

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

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

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

ON ORDERS OF THE DAY

QUESTION: LICENSING OF TRUCKS

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Before the orders of the day are called I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. Has the government considered a reciprocal licensing agreement for trucks with the government of Ontario? If so, has any decision been reached by the cabinet, and would the minister make a statement at the present time?

Hon. C.C. Willis (Minister of Highways): — The question should be answered by the Provincial Treasurer. This comes under his department.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer): — I would like to advise members of the house that there has been very active negotiations with the province of Ontario on this subject. There were in fact representatives of the Ontario Provincial Department of Transport in Regina about ten days ago at which time I believe all outstanding issues were resolved, and I anticipate being in a position to recommend to my colleagues that we enter into an agreement in the very near future. I am anticipating there will be an announcement in a very short number of days.

QUESTION: REORGANIZATION OF MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. David Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view of the fact that reports of the Leader-Post that you are quite sure that

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

the county act will not be ready for submission to the legislature before the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities convention ends, and considering the fact that the reorganization will be a vital issue at this convention, I would ask the minister to reconsider and make every effort that the hon. members of this house and the convention delegates be privileged of having the act by Monday night.

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Is this a question, or are you asking me to consider a certain thing.

Mr. Thatcher: — Can we have the act before . . .

Hon. Mr. Wood: — I am afraid it is an impossibility. As you know we had a fall session and we have a new minister in the department, and this act is now in the hands of the legislative counsel, but I am afraid it will not be ready for laying on your desks, and I can't discuss it or have it ready for the convention until it has been laid on your desk. I sincerely hope it is available soon after, but I regret as well as the members opposite that it will not be available in time for the municipal convention.

ANNOUNCEMENT: SASKATCHEWAN SAVINGS BONDS

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to advise hon. members, and they may be interested, on the success of our current Saskatchewan Savings Bond issue and I would like to advise that until 5 o'clock last evening we had applications totalling \$1,016,000.00, which is just about the rate at which they came in last year.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Berezowsky, seconded by Mr. Thurston:

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, you will recall last night when I asked leave to adjourn the debate, I had been pointing out some of the definite findings of the Throne Speech

debate. I think I pointed out Mr. Speaker, that this debate is one of the most barren that has been brought into the legislature. I pointed out how in my opinion it is designed with a purpose behind it, it is designed to reveal nothing, to promise nothing, and to detract from all the problems facing us in Saskatchewan today. I think I went on and pointed out that this speech through its lack of substance gave evidence and clarity to the extent to which this government was wallowing in a sea of stagnation.

I went on and made reference to the old CCF having grown old and weary and finding itself sapped of all its energy, in desperation turned to the new prospective NDP. They had hoped this new arrangement, this shot in the arm so to speak, would remove them from their lethargy, restore them once again to some resemblance of vigor. I pointed out how disillusioned the members of the government have apparently become with their new arrangement with the NDP, and that this general atmosphere of the debate in the house made it abundantly clear that so far as Saskatchewan is concerned, the NDP has become a millstone about their neck. Now Mr. Speaker, I think I have sat in this legislature for fourteen years, and never during that time have I witnessed government members that are so bewildered, so bereft of ideas. It is most interesting to sit down during the debate and watch those members groping in the fog, clawing the air trying to find their way back to the sunlight.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I found it most difficult to believe my own ears when the elderly gentleman from Nipawin (Mr. Perkins) said that the opposition was attempting to vilify him and his colleagues by referring to them as socialists. I didn't realize before, Mr. Speaker, that the word socialist had become so distasteful. He went on to enlighten the house that he was attempting to build a party, not to be the party of the right, nor a party of the left, but the party that would march straight down the middle of the road. May I say to the hon. member from Nipawin, when you have come along the trail that far you are now rapping on the door of the Liberal party.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Now the Premier, knowing of this bewilderment,

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

trying to lead his group out of this fog, says that he is setting up a different party. His was going to be a party of togetherness. In essence he said to us, people of Saskatchewan follow me now, and my government, together with the people in this spirit of togetherness we will usher in a new dawn for Saskatchewan.

Let me say Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, before you launch a new party of togetherness you had better make a start on your Minister of Health, and let him get together with the doctors.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I may say to the Minister of Health, in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, cut out negotiating by the press and get down in a spirit of togetherness and co-operation in order that we can extend something of the wonderful prepaid medical care that we have had in Swift Current and give the opportunities to the rest of the people of the province to enjoy something similar. I would say Mr. Speaker, to the Premier that he had better have his Minister of Agriculture get together with the Minister of Social Welfare. There is where he should start his togetherness. I recall last fall the Minister of Agriculture made a very serious appeal to the people of Saskatchewan. He said I and the government will leave no stone unturned to get Ottawa to do everything possible to assist you. Then he said to the farmers if you need aid over and above what I can get for you from Ottawa then go to the Minister of Social Welfare and he will further help you by means of social aid.

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . agricultural policy.

Mr. Cameron: — This brings me, Mr. Speaker, to the problem of social aid, and I want to deal with social aid from the standpoint of southwest Saskatchewan together with many of the problems facing our people in southwestern Saskatchewan. I recall Mr. Speaker, in looking back at my maiden speech in this legislature fourteen years ago that it was a plea to the Minister of Agriculture to cease making derogatory statements about southwest Saskatchewan. I find myself today, fourteen years later, having again to bring matters to the attention of this legislature, dealing with the relationship between the ministers and my people needing assistance. The Minister of Agriculture made the statement that if it wasn't for PFAA payments in southwest Saskatchewan those people would no longer be living on that submarginal land.

He blamed the PFAA payments for preventing the removal of these people and rehabilitating them on irrigated land in Alberta.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The hon. member has attributed a statement to me that I have never said. I have never at any time made any derogatory statement about southwest Saskatchewan or any other part of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Cameron: — I can understand the predicament of the Minister of Agriculture, but may I assure the house that at the first opportunity I will have with me clippings in which those remarks were made in 1949. I said in 1949 and I want to restate it here, that southwest Saskatchewan does not stand before this government tin cup in hand. We don't come here begging for handouts; all we ask for our people in the southwest Saskatchewan is that they receive the same fair treatment accorded other areas of the province.

Mr. Speaker, there are areas in my constituency and throughout the southwest of the province that have had fair crops this year. There are other isolated areas that had a complete crop failure, and in many cases the farmers did not even get their seed. Many of these farmers are compelled, distasteful as it may be to them, to seek assistance in the form of social aid. Farmers who have not sought assistance since the dirty thirties. We can be very thankful in the province of Saskatchewan that it is only small isolated pockets throughout the province requiring this assistance.

But be that as it may, it does present an opportunity to test in action this government's much-flaunted social aid program. This is the first test this government has had in social aid to farmers. Even in this limited field it shows how ill-equipped this government is to deal with the situation.

I can recall the speech of the former minister of social welfare when he stepped up with this new program of social aid, and I want to quote some of his statements. He said in order for social aid to be administered quickly and efficiently, administration would be placed in the hands of local government officials. This program he said was designed to assure those in need a standard of living that would permit them to retain their dignity. This program he said was based on a needs test, not on a means test. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

moments to have a look at this great social aid program in action. This program, he said, was designed so that those people requiring assistance would never again have to suffer the humiliation they did in the thirties. When we look at the social aid administered to the farmers, what do we find? We find that when he applies to his municipal office for some assistance from this government, that his assistance is limited to 95 per cent of his earnings of the past 12 months immediately preceding the date of application, and those past 12 months takes in the immediate crop failure that he had last fall, and how it works is this. If as a result of a crop failure one of my farmers has sold \$480 worth of grain, divide that by 12, you get the number of dollars worth per month. His income would be \$40 a month. Social aid comes along and says we will give you 95 per cent of what your monthly income was in the past 12 months — here social aid figures out at \$38 per month. It doesn't matter whether he has one child or whether he has a family of ten, and if the farmer received nothing in 1961, he received nothing in social aid. Why Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The information given is not accurate, and he is aware it is not accurate.

Mr. Cameron: — I am living with those people and in the midst of it and we are on the ground floor and know Mr. Minister. Why do these conditions exist? Because right in the social aid regulations it stipulates social aid was not designed to keep the inefficient farmer on the farm. The Social Aid Act says in the case of extreme hardship the farmer's application may be sent to the director for decision. Not to the municipal official, but to the director of social aid in Regina. The application must go to the regional office for processing first, which in our area is Swift Current. Then the regional office forwards it to the director here in the city of Regina. This method of processing these extreme cases has taken as long as three months, and we find in some instances after this lengthy delay, and all of this red tape, the director sitting in his office in Regina, has turned down the application. Let me illustrate just this one case. The secretary of this municipality sent in an application showing extreme hardship direct to the director in Regina.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — What was the application for?

Mr. Cameron: — For social aid — that is what I am dealing with Mr. Minister. The director sent the application back. He said, I do not accept applications direct; take the regular course and submit it to the Swift Current regional office first. Then the Swift Current regional office processed it and sent it into the director in the city of Regina.

This application shows on the original application a deduction from the amount for milk used because as you know the farmers are treated a little differently than in the urban centres. From the rate established is deducted certain amounts per person for milk, their own meat, their own eggs, their own butter and so forth.

The director sent the application back; he said he was not satisfied with some of the other details submitted. In due course this application came back to the director again with the information he required submitted. The director returned the application again and he said how come when you sent in your first application that you deducted for milk and on the last application you showed no deduction for milk. Well the secretary said, how come, because it took so long for you to process it that the cow went dry in the meantime. That is how come.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — That is togetherness.

