amendment, which would have widened the powers or given greater latitude to marriage commissioners to conduct marriages in office or anywhere else.

**Mr. Kramer:** — For or against?

**Mr. Snedker:** — Now I think I have got that idea pretty well across and I think I have indicated to all and sundry that I am going to oppose the amendments for the reasons that I have stated. I don’t think marriages should be conducted by commissioners. I believe marriages should be conducted in churches by Christian clergymen. I can very well . . .

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Snedker:** — . . . understand why this amendment was brought in to encourage marriages in registry offices, because in my humble opinion it was brought in by people who are socialists and socialism is based on a foreign ideology and an alien creed. I am going to oppose this amendment all down the line. I think I have made myself clear that I don’t believe in marriages in registry offices,

save and excepting for those people who through some disability cannot be married in a church at all. I am going to oppose it on those grounds, Mr. Speaker. I hope everybody understands why I am doing it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must warn you that the minister is about to close the debate, if anyone wishes to speak, they must do so now.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I would just like to say a word in support of the stand taken by the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker). I feel as he does that this is actually an important move that is being made and I think the gentlemen across the way have not accepted in the seriousness that the member for Saltcoats meant to present his particular case in this light, and I regret that people across the way have not more respect for the tradition of church weddings and church marriages than they appear to have by the ridiculous attitude that they have taken towards the remarks of the member for Saltcoats. I think it is an insult to this house that a member who rises in his place to make a serious statement . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — That side of the house.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — . . . about a bill that is before this house . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — . . . that he should be ridiculed in the way that the members across the way have done during this discussion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! We are debating this bill.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Well, I am speaking to the bill. I am speaking of the attitude of the members across the way on this very bill. I think since the minister stated that he did not have the opinion of the churches on this amendment, that he should take this bill back and he should present this amendment to the churches in this province and ask them if they desire to have this change brought about, which I think the member is quite right in saying, could encourage individuals to have marriages take place outside of churches that now take place within the church.

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

Because of course we all know as the minister stated that an office is not the nicest place to have a wedding, and of course if a commissioner or a registrar can have other places that are nicer to have weddings, to perform them, it is quite possible that more people might get married before a registrar or commissioner than do at present through the facilities of our churches in this province. I think it is unreasonable for the minister to come here and first leave the impression that this bill was placed before the churches of this province for their approval when this change was not mentioned, because this is the most important change in this bill and they have never been asked their opinion on this particular clause.

I am going to ask the minister if he will consider withholding the bill until such time as he receives the opinion of the various church bodies in this province as to this, which I think is the most important amendment, the other one was quite possibly asked for by different church bodies but he has actually admitted that the churches have never had an opportunity to express an opinion on this part of the act. So, at the present time if the minister insists on proceeding with the bill, I think that I would have to take the same stand as the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) and oppose the bill, because of this section being included.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, I can't agree with everything that has been said. I do think that there is a place, and I think that the law should provide a manner for marriage being solemnized without the clergy for those people who don't accept the Christian doctrine or perhaps have another religion that has no recognized form of marriage. I think this is necessary as part of our law. How that should be enforced is another thing.

There are two things before the house in this bill, two principles, and I do want to say this, for the record, and this has gone on very frequently. This government has brought in bills and ministers have brought in bills and said this has received the approval of this association and that association and these people and that and they leave the impression that it was at the request of these various organizations and then they slip in something on their own. I think this government should take the responsibility of bringing in legislation on its own shoulders. Bring it in and say this is our legislation. I think it is a fine thing if they consult other bodies but I don't think that they should lay the blame for legislation that they bring in on any church, nor the head of any church. I don't think for instance



that the Anglican and the Roman Catholic churches, who publish banns as a matter of practice, are going to be guided by this government. They are not going to change their canon law to conform with this government. They will conform with the law of the government so far as the state requires it, but they will still have their own methods; they will follow their own canon law in publishing banns. I don't think it makes any difference to them basically, and perhaps this is exactly what they told the hon. minister when he consulted them. I don't think it is fair to blame any church for this legislation unless a church has actually come in and said, we want some regulations about banns and if this is the case, that church should be named and there is nothing wrong with it.

If it is to fit one particular type of church organization we should certainly be told and I don't think that anyone is so narrow minded that they would prohibit any church organization from publishing banns in a certain way and making this law. If this was supposed to fit a particular case, that this as has been done a hundred times in even my limited experience when a minister brings in an act and instead of saying, this is what we want — he says this has been given us by a church, this has been given by a certain organization — this is the request of the organizations, and he leaves the impression that everyone has been consulted and everyone has agreed to everything in the bill.

As the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) pointed out, the churches were not even consulted in regard to the registry office part of this bill. That was not the impression that was left here by the minister. What is wrong with the very fine explanatory notes that we have concerning the bill? They were self-sufficient I think. If the minister hadn't seen fit to drag in the churches and drag in the fact that this was at the request of somebody else and this was approved by somebody else and had had the courage to come in and say this is what we want to be passed as the law of this province, there wouldn't have been this debate. As it is I beg leave to adjourn it.

Debate adjourned.

**Bill No. 2 — An Act to facilitate the Transplanting of Corneas from the Bodies of Deceased Persons to Living Persons**

**Tuesday March 6, 1962**

**Hon. Mr. Davies (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, in providing a brief explanation on this cornea transplant act, I think everyone in the house knows that in recent years a very good procedure has been found for the restoration of sight of persons who have either impaired or no sight, by the removal of corneas from the eyes of deceased persons and transplanting them to the eyes of those who need them.

Now we are told that it is the rule of law that there is no property in the body of deceased, so the testator may not validly bequeath his eyes on his death. A relative or his executor may say 'no' to the disposition or the willing of the corneas to an eye bank.

The commissioners on uniformity in legislation have prepared a draft bill, which is almost identical with the bill that we have before you, and the effect of this bill is that a person may make a valid testament so that he may will his eyes for the purpose of benefiting some person who has impaired sight, or no sight. I say again the provisions of this bill are taken from the draft bill, and I think that it is quite simple in every way, and I don't think I could say more than to move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

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