Mr. Cameron: — Those are two cases Mr. Speaker, from southwest Saskatchewan. May I say to those people who would rush helter skelter into ever larger units of administration, take heed as to what centralization can lead to. Here is a program supposedly administered by the municipality in which the municipality today finds they have been made the scapegoat and the government is hiding behind the skirts of the municipalities in the whole program of social aid. In brief, Mr. Speaker, there is no social aid for the farmers. The only assistance that the farmer has is that given to him by Ottawa. That is assistance in the form of PFAA acreage payments and wheat board payments. This government has a glib tongue, but every farmer today knows that the only assistance he is receiving in this critical period is that which comes from the federal government in Ottawa.

PFAA, Mr. Speaker, was not designed to take the place of social aid. PFAA payment, acreage payments, were

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

designed in order to permit the operator of the farm to remain on the farm. They were designed in order to assist him to purchase his fuel, his seed, his farm repairs, in order that he can seed his land again next year. That is the purpose of PFAA, but we find again that this humanity first government is exempting itself from all responsibility for assistance to these farmers, by again using PFAA and acreage bonus, and calling them income of the farmer and saying when you receive acreage bonus and you receive PFAA you are not entitled to social aid.

Now it has always been known that farmers use PFAA payments as a backdrop, knowing that if they ran into difficulties that they would be able to draw on this in order to meet their credit situation. They have become accustomed to having the fuel dealers supply fuel, the implement dealer supply repairs, knowing that even in the event of difficulty he would have the PFAA bonus to meet his obligation. That is the great basis upon which credit has been established. This fall these farmers wanting to keep this credit record good as they always have maintained, were willing to and anxious to use the PFAA payments to pay back the merchants to reimburse him for the fuel he had supplied during the summer, to reimburse the implement dealer for his repairs. When he went to do that he was informed by this department of social aid that if you use any of those payments to pay debts with you will not receive any further assistance. Therefore, they cut off any privilege of the farmer to meet his financial obligation and the farmer finds himself in the position today that he has not paid his fuel dealers for the summer supply of fuel, he has not paid his machine dealer for the repairs he used, and he knows that he is going to have to have credit next spring in order to carry on.

Now in spite of this, men as they are, they took those payments to assist the merchants who were so good as to carry them throughout the summer on credit, in order to re-establish their credit next spring, and if they had not done that, if they had followed the direction that was given by this government, every one of them would be camping on the doorstep of the municipality next spring and asking for seed and fuel in order to put in their crops. It would then become the responsibility of the municipality to borrow huge sums of money in order to finance the farmer to put in his crop next spring. That is how this government is getting out of their responsibility under social aid.

Mr. McFarlane: — Shame on you . . .

Mr. Cameron: — And that is going on all over the province of Saskatchewan.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, if there is any department of government that needs a thorough housecleaning, it is the Department of Social Welfare.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, this whole social aid program is ridden with irregularities, irregularities that lead to flagrant abuse on one hand, and to rank discrimination on the other. This has become so bogged down that municipal officials in my area have thrown up their hands, secretaries have resigned, as social aid officials, and as a result we have piles of applications waiting to be processed in municipal offices that have no place to go. They ask to send them in to the director only in extreme hardship. Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to say that I have some farmers whom, if you go to their homes, see the conditions in which they are existing due to this lack of aid, would bring tears to your eyes. I have farmers, Mr. Speaker, that have hardly clothes or shoes to send their children to school, and when we send in that application showing extreme hardship, having to wait two to three months and then find it rejected by the director sitting in his seat here in the city of Regina — that is the treatment of this government in the social aid in regard to farmers.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Tell this to the member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt).

Mr. Cameron: — I am telling it to you — you are the minister . . . the member from Rosthern was speaking of the abuses in social aid, and there are goodness knows many of them. I am bringing to your attention the injustices, the discrimination in the social aid program. Don't you sit there Mr. Minister and try to tell me as you are saying now that this is the responsibility of the municipality. Don't sit there and tell me to go to your municipal officials — they must deal with it. We have had that said to us long enough.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — They made the decision.

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. Cameron: — Who made the decision?

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — The municipal officials.

Mr. Cameron: — What decision —

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Whether they are eligible or not.

Mr. Cameron: — I am glad to get that statement, Mr. Speaker. Everyone of my farmers will review with great interest what the minister has just said that anyone in my area who did not receive social aid, it is because it is the responsibility of the municipality, and it was the municipal officials who made the decision not to give the social aid. My farmers will be most interested in that statement of the minister. This is a fair example of hiding behind the skirts of the municipalities. This government, Mr. Speaker, always talks about the slogan humanity first — talks about the need of the individual — they talk about the dignity of man — they talk about the guiding principle and philosophy behind this particular movement — that we are our brother's keeper. Well I invite the Minister of Social Welfare to come to southwestern Saskatchewan and I am sure in other parts of the province of Saskatchewan, and let those farmers tell him what a great keeper he is.

Mr. McFarlane: — . . . got half a dozen brothers . . .

Mr. Cameron: — And I say to you the government, the people of Saskatchewan today know that they have been kept in this protective custody for seventeen years. Given an opportunity they will show you whether they want to be considered as your brother's keeper in this protective custody that you have established across this province.

There are many other problems facing my people and all across the province. As I pointed out last evening the people of Saskatchewan are knee deep in problems, but no member who has spoken in the Throne Speech debate has given any attention to the immediate problems facing the people. They said nothing about the unemployment problem, nothing about education, about teenagers, about our boys and girls in their early twenties who are flooding and filling the ranks of the unemployed in this province because they are not qualified for the jobs that are available. When I mention

something about the conditions of education and the impasse that exists between the trustees and the teachers which has sunk to a new low in Saskatchewan, which has become a blot on the educational system, the former minister of education last night gave a big guffaw and said that is old wheat you are trying to thresh. Mr. Speaker, that is not old wheat, those are trying problems facing the people of Saskatchewan.

There are problems today in municipal reorganization. Now I will admit that municipal reorganization is going on. These problems are multiplied rather than becoming less, and I think it is regrettable that any program that the present Minister of Municipal Affairs saw fit to lay before the legislature dealing with municipal reorganization, could not have been brought in at an earlier date than this.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — They are up in my area, and I am sure they are everywhere across the province of Saskatchewan, drawing up new boundaries for the larger school units, and I have no objections to that. This is a question and this is the problems that we face. This has been going on now for two years and they come and tell us this is where your boundary is going to be, two months afterwards they come back and tell us your boundary is going to be somewhere else. We have school units that are completely bogged down in their construction program, because they are not going to take their finances and add to schools and construct new schools in any area which they have every indication to believe is going to be in a neighbouring larger school unit. We are facing that all over the province. I would put forth an urgent appeal that at least in those areas where the government is satisfied in its mind that that boundary is going to be the final one, notify those people in order that they may get along with the job of constructing the classrooms we so urgently need. That is another problem with municipal reorganization.

There are problems that are creeping into hospital districts. One hospital district is finding its boundaries threatened to be changed because people realize that while the minister and his staff tell them today that all we are doing is setting up new larger school units, they know that if this government should remain in power, that that larger school unit will become the county system of government, and knowing that, they will eventually

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

be placed in this particular county, they don't want to commit themselves to long term debentures to pay off the construction of a hospital that is going to be in another particular country. Therefore, in many instances the hospital program is bogged down likewise. And you can multiply this, Mr. Speaker, all across the province. It has led to an atmosphere of uncertainty throughout all of the province. The people are becoming bogged down. They are bogged down in problems which they face at the local level — they see nothing being done by this government to alleviate those problems.

Mr. Speaker, people are not judging this government on their great philosophy, nor they are not going to accept the Premier's new approach in a spirit of togetherness, when all the while their battle is to try in some way to band together to try and stop the invasion of the government onto their property and onto their rights. That is the problem the people of Saskatchewan are facing.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say to you, and I have had experience enough across the province to know, that given the first opportunity, the people will let the government know what they feel about the ineffectual manner in which they handle these problems, and that they would shake off this custodial care that has been imposed upon them for the past eighteen years.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I have heard the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) make a lot of speeches in this house, but I never heard him make one that displayed so much ignorance as this one today, especially when he was dealing with the question of social aid. If he doesn't know that applications for social aid are made to the municipal council, and the municipal council deals with them, then I would say he is so ignorant it is high time that the people of Maple Creek got a new member . . .

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . who would cease to lead them astray and get the wrong information, because he has been giving this house the wrong information all afternoon.

Looking back over past history in this legislature for fourteen years, we have sitting in opposition benches in this house, an opposition that was not interested in the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan, but was interested in obstructing everything that was being done, whether it was the administration of social aid or whether it was putting into effect the medical care program, and it makes one a little bit disgusted to listen to this kind of stuff day after day. Then the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) started out today by saying, "I did not know the word socialist had become so bad." I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, why it has become so bad — because of the way that the people in the opposition have used it; because of either their ignorance or their intent to confuse the word with communism, that is why. Mr. Speaker, they are constantly trying to carry out that kind of a program of smearing everybody who belongs to the CCF or New Democratic Party. I have listened to this a long time.

Now to come back to the question of social aid. Farmers in their right to receive social aid are exactly the same as anybody else. They do not get this on the basis of a percentage of their previous income or anything like that at all. They get it on the basis of the budget deficit, their needs are calculated the same as the need for anybody else; the means they have available are set off against that and the deficit is made up. This is handled by the social aid officer in the municipality. If the applicant is not satisfied with the decision of that local officer he can appeal to a committee of the council appointed by the council. If he is not satisfied with that he can appeal to a provincial committee to have his case considered. The statement was also made today, will the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) sit down and be quiet.

Mr. McCarthy: — I will if you will tell the truth.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The member for Cannington will sit down period. Mr. Speaker, a statement was made that it took three months to process applications for social aid. There is something wrong with local administration if it takes three months, because that is where they are processed, and they don't have to come into either a regional office or a provincial office before aid can be issued to those people.

The member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) at one point in the debate this afternoon said — humanity

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

first. It sounded like him; if it wasn't him it was one of his neighbours there, but I am sure it was the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. If he wasn't so young, and that would go for his seat-mate too, he would remember the kind of treatment that people living on public assistance got when we had a Liberal government in Saskatchewan, and a Liberal government at Ottawa. They sent them away up to the bush where they would be out of sight and they gave them five or ten dollars a month and a team of oxen or a team of horses and this sort of thing.

Mr. McDonald: — Can't get that now.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — These are the people who now say humanity first, and the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) gets up this afternoon and cries a whole lot of crocodile tears. Well it doesn't impress me the least little bit — that kind of an approach. Now he also mentioned discrimination. If there is any discrimination in social aid it is because of the people who are administering it and making the decision, and it is the people in the municipality. There was a time when not only the municipalities had to administer the social aid but they had to carry a heavy percentage of what was paid out in social aid in their own municipality. That is not true any longer. They carry a very small percentage of the total amount paid out in social aid throughout the province of Saskatchewan. Seven per cent to be exact. I think that is enough as far as the member from Maple Creek is concerned.

I would like to deal with a remark made by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thatcher: — Careful Brock . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Right now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a little time out to talk to you about the behavior of the Leader of the Opposition. I have seen a lot of people in this house, and I never saw anybody as bad mannered as the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. McDonald: — Have you ever looked in a mirror?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He shouts not for the purpose of making a personal correction or on a point of order, but immediately he hears somebody say something he doesn't agree with,

and there are a lot of people in the next few years that are going to say things he doesn't agree with.

He should read the rules of this house and learn to abide by them a little bit, and he would get along a good deal better. But he threw in a remark when the member from Nipawin (Mr. Perkins) was speaking about the co-operatives — and the Leader of the Opposition said, "They are not socialists", yet I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to find Liberals, you don't go down to the Sherwood Co-op. You don't find them there . . .

Mrs. Batten: — Why not?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They are as scarce as hens' teeth there because with rare exceptions, like the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson), they are not co-operators. There may be the odd one. I go down, I shop at the Sherwood Co-op and I know who I see there, but I sure don't see the Liberals.

Opposition Members: — You are wrong — you are wrong . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! We cannot have this constant interference all the time.

Opposition Members: — . . . Tell the truth.

Mr. Speaker: — The minister is making statements on his own responsibility, and I must insist that this interrupting stop.

Mr. McDonald: — Nuts as well . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I am sorry if my hon. friends are so thin skinned Mr. Speaker, but they . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Go ahead Brock . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . but they talked pretty plain in this debate already, and I think I can talk plain and I shall try to stay within the rules of this legislative assembly. Now Mr. Speaker, I want to take time out to offer you my compliments on the election to your office. I knew you Mr. Speaker when you were making a living the hard way

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

and cutting cord wood and pulpwood and shingle bolts up in the country where I live. This was before the days of the timber board or you would have been making a better living out of it.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, you could pick up a four foot stick of cord wood, fourteen inches in diameter and put it on a sleigh with the greatest of ease, and I was just wondering if it would enable you to keep good order in this house, if we shouldn't bring in a four foot long fourteen inch in diameter stick of cord wood and stand it there beside you and if anybody gets up, you just get up and lift that up a few times, and then when you call order I think they would obey sooner.

I expect Mr. Speaker, that the experience which you have had in not only this legislature, but in living and understanding the province of Saskatchewan is of value to you. I also will congratulate the member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley), and like others I did my best to keep him from coming here. I hope he turns out to be a good man because certainly the Liberal party can do with some.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition apparently thinks the Conservatives are too far to the left, or he was reported in the press as making this statement. When I was travelling in the car last weekend I heard Premier Smallwood, Liberal in the province of Newfoundland, on the radio, talking to a group of high school students. They were discussing socialism, and do you know what Premier Smallwood said, Mr. Speaker? He said the Liberal party is part socialist. Now I presume Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition wouldn't allow Premier Smallwood to make his speeches in Saskatchewan. I also ran across some other interesting information when I was out in the country last weekend. I attended an executive meeting there and we had a dandy executive meeting — everything was in good shape. We had over 40 members there — all in good fighting spirit and there were no spies present at that meeting either. But I got some interesting information. A CCF friend of mine lost a bet to a prominent Liberal, and the wager was that Mr. Argue was going to leave the new party and join the Liberal party. On the Saturday before Mr. Argue resigned, my

Liberal friend said to my CCF friend, that he had been talking on the telephone to the Liberal leader in Saskatchewan and that my CCF friend had better go to the store and buy the bet, because he couldn't get it on Sunday. He said you will need it on Sunday. You see this makes it quite clear that the . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — You are guessing Brock . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . Leader of the Opposition and others together with Mr. Argue knew when the resignation . . . This was togetherness for sure.

Mr. Thatcher: — This was the kind of togetherness you didn't like Brock.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He knew when Mr. Argue was going to resign and the Leader of the Opposition apparently condoned his attending a council meeting of the party he was leaving, after he had made up his mind to leave it, for the obvious purpose which we can all well guess. This is not very high political ethics, to which it is evident the Leader of the Opposition has fallen.

Mr. Speaker, there were also some questions raised in this house about the New Democratic Party, and apparently some of my hon. friends have been disappointed because nobody talked enough about the New Democratic Party. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I would like to talk about any better, so I am going to take the opportunity to say a few words about it now. When I got out of the Canadian army after the first World War I went farming in Saskatchewan, and it didn't take me very long to find out a whole lot of things. I am still a farmer, and my major economic interest is still, in fact my sole economic direct interest, is still in farming in Saskatchewan. It is now about 30 years since I became an active supporter of the CCF. Most of my family were Liberals, some of my family had strayed away and become Conservatives. I changed my political allegiance back 30 years ago.

Mr. Thatcher: — Renegade . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — But I haven't done it lately. I joined the CCF because after long experience I was convinced that farmers and many other groups were not getting a fair deal in Canada's economy. They were not able to have

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

anything like, even though they worked twice as hard, anything like a comparable standard of living with these other people. So we organized the CCF which was a political effort to get all of these people who were not getting a fair deal in Canada's economy, and the people who wanted to see everybody get a fair deal in Canada's economy together, and we were successful in Saskatchewan. It was only twelve years after the CCF was organized, in spite of all the jeers and all the prophecies that came from the Liberal party that it would never happen, it was only twelve years after it was organized until we took power in Saskatchewan in 1944. It could very well be in spite of all the jeers of the Liberal party and the Conservative party and the press, that within twelve years or less, the New Democratic Party of Canada could take power.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, of course I could not be satisfied with just dealing with provincial affairs because most of the important fundamental questions like unemployment, the question of division of the national income, the question of international security and peace, can only be dealt with on the federal level. So I either had to put up with the ineffective and hopeless policies of Liberal and Conservative parties, or else do something about it. We have done something about it. We have organized a new political party in the federal field much like the CCF was organized 30 years ago. And of course the same circumstances to a very great extent prevail. I made the same decision to join this party. Every effort is being made to prevent people from supporting this new political party, by saying farmer and labour people can't work together, by saying the labour people are responsible for the high cost of machinery and that farmers get such a big price for their cattle that steaks cost too much, and so forth. Of course nobody that lives in the city or close to the city tries to raise their own beef.

Then the best one of all is when they claim that a little labour clique of bosses is running the whole show. This just can't be true, because the constitution of the party does not allow it. Delegates are sent to our federal convention Mr. Speaker on this basis — if we have a thousand party members in the federal constituency we send 12 delegates. Do you know how many trade union members would have to be affiliated to equal that number of delegates? There would have to be 12,000 trade union members affiliated to equal that number, so figure it out for yourself there is no possibility of a majority of trade union delegates getting control.

I wouldn't tolerate it. I wouldn't put up with it, if there was that possibility. I want to make it clear that all of the things they can say about this new party are just good advertising for it, and the more they say the better, and before too long we will be taking over in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, one of the subjects that has been discussed during this session is the subject of medical care. In introducing this subject I want to pay a special tribute to a doctor, a pioneer doctor in Saskatchewan who was really the pioneer in prepaid medical care in Saskatchewan. This doctor was the first municipal doctor in this province, at Holdfast, just northwest of here, and it was in 1920 or before when he was municipal doctor there. His first salary as far as I know was \$1800 a year. He stayed there, I hope he got an increase in salary, but he stayed there until 1930. Then he practised at Waldheim in Rosthern constituency for three and a half years and moved to Arborfield in my constituency in 1934. Dr. Schmidt practised there for a few years and then retired and lived on a farm. Dr. Schmidt died a short time ago, having given a great life of service, and having been a pioneer in this program of prepaid medical care, beloved and respected by the people he served. This that kind of a background we cannot help but think it is a real honour and a privilege to now have some part in putting into effect a medical care insurance plan for all the provinces of Saskatchewan.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Liberal party has been accused in this house as being violently opposed to the medical care plan, and the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) and the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), tried to make a defense on it, but they look awful like they are opposed to it by the way they act, and if they would look a little different and act a little different it would be a lot easier to believe they are in favour of a prepaid medical care insurance plan in Saskatchewan. When we know the record of the Liberal party then we have to discount their words about it.

I would like to read just a very short Liberal passage from the Workmen's Compensation Act. The Workmen's Compensation Act of 1928-29 — if you want the section it is section 48, subsection 5:

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

“The fees or charges for such medical aid shall not be more than would be properly or reasonably charged to the workman if himself paying the bill, and except in the case of an employer individually liable and himself furnishing the medical aid, the amount thereof shall be fixed and determined by the board, and no action for any amount larger than that fixed by the board, shall lie in respect to any medical aid herein provided for.”

Passed by a Liberal government, proclaimed and brought into effect by a Conservative government.

Opposition Members: — For the truth.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Words have been said too about the act as it was passed by the Liberal government in 1944, and thinking over this I recall to mind that in 1944 when I was in this legislature, I received a telegram from Dr. Kirby, and this was the wording of the telegram.

“Regret to inform you introduction health insurance bill without consultation with College of Physicians and Surgeons grossly unfair.”

In the first session of 1944, Mr. Patterson was the Premier at that time, Dr. Uhrich was the Minister of Public Health. This was just passed at the eleventh hour. The telegram goes on:

“We are principally concerned in implementing this scheme despite the fact that nearly one quarter of our members are on active service . . .

Mr. Danielson: — . . . commission . . . how about telling the truth?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The last sentence of this telegram which says:

“Urgency for action not apparent when dominion enabling act still in formative stages.”

Actually the doctors were making very similar noises then to what they are making now and they made them to the

Liberal government. One of the differences is, Mr. Speaker, that at that time we had in opposition a group of people who wanted prepaid medical care in Saskatchewan and they were giving the government every encouragement possible to bring it in. I was sitting in opposition at that time, and we certainly were constantly encouraging the government over here to do this. We weren't interfering with them or trying to make trouble or make it difficult for them.

Mr. McCarthy: — That was over 20 years ago.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Now the situation is different altogether.

Before I go on I would like to follow the good example of the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) and read just a short passage from a speech that was made in the session last fall. This speech was made by the Hon. Mr. Erb, then Minister of Public Health, in closing the debate on this bill — second reading of the bill. He said:

“We are not prepared to discuss fundamental changes Mr. Speaker, and when I talk about fundamental changes I am talking about those fundamental things to which both the college and the government had agreed to in the first instance.”

Again he says:

“All down the line Mr. Speaker, our attitude has been one of compromise and of negotiation, but there is a point reached from which we will not negotiate any farther.”

Of course, Mr. Speaker, that point is where you begin to abandon the plan itself.

Mr. McCarthy: — That is where you close the door.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Again:

“We are quite prepared to sit down with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and go through this act in order to clarify everything, section by section. This was made clear in the past that we were quite willing to do this.”

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal for a few minutes with some of the subjects that my own department are concerned with — first petroleum and natural gas . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . give us the petroleum now.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Saskatchewan, of course, had no production of oil of any consequence as long as we had a Liberal government. That is one of the facts of life. Now I don't blame that Liberal government altogether, but I do blame Liberals for harping and crying and criticising when somebody else is the government and when oil is produced in very substantial quantities. In 1960 our production in Saskatchewan was nearly 52 million barrels. In 1961 approximately 56 million barrels of oil. The wells in the southeast part of Saskatchewan are producing at capacity. That is to say there is a market for all the oil in southeast Saskatchewan that they can produce there. This market has been improved by the fact that Ontario refineries are taking more of the medium gravity oil. Now I would like to just read one short quotation from the January 18th issue of "Oil in Canada" that has to do with this, on page 3 if you want the reference:

"High level of southeastern Saskatchewan crude oil markets is shown by 122 thousand barrels a day estimated throughput in Producers and Westspur pipeline systems in January. This month shows phenomenal increase of 33 per cent over last January."

This is the province which my hon. friends opposite have been crying about being a stagnant place — 33 per cent increase in oil through those pipelines since the year before. Another from the Leader-Post of February 24th — the headline is "Alberta amends oil gas rules." One statement here is "Production during 1961 (this is Alberta) averaging 450 thousand barrels daily — about one-half the permissible production quota." It is not the fault of the Alberta government that they haven't been able to produce at more than one-half of the production quota. We have had the good fortune to be closest to markets and get the markets. I don't want to make anything else of this. But when my hon. friends try to make out that no oil or very little oil is being produced, it just sounds like nonsense.

Government Members: — It sounds like liberalism.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It is the same thing. My friend said it sounds like liberalism — well that is the same thing as nonsense. I don't need to make a distinction.

In 1960 our production was at the rate of 140 thousand barrels a day. In 1961 — 153 thousand barrels per day. In Alberta, and this is from the Calgary Herald, March 1, 1962:

“1960 crude oil production showed a slight increase over 1959. It was considerably below the peak reached in 1956.”

In Alberta they were at the high peak of production in 1956. They went down very considerably from it and now they are beginning to come up again. I want to point these things out — these are some of the things that happen in this kind of business. The Alberta government — I certainly wouldn't like to blame them for this, even if it were a Liberal government there. In Saskatchewan we have almost five thousand wells capable of producing oil or gas — 4,992 actually. A few weeks ago we had well over five thousand wells capable of producing oil or gas. Now we are down to 4,992. Somebody is going to say — why this decrease? Are they pulling up the oil wells out of the ground and taking them some place else? I rather expect to hear that said by some of my hon. friends opposite. What is happening Mr. Speaker, in the Steelman oil field, which is quite a large oil field, they are now in a unit operation and putting in a water flood system. Quite large numbers of wells have been taken off production of oil and are used as input wells or injection wells for water. They push the water down and it pushes the oil over to the other wells where it is produced. It doesn't mean less production but it does mean a lesser number of wells capably of producing oil. That is the explanation for the decrease.

I listened to the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) on TV a month or so ago, and if I remember right he said “oil revenues in the province of Saskatchewan are down \$15 million in the last three or four years.” Well, I don't know where he got his figures, and if he says that wasn't the figure he was quoting — all right. But if he quoted that figure he was certainly far from being right. Now, it is true that our oil revenues in Saskatchewan during the last two or three years have gone down, but they have also gone down in other places too. We hit the high revenue from oil in

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

1957-58 with a revenue of over \$21 million and the low since that time was in 1959-60 when we were down to \$13.1 million. So the worst decrease would be \$8 million. Now, in that year of the high revenue we were able to sell about \$12 million worth of crown reserves. In another year there was about \$10 million sold. But during recent years that has not been nearly as lucrative a market. That is right. Somebody said 'hear, hear' and that is correct.

I would like to call the attention of the house to a quotation from the Calgary Herald, dated March 1, 1962 and I hope the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) will look this up. The Hon. E.C. Manning was dealing with his department and it stated here that the revenue for his department of mines and minerals was down \$38½ million in 1960-61 from the previous year. The biggest decline, more than \$34 million, occurred in the sale of crown reserves. The member for Arm River might go and ask what the reason is over there. Well, the reasons are plentiful. Let's get back to Saskatchewan revenue. In 1960-61, the last complete fiscal year, the oil revenue was about \$15.3 million which was up \$2 million over the previous year. In the current year — in eleven months — we are just under \$14 million, which is quite a bit above the same period last year, and at the end of this year it is expected that our oil revenue will be somewhat higher than it was last year. The total revenues from the department, the last complete fiscal year \$19 million. This is a far cry from the kind of revenues that we got back in the days when my hon. friends' friends were looking after the minerals in the province of Saskatchewan. This year it is expected that we will exceed last year and will be someplace within a half a million of the \$20 million revenue from the Department of Mineral Resources. When this happens, this will mean that in the last six years, the average revenues to the government and consequently the people of Saskatchewan, from mineral resources, has been over \$21 million per year.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Fluctuations are quite normal in this business. As I pointed out, the revenue fluctuated here, it fluctuated in Alberta — went down in one year by \$38 million. Their revenue of course is much larger because they have a great deal more oil than we have here.

The Globe and Mail, this small issue of the Globe and Mail called 'Report on Business' dated

Tuesday, February 27th has this headline — “Major Oil Discovery Biggest Need Now for Alberta.” And one paragraph reads:

“One of the significant facts about oil in Alberta is that there has not been a major discovery in the past six years.”

That is too bad. But this is also our major need exactly. Our biggest need is exactly the same as Alberta’s. We haven’t had a major oil discovery for about six years either, and there is nothing to make the oil business go, whether it is in Alberta, Texas, Saskatchewan or any place else like good discoveries of oil. That is what we want. That is what we have been hoping to get and I think Mr. Speaker, that is likely what we will get here in Saskatchewan.

The other headline here, and the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) wants to know the reason for the decrease in the value of crown reserves sold. Here it is. No major oil field discoveries for the past six years. And in this same paper, there is another headline, “New Oil Fields seen as Market Burden” under the dateline New York. “Some oil men are questioning of opening for development at this time, the potentially oil-rich lands on the gulf of Mexico, off Louisiana and Texas.” Why are they questioning opening them up now? Because in the state of Texas they are producing now, less than half the actual capacity of the wells. This is why they are not keen to acquire more reserves — why they are not keen to go out and spend such large amounts in exploration as they have spent in the past.

In regard to the drilling and the increase in the number of wells in Alberta, I would just like again to refer you to the Leader-Post of February 24, 1962. The number of new producing wells, (this is in 1961,) was 172 below the increase in wells a year earlier, and was a barometer of the slowing down of exploration. Exploration has slowed down for these reasons which I have told to you this afternoon.

Now Mr. Speaker, one other interesting thing I came across is the fact that in Alberta they are making some changes in their regulations and one of the changes they are making is to change the 21 year lease to a 10 year lease. Now I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if in the province of Saskatchewan, we had changed our oil leases from 21 years to 10 years, we would have been told by our friends in the opposition — you are going to drive the oil companies out.

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. Thatcher: — You have driven most of them out.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The member in his abysmal ignorance says we did drive the oil companies out, and I have just been telling the house that we have been producing 153 thousand barrels a day last year. They weren't driven out when this kind of oil is being produced. How stupid these people can get is really more than I can understand.

Mr. Guy: — How long since you got a new well?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — In Alberta they have had the same problem — they have a smaller amount of drilling going on because of the surplus of oil.

An Hon. Member: — They need a Liberal government too.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It is a long time since the people in Alberta have ever had the notion that they needed a Liberal government. I don't think too much of the government they have got, but they have a pretty small Liberal opposition.

Mr. Thatcher: — Bigger than the NDP they've got over there.

Mr. McDonald: — How long since they had an NDP government Brock?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It is quite a while.

Mr. McDonald: — It sure is. There has never been one.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out that if we had changed our . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . government . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . leases from 21 years to 10, these people would have said, you are driving the oil companies out. But this can be done in Alberta and nobody says a thing.

Mr. McDonald: — You gave them a 99 year lease.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — These people didn't say a thing. We never gave a 99 year lease here in Saskatchewan at all.

Mr. McDonald: — You let a lot of oil people get them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We never did.

Mr. McDonald: — You did so.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The ex-Leader of the Opposition — we have a whole front row of them there. They will be moving over there before too long because the present Leader of the Opposition isn't going to last.

Mr. McDonald: — Your ex-leader didn't last too long either.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The last leader of the CCF party in Saskatchewan lasted a long while, much too long for the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald).

Besides this, they increased the royalties in Alberta, and they increased them very substantially. A well producing 2400 barrels per month — in Saskatchewan the royalty would be 347 barrels, in Alberta 390 barrels. Forty three more barrels of oil they take in royalty; approximately \$100 more a month from that type of well — a little more than a hundred dollars. Now I can imagine the screams to high heaven if we had done this here.

A well producing 600 barrels per month — Alberta takes 12 barrels more royalty than Saskatchewan. This is a little well that produces at the rate of 20 barrels a day. If the production is 1200 barrels a month — Alberta takes 20 barrels a day more than here in the province of Saskatchewan. When my hon. friends tell me all these stories, I just have trouble in believing them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to run over some of the other minerals which we have in the province and we have quite a few of them. Saskatchewan has minerals

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

of real value being produced and many more of potential value scattered over the whole province. From the oil and the coal in the south of the province, to the uranium and the other metals in the far north. Potash is one of these very important minerals. Land under disposition at the present time in regard to potash is a little over three million acres. Sixteen companies are holding this land. They include all of the major companies operating at Carlsbad, New Mexico, and in spite of the trip that the Leader of the Opposition made to Europe and to Germany, the list also includes the German company, Alwinal Potash company. It includes now Imperial Oil Company. It includes Sifto Salt which is a subsidiary of Canada Tar and Chemical, one of the largest corporations in Canada. It includes Standard Chemical Limited. Now, two of the companies, Potash Company of America, which was the pioneer at Saskatoon, and International Minerals and Chemical at Esterhazy are getting nearer production. The Potash Company of America did produce for a few months, then water leaked into their shaft and they had to shut down production, and undertake a very expensive and time-consuming process of making this shaft water-proof, which added millions of dollars of costs to their project, but they are making progress. It will be a little time before they produce. International Minerals and Chemicals at Esterhazy are now through the Blairmore and well on the way down to the potash beds. And they are getting fairly close to production and sometime I would guess, I haven't been told this, but I would guess that sometime before mid-summer they will be in production of potash at Esterhazy.

Another first for the province of Saskatchewan is what has taken place half way between here and Moose Jaw under the direction of Standard Chemical Company, a full-scale solution mining test operation to mine potash by the solution method. There is potash, not only in this belt from Unity to Melville, but also over a great part of the southern portion of the province. But most of it is too deep to be mined by ordinary conventional methods and if it is ever recovered it will probably have to be recovered by a brining method. I cannot say, I don't know whether the company could say yet, whether they have got his method to the point where they are sure it will work, but if it does work it means that we have then available very extensive deposits of potash, even though they may be four, five, or six thousand feet below the surface.

Another interesting development which has been going for a couple of years is in regard to helium and during the year two wells were drilled to prove reserves. There are some problems in regard to helium. It is something like the old question of the hen and egg — which comes first, problems of proving up reserves of helium and getting available markets. Helium, as the hon. members will know is an inert non-combustible gas. It is lighter than air. It has been used for balloons. I don't know whether my hon. friend over here, the Leader of the Opposition uses that in his balloon when it goes up, or not, but it won't catch fire so it is safe if he wishes to use it. It is also used in certain metallurgical processes where it is important to prevent oxidization. If the process is carried on in an atmosphere of helium no oxidization can take place. Another use, and this would be a major use would be as a substitute for heavy water in an atomic energy plant. It can be used in that respect, but no one will build an atomic energy plant, designed to use helium until there is a proven 20 or 30 year supply. So this is the point where the question of markets and supply come into the picture. Now these companies are working trying to get an idea of the reserves that they have, and they are certainly working on the market question too. I think the prospects are fair that we will have production of helium in Saskatchewan. I don't know just how soon, but there are fair prospects for it.

In regard to the iron-ore deposits up at Choiceland that we have heard a good deal about in this house, and it was mentioned the other day by the hon. member for Nipawin (Mr. Perkins), it is now held under option by Gunnar Mining Limited. They first are taking an economic and market survey. If the results of this survey suit them, they will go ahead with a drilling program that may cost them up to half a million dollars, to prove beyond any doubt that the ore body in quantity and quality is there before they would risk going into the investment of \$30 million or more. If the drilling program results suit them, then the next thing would be to go ahead with construction of a shaft and a plant. No one can say yet whether this is going to go ahead.

Mr. Thatcher: — We are pretty sure it won't Brock and . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We can say that the prospects for the going ahead are fair.

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

During 1961 we carried out an aero-magnetic survey over 19000 square miles at the north end of the province of Saskatchewan — a belt right across the top of the province. We selected this location, not because it was the most accessible, not even because it was the most favourable from a geological point of view — but it is a favourable area — but because it is situated adjacent to Uranium City, and this can give a little boost to the economy of Uranium City. These maps are now being published. The cost of this survey, I am pleased to report has been shared by the federal and provincial governments. I want to say that we do appreciate the shared programs like this. Some of the shared programs may have some other implications, but this is good — this kind of thing. I just regret that we weren't able to get the former government years ago to put anything into this kind of program. We hope that we will be able to carry on a similar program in 1962.

The Department of Mineral Resources had eight geological survey parties in the field last year. Their reports and maps will be published in the not-too-distant future and we hope for a similar program this year.

I want to say a word about the roads to resources program. This is another joint program between the provincial and the federal governments. Though I certainly objected with many others when that bridge at Prince Albert was counted a part of the roads to resources, I do appreciate the program in general. There are a number of things we have to get and it is the business of any government to get, in regard to resources. One — basic information — this is what you get by these aero-magnetic surveys — by the geological surveys. The other — some reasonable access so that prospecting has as little difficulty as possible. That is where these roads come in well. They are useful not only in prospecting for minerals, but for getting out timber, for getting access to very fine recreational sites and a great many more things.

In metal mining, the Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting Company is at present the only mine that is producing metal. This has been a great mine. It has been operating for over 30 years, and is still going strong. Besides the main mine there are two small mines in Saskatchewan. One has been mined out — the Birch Lake Mine, and the other the Coronation Mine is still in operation. The Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company is doing a substantial amount of prospecting in Saskatchewan, which has been on the increase steadily over

the last three years. This mine of course has been very important to the people of Saskatchewan and has in many years brought in revenue — \$2 million. The revenue that comes to the province is not all from this mine, some of it comes from other fees — some of these eleven hundred taxes that the Leader of the Opposition was talking about for various services. This mine has been very valuable to the people of Saskatchewan in bringing revenues. In sodium sulphate, we have five plants in operation in the province, two of them are crown owned, the one at Bishopric and the one at Chaplin. The report of Saskatchewan minerals was tabled this afternoon, and I hope all the members are happy with the nice surplus that is shown in that report for sodium sulphate. The production of sodium sulphate in the past year, if it wasn't a record for all time it was very close to it, and the total revenue, including the revenue from our own plant, and the royalty made over half a million dollars.

Coal — one of the best, most healthy coal industries in Canada, fortunately, it is our good luck — a steady production of over two million tons each year. There is a very moderate revenue that comes to the crown of about \$75 thousand a year.

The structural minerals, sand, gravel and clay increased greatly in production. They were more than double in 1960-61 over the previous year. In 1944, Mr. Speaker, the revenue from minerals to the province of Saskatchewan was about \$234 thousand. In the last six years the average has been over \$21 million a year.

The Leader of the Opposition was talking about the great number of staff we had in the department. One of the explanations that can be given is that in mineral resources in 1944 we had about six employees, and they weren't too busy. At the present time we have just under 200. Many of them are geologists and engineers. We have nearly 5000 oil wells to look after and numbers of mines. Of course the people in the opposition would like us to go without that so that we didn't get the benefits of this development. I want to point out to you Mr. Speaker, that the total cost to the people of the province, of the Department of Mineral Resources has been in the neighbourhood of six per cent of the revenue from mineral resources for a number of years. If this isn't pretty good business, I would like somebody to stand up and say so.

I want to pay some compliments to my staff because I don't think they appreciate the gratuitous

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

insults that are sometimes handed to civil servants by the Leader of the Opposition. I want to make special mention of Mr. James T. Cawley, my deputy minister, who is now on a United Nations Mission to Indonesia, helping to set up a college on geology and petroleum engineering and helping them to develop a system of handling their petroleum resources. This is the fourth such mission that Mr. Cawley has been on in the last ten years, which is a real compliment to him.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He will be away for two years and I am very happy to have a very excellent person as acting deputy Mr. A.J. Williams, who joined the department about 1946, right after the last World War, and recently was director of the petroleum and natural gas branch, and is now acting deputy minister.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It is just a fantastic kind of story when the Leader of the Opposition called the civil servants political heelers, or words to that effect. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that most of these people, when it comes to putting the mark on the line they will vote CCF, but not because I asked them to — get that straight. Not because I asked them to, but because they know the policies of the government; because they know how they are put into effect. That is why when they support the government by a majority — that is why they do so. Now Mr. Speaker, there are a few general remarks I would like to make. There is a whole lot more I would like to say but time is running out.

I, as a member representing a constituency in the province of Saskatchewan, I appreciate some of the things that have been done by various departments of the government. I appreciate the highways which have been built in the province of Saskatchewan. I, together with a good many people in this house can well remember the kind of roads we had. I appreciate the grid road system which is being built throughout the province. I heard one of the hon. members saying that the municipalities thought they couldn't afford to build them and therefore they are building three or four miles instead of one. Let me say this, that more mistakes have been made in the past by building to too low a standard than by building to too high a standard. The people in this province appreciate these roads to no end.

The coming of electricity throughout the province of Saskatchewan has been a tremendous thing over the last several years. I don't know of any neighbourhood in the province of Saskatchewan where you can go and not find the power lines. Power is available to them.

The coming of natural gas to the small towns, as well as the bigger ones and the cities has also been a great boon. Probably the people of Saskatchewan place more store in the hospitalization program and the hospitals which have been built in Saskatchewan, largely by virtue of encouragement given by the government and financial assistance given by the government. Because they know what it was to do without these facilities and to do without this service in the past. This is one of the reasons why they are so anxious that we also get a prepaid medical care program in this province.

Local government, in spite of all that is said in the opposition, are today getting thirteen or fourteen times as much provincial grants as they got in 1944. Yet one of the hon. members over there gets up and talks about the stinginess of the government. He should have seen the stinginess of the former government, and he would have really had something to go on.

The coming of the sewer and water to the small towns. My constituency is one of the pioneer agricultural constituencies in Saskatchewan. Most of the towns are relatively young and it was only this summer that the first town in my constituency got a sewer system installed. I will tell you that people who live in these communities do appreciate the help and assistance that they have received. The program of installing sewer and water on the farms is also one that is very much appreciated. These are some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I believe that people can organize political parties to do things for themselves, and put governments into power to serve their needs. But the Liberal party on the other hand — they are one of the political parties — they take money from the rich and votes from the poor on the pretence of protecting each from the other.

We get our money from the same people from whom we get the votes, and that is why we are always asking for it and that is why in the CCF that the CCF is going to remain true, because that money comes from the same people who support the CCF by their votes. I am happy indeed to vote for this motion this afternoon.

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to associate myself with the other members of this house in congratulating you on your appointment as Speaker. It is a position where your duties cannot be taken lightly and I wish you the utmost success in carrying out your responsibilities in this house.

I would also, on behalf of my wife and myself, like to thank members from both sides of this house for their congratulations and best wishes on . . .

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — . . . the happy event of the birth of our daughter. I would also at this time like to welcome my colleague from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley). His first address, I am sure, points out the fact that he will be a fine addition to the Liberal opposition.

Now I am very pleased that I have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the dying minutes of this debate. For a while I thought perhaps this privilege would be denied me. I must admit that I was rather anxious to participate particularly because both government members from the northern part of this province made remarks in this debate which I would like to spend some time dealing with this afternoon. I must say that I intend to spend considerable time dealing with the matters that concern us in northern Saskatchewan. I make no apology for this because after all I represent the northern half of this province and I know that I was sent here to the legislature to do just that.

My only regret is that I understand that I am taking the time of the hon. Minister of Natural Resources, and we in the opposition always enjoy his boisterous and sometimes loud attacks on the opposition. We hope that perhaps we will have that opportunity in the following debate. I think perhaps I will have sufficient time to cover the many matters which I hope to discuss. I thought perhaps I would have to spend some time in refuting some of the statements made by the Minister of Mineral Resources this afternoon. However, he brought out the same old speech that he has had for the last 20 years, in most part — referred to the thirties and the early forties so there is not too much to be said concerning his remarks. However, there are one or two things that I would like to say about the remarks

of the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources. He said first of all that he was hoping that within 12 years to see an NDP government in Ottawa. Now I understand that the CCF or NDP or whatever you wish to call them are quite the, shall we say, sporting organization. They run lotteries here and there getting membership and one thing and another, and I would be willing to enter into the spirit of things and make a little wager with the Minister of Mineral Resources that the NDP will not be in Ottawa during his lifetime, during my lifetime and will not be there during the lifetime of my children or my children's children.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Guy: — In fact within 12 years I think you will find that the NDP will be looking for somebody else's back to climb on to get out of the doldrums that they were in under the CCF.

Now, he made some reference to the bad manners of the Leader of the Opposition, which is rather surprising coming from a member on that side of the house, who without a shadow of a doubt, has a member that has the worst manners of any house in Canada today, and that is the Minister of Agriculture. He attacks the members of the opposition when they are speaking. Whether he is standing up or whether he is sitting down, he still cannot keep his thoughts to himself. So I would suggest that people in glass houses should perhaps throw their stones the other way.

Now, the Minister of Mineral Resources also referred to the amount of oil that we have here in Saskatchewan, and he said that Alberta has more oil than we have. Now, this is an assumption that cannot be accepted as true. It is true that Alberta has more oil wells, but it is certainly not necessarily true that they have more oil. The only thing that is true is that they have had a government which has not chased the oil companies out of the province by their restrictive policies. In fact, perhaps, it would be very wise if both provinces, since neither one has had an oil well in six years, to get rid of their governments and elect a Liberal government.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Guy: — Now I would also like to join the Minister of Mineral Resources in paying tribute to some of the members

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

of his staff. Now I have met many of the geologists that work in northern Saskatchewan, and I appreciate the great work they are doing. But like all the departments of the socialist government they have two groups of workers; those who are working for the benefit of Saskatchewan and those who do nothing but propagate political propaganda.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Guy: — Now, this session so far has been a great disappointment to me. First of all I was disappointed with the Speech from the Throne. Never in the history of the province has a Throne Speech shown such indecision and hesitation. The first Throne Speech under the new Premier has been a fiasco and the Premier's speech did nothing to add anything to it. It is clear that the present government and its leader have none of the mumbo-jumbo for hiding the true picture of our economy that the past Premier had, for if the former Premier had one attribute, it was his ability to mislead the public. I know now that my thoughts when I read newspaper reports of last fall's NDP convention were right. I refer to one of the first remarks made by the new leader when he told the convention, as reported in the Leader-Post of November 3, 1961 — one of the tasks of the future he said, will be to not let the people forget the dismal record of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan and in Canada. Instead of being prepared to face the challenge of leadership, with imagination and determination, to present a bold new approach to the problems of this province, and heaven knows there are many, the best that the new Premier could promise to the people that elected him and to the people of this province was to remind them of the things that occurred 20 years ago. And his remarks the other day, as well as the remarks of many other members who participated in the debate show how void their thoughts are for the future. It is obvious that the present government are living back in the days of the thirties. They are thinking in the past; they are living in the past; and they are legislating for the past.

When I heard the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) had been given the privilege of moving the Address in Reply, I thought at last that the many problems of northern Saskatchewan would be laid before this assembly by a government member. Even as the member began his speech, I felt that I had been right about thinking this, for he mentioned how he felt that his selection as mover would give well-deserved recognition to the northern part of the province, but it was here the bubble burst. For the rest of his radio time, as well as for a good deal

of the radio time for the member from Lumsden (Mr. Thurston) which he stole, you would have thought that he was nothing more than another prairie chicken from the wide open places.

Now it is true that he did make a few casual references to what the government had supposedly done in the north, but little time was spent on the real problems that confront us and little time was spent in suggesting what the government should be doing to solve our problems which have increased in geometrical proportion under the socialists.

It was with a great deal of surprise that I picked up the Commonwealth of March 7th, where a report of the member for Cumberland's speech was given and it is to be noted that the hon. member is quoted as saying many things which do not appear on the official records of this house. Now this goes to show the great lengths that the socialists will go to to misrepresent the facts. There is one remark that the hon. member for Cumberland is alleged to have made which I cannot let go unanswered. It was this, and I quote from the Commonwealth. He told of a La Ronge teacher who was threatened with dismissal by the federal government if she dared investigate the conditions on the reservation there. Now this is a complete and deliberate misrepresentation of fact, and if it wasn't why didn't the member for Cumberland have the courage to stand in his seat in this house and make that accusation.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Guy: — The hon. member knows as well as I do that the federal government has absolutely no say in the hiring and dismissing of teachers in the northern areas of this province. It is the complete responsibility of the provincial government. That statement is not true, and it cannot be true under these circumstances.

The statement made concerning children's fainting from malnutrition is also unfounded. The doctor examined the particular case in point and found that he was suffering from a severe case of the flu. Now I am not saying that these people in my constituency do not go hungry at times, for they do. They go hungry because both provincial and federal governments have failed to provide programs that will give them an opportunity to make a living. But these statements to deliberately

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

sabotage the steps that have been taken by both provincial and federal governments in the field of school integration of our Indian and white students is most unworthy of the member for Cumberland.

Mr. Berezowsky: — On a point of privilege Mr. Speaker, regarding the report which apparently appeared in the Commonwealth. I may have intended to do so, but I did not make that statement. The hon. member said I made that statement to this house and I did not make it.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I did not say he made it in this house. I said he did not have the courage to make it. Instead he makes it in the Commonwealth, the propaganda sheet that goes out to all the members in the province, but he did not have the courage to make the statement in the house.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I did not make this statement to the Commonwealth.

Mr. Guy: — All right Mr. Speaker, in other words we can accept then that the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) is saying that the Commonwealth is telling a lie. It won't be the first one.

I must confess that I have enjoyed the reports of the member from Cumberland's speech to the trapper's convention and his letters to the editor of the Prince Albert Herald much more than I did his address in the house the other day, and I submit that these reports that he makes outside the house show the true thinking of the hon. member, much more than his remarks here when he is held in check by the shadow of the Premier and his cabinet over his head.

Now after his address to the annual trapper's convention, part of which he read to us the other day — and again I want to commend the member for that speech he made to the trapper's convention — the editor of the Prince Albert Herald had this in an editorial in the Prince Albert Herald February 2nd:

“Did we hear right or was it a dream? Can you imagine a true blue socialist, in fact much more of an apostle than a disciple, telling the people that they should go out and do things themselves. Incredible, and yet that is exactly what Mr. William Berezowsky,

“MLA for Cumberland, a dyed-in-the-wool CCF’er told an audience of trappers the other night. This wasn’t all, Mr. Berezowsky also pointed out that it did not seem right for us in the government to tell you what is good for you, there is another switch. Can you imagine the CCF or CCF-NDP or plain NDP ever stopping telling what is good for us? This is fantasy.”

Mr. Thatcher: — That’s right Bill.

Mr. Guy: — Now it is most unfortunate that a man who has some of the right answers for the people in the northern part of the province must be in a government that will not listen to him, and is anything but sympathetic to the problems that exist.

Perhaps the day will come when the hon. member from Cumberland will heed his conscience and leave the party whose principles it would appear he does not believe in. There is only one sad feature to this, Mr. Speaker, it was very unfortunate that this remarkable speech was foreshadowed by a letter that he wrote to the Prince Albert Herald condemning the action of the College of Physicians and Surgeons in a similar fashion to which he did the other day. The most significant statement that was made, and I quote from the Prince Albert Herald of January 17, 1962, where the hon. member said:

“I will press that legislation is brought in to have the public authority, the government, license the medical profession . . .

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Guy: —

“. . . I also hope that teeth will be put into the Medical Care Insurance Act so that medical doctors will not be allowed to demand payment for services for insured citizens but that bills and accounts be submitted to the appointed commission.”

Now the members from this side of the house have been watching from day to day to see how successful the hon. member is in his hope for such legislation, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is these threats and these statements that make the doctors and the public wonder about the intentions of this government.

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Now I was also very disappointed when the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) spoke. He was my last hope that a government member would speak for the people of the north, but he too soon showed that he was living back in the days of the thirties with his reference to roads and so on and he showed himself further out of tune by not even keeping up with what this government of his is doing, because he suggested that there should be a special course for teachers teaching in the northern areas. Now such a program was started a year ago and I have every reason to suspect that it will be continued this year and it is a good program . . .

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Guy: — Make no mistake about that, but you would think that a member of the government would keep up with the things that are going on.

But more significant than that Mr. Speaker, was the fact that not once did he mention the Indian and Metis residents of his constituency.

Now although both members from Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) and Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) represent areas that had a very bad fire season last year, not once did they complain about the mere pittance that this government pays their fire fighters. I can only conclude that \$4 a day is sufficient for their constituents who risk their lives fighting forest fires. While they may be satisfied I am certainly not, and although I mentioned this last session, I will mention it again today and I will mention it again in the budget debate and I will mention it again inside and outside this house every time I stand up until this government decides to pay the fire fighters of northern Saskatchewan something which they are worth and something that they deserve.

The Minister of Natural Resources should hang his head in shame, he introduces legislation from time to time to take money from these people but does he ever introduce legislation that will put much-needed revenue into their pockets. For a government that preaches more abundant living, they are a sorry disgrace.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Look at the budget.

Mr. Guy: — Now I would like to turn for a few minutes to some of the profound announcements appearing in the Throne Speech.

Now last fall I was pleased to congratulate the present Provincial Treasurer, who was then the Minister of Education on his announcement that a new technical school would be built in Prince Albert. This was the statement that appeared in the press:

“\$5 million to extend Technical Schools.”

As you know under this agreement the federal government pays 75 per cent and the provincial government pays 25 per cent, yet the provincial government is not satisfied with this agreement, they think that they need more time under the agreement to raise 25 per cent.

There appeared the other day in the Leader-Post a clipping:

“Government Plans Two Technical Schools” — February 19th

“Public Works Minister Walter Erb told the Leader-Post that the government plans to go ahead with the Moose Jaw expansion, the schools at Saskatoon and Prince Albert are under consideration.”

He says this now and yet last fall, I refer back to this previous clipping:

“Construction at all three centres is to start immediately with 1963 set as the expected date to complete and open the schools.”

Now in the Prince Albert Herald of February 22nd, three days later:

“Technical School Plans Run Into Difficulty”

“Education Minister O.A. Turnbull said today that it is hoped that a start can be made this year on the proposed Technical School in Prince Albert. He said, some delay may be encountered because the Education Department has been placed in a difficult situation, where under the federal government stipulation two such schools in the province will have to be completed by March 31, 1963.”

I want you to notice the date — February 19th — government plans two technical schools. Leader-Post, February 19th —

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

new SGT headquarters could cost \$2 million, to be started in October. Yes, they haven't got money for technical schools in this province but they have got money to house their thousands of public servants that they are taking into their government. This is the type of government that we are getting from the people sitting on your right Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kramer: — What would you say if that was a private company?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Guy: — We are not asking you for any remarks Mr. Member from Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). We would get it done, that is the main thing; we would get it done.

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . Bank.

Mr. Gardiner: — You should be complaining too.

Mr. Guy: — Now both the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) made reference to the dominion-provincial road to resources program and the Minister of Mineral Resources made the same reference today. The Throne Speech said that this program would continue and for this I am very glad. The roads built under this program certainly are appreciated by the residents which they serve. The Otosquen Road and the Hanson Lake Road are projects which are nearing completion and have been built fairly reasonably, and will prove extremely valuable in opening up our north, but the proposed road from La Ronge to Uranium City is a long road and the story connected with it is a long story, and believe you me Mr. Speaker, it is a sad story. It is a story which this government is becoming well known for, starting out with a big propaganda build-up and ending with a complete bust.

The La Ronge-Uranium City road was one of the first roads planned under the roads to resources program where the federal and provincial governments would share the cost and at first there was some discussion about the route of this road. On September 4, 1958 in the Leader-Post the announcement was made:

“That the Saskatchewan road route was decided, Resources Minister Alvin Hamilton said today, the route has been decided for a new northern Saskatchewan road to Uranium City.”

It goes on to say that it is going to start from La Ronge and proceed in a north-westerly direction until it reaches Uranium City. On September 22nd, we have a report from the Minister of Natural Resources who says that work has started on the 500 mile northern development road from La Ronge to Uranium City. From then on the reports come thick and fast, and although this was a large and costly undertaking the government showed no doubt as to their ability to carry it out, in fact they were already planning an extension to the road. On October 17, 1958, it appeared in the Leader Post, a big map showing where it was going to go and here we have the La Ronge-Uranium City:

“Road to resources now being built, places Saskatchewan on a threshold of a new area of northern development, Premier T.C. Douglas said Thursday, the road now being built will later on be extended further north from Uranium City, to link up with other arteries in the North West Territory.”

Big plans for this road. Then on October 23rd, less than a week later:

“North Road Extensions are Proposed”

“The hon. Minister of Resources, Mr. A.G. Kuziak says, one proposal for extension calls for the continuation of the Green Lake-Buffalo Narrows Road northward to the village of La Loche. The second extension is the continuation of the La Ronge-Uranium City main development road to Gunner Mines. And then it goes on to say, besides the immediate benefits of the La Loche road and surrounding area Mr. Kuziak envisages the Green Lake-Buffalo Narrows road eventually being pushed further north to connect with the La Ronge-Uranium City road between Green Lake and Lake Athabasca.”

Oh, he had great dreams, that Minister of Natural Resources.

During 1959 and 1960 glowing reports were heard from day to day and week to week about the progress that was being made on this road. In fact they built a bridge over the Churchill River while the road was still 20 miles away so they wouldn't be stopped when they got there.

Mr. Thatcher: — Socialist planning.

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. Guy: — The La Ronge-Uranium City highway became a familiar phrase appearing in many of the government propaganda sheets and a big white sign in the village of La Ronge was erected with the words ‘Uranium City Highway Starts Here’, twenty miles completed. There was no doubt in anyone’s mind that the government intended to continue this road to Uranium City come hell or high water.

The first whisper that all was not right with the world came when the Prime Minister announced that the new Prince Albert Bridge would come out of the Road To Resources fund. But the hon. Minister of Natural Resources soon dispelled any doubt that this would curtail the Uranium City Road. He stated in the house during the 1960 session, recorded in the debates and proceedings, Volume 18, page 50, and I quote:

“As far as we are concerned we still have the great vision of northern resources development and we are prepared to go on to Uranium City.”

Government Members: — He’s wrong.

Mr. Gardiner: — Follow John.

Mr. Guy: — During 1960 work continued in fact a maximum of 65 men under the Department of Highways were employed.

Mr. Thatcher: — Was the by-election on that year?

Mr. Guy: — That was the election year. During the spring session of 1961 estimates of the highways department included funds for the continuation of the road. The sign in La Ronge was changed to 34 miles completed. It appeared that the hon. minister’s vision was continuing, but on April 28, 1961, just three weeks after we left this assembly, the residents of Saskatchewan were faced with a clipping in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix which said,

“Uranium City Road stalled, diverted to Reindeer Lake. Hon. J.H. Brockelbank, Minister of Mineral Resources said the lack of funds was the reason.”

You will note who made the announcement. It would appear that when the vision of the Minister of Natural Resources flew out the window that he went with it, and to this day there has been no official statement from the hon. member concerning the road to Uranium City.

Mr. Thatcher: — How about it Alex? Are you going to let . . .

Mr. Guy: — Now needless to say there was shock and disbelief when this report was issued, the residents of Uranium City can hardly believe it, this was a further blow to their hopes of survival, and certainly seemed out of keeping with the promises that the government office made last spring when debating the resolution that I had presented into this house.

Now since the announcement that the road was being diverted we have heard very little about the Uranium City highway. Emphasis has been shifted to the Hanson Lake Road, and the lovely white sign that was in the middle of the village of La Ronge, one dark dismal night disappeared and a little green sign appeared that said Churchill River 50 miles.

Now the question that arose that remains still to be satisfactorily answered is, where did the money go?

Mr. McDonald: — Where did the sign go?

Mr. Guy: — Since the reason given for its stalling was lack of funds, several representatives of the federal government made some interesting observations in regard to the financial situation, and in the Uranium City Northland News the following report appeared:

“Uranium City Road decision shocked MP, (this was the MP for Saskatoon, Mr. Jones). He said, I just don’t understand that at all. The federal government made \$7.5 million available to aid the province in construction of resources roads. Arrangements were made with the Saskatchewan government for federal aid in building three such roads.”

And he goes on and he says,

“One morning the provincial government says that it has no money for a new hospital at Weyburn, then it has money for a power corporation

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

“palace in Regina. They don’t seem to know if they are broke or not. Someone should enquire.”

I think the most significant statement was made by the Hon. Walter Dinsdale, Minister of Northern Affairs, in a letter to Mr. Bert Cadieu who is the member representing Uranium City, and this is his letter as it was quoted in the Uranium City Northland News. He mentioned the various sections of the act whereby the Saskatchewan government entered into an agreement to build these roads and so on, I haven’t time to quote all that I would like to but I think the most significant part is this:

“No doubt you will be interested in knowing how the expenditures on the agreement stand at the moment. I am happy to report that there is still a very substantial balance available the figures indicate that less than \$8 million has been spent to date by the province. This means that there is \$7 million remaining, so you will see that there is sufficient monies available to get on with the job on the Uranium City road.”

Now in view of this letter it is difficult to justify the statement of the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources, who said there was a lack of funds. I think Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for a full scale investigation to be held into the use of the money under the roads to resources program. I am afraid that we might uncover evidence that would make the Pacific Railway Scandal appear under a halo compared to the Uranium City Road Scandal. In the few investigations that I have been able to make, I have come up with some rather shocking and startling figures as far as the Department of Highways is concerned.

Now most of these roads as you know have been constructed by the Department of Natural Resources and a reasonably good job has been done by them. Mr. Kuziak could take a bow, but the Hanson Lake Road was built by the Department of Natural Resources — 200 miles — three years at a cost of \$22 thousand per mile. The first 21 miles of the La Ronge-Uranium City Road was built by DNR in one year — 21 miles at \$10 thousand per mile. The next 37 miles took three years to build under the Department of Highways and it cost \$36,500 per mile. The first 21 miles cost \$10 thousand under the Department of Natural Resources — under the Department of Highways it cost \$36 thousand per mile; same terrain; same country; same everything.

These figures certainly raise some doubts as to the efficiency of the highways department to say the least. In fact, it raises sincere doubts in my mind as to whether this money has been spent in an honest and straightforward manner. For three years someone has been on a gravy train, and I think the taxpayers of this province are entitled to know who they were and why they were on it.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, on a pint of privilege . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! This is not a point of privilege.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not allowed, according to the rules of the house to make imputations of dishonesty with regard to the government, I suggest Mr. Speaker, that they should be withdrawn.

Mr. Guy: — Because of lack of time, I will withdraw the statement, I have a lot more to cover, but I still say that there is some doubt as to whether this money has been expended in an efficient and orderly manner as it should have been under the Department of Highways.

The question now of course is, what is the future of this road? There are few doubts that the announcement made last spring that the road is to be diverted toward the Manitoba boundary was a smoke screen to hide the facts, the sordid truth that the Uranium City road is ended. It will not go toward Reindeer Lake, it will not go to Uranium City under this government it will end at the Churchill River and the \$300 thousand bridge to cross the river was unnecessary and Saskatchewan as a result of this will not share in the development of natural resources and in the roads to resources that will link the other northern provinces and the North West Territories.

Now, I was pleased to note in the Throne Speech that good progress is being made in the transfer of co-operative ownership of the provincially-owned fish filleting plants and trading stores in the north. Progress in this regard cannot come too soon to the members of these co-operatives. When the government announced that they were going to turn the fish marketing services and northern trading stores over to the co-operatives, owned and operated by the people themselves the announcement was met by enthusiasm. As I pointed out last year

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. Speaker, the people were sick and tired of being exploited by this government. The residents in these areas got busy and they organized their local co-ops, they set up their boards of directors, but the government too got busy and they hired a flock of so-called co-op advisers who were to help the people organize and operate these co-ops. Well we all know what the results were. The residents made an honest, forthright attempt to make these co-ops function properly, but unfortunately to date these efforts have been in vain, for the government has let them down and they have appointed men for political ability rather than managerial ability . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — They do it all the time.

Mr. Guy: — . . . and because of that the local directors have no say in what is going on, they do not know what is going on. All they know is that they are working for the benefit of the government.

Now at the fall session of this legislature, I issued an order for a return asking for information regarding the financial statements of the fish marketing co-ops, the Minister of Co-operatives, who is now Minister of Education, at that time requested me to withdraw the return as he did not feel that it was in the public interest to make such information public, but did say that if I would write a personal letter to the minister that he would give me the information that I required and I did write to him. In the meantime a new Minister of Co-operatives was appointed and the reply was subsequently received that such information could not be given to me, as it was not in the public interest and could not be given without consent from the local co-op directors. This of course is false since the co-ops are still owned by the government, administration and all decisions being made by the government. However, I didn't have too long to wait to find out why I didn't get the information, because I started getting information from the local board of directors as soon as the co-op annual meetings were held. I started receiving copies of their annual statements with pleas asking me to see if I could help them and I realized then why the socialists thought it was not in the public interest to let this information be known.

I have here a statement for Pelican Narrows Co-operative Fisheries Limited, summer 1961, and I want you to listen to these figures Mr. Speaker: Sales — \$103,544. Total available to the fisherman \$20,804.

In other words less than 20 per cent of the money that was received by Co-op Fisheries went back to the people who did the work. Now that is the reason why they didn't want these statements made public, and I don't blame them. When this statement was presented at the annual meeting by co-op officials, no effort was made to explain where the money had gone to, not even the price per pound was given to the members of these co-ops. It was a pure case of here it is, take it or leave it.

Mr. Berezowsky: — It is not true.

Mr. Guy: — That statement is here in mimeographed form, there is no doubt . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — The statement is not true.

Mr. Guy: — . . . time is running short and I want to make one more reference to these co-ops in northern Saskatchewan, because when I was in La Ronge at Christmas time I was told that the final payment of the La Ronge Co-op as well as others was on the co-op manager's desk in Prince Albert. The fishermen were told no one could get them until every single member had paid their outstanding accounts. Now trapping had been poor, Mr. Speaker, and these people needed the money in order to go back on the trap line. They asked me if I could help and I wrote to the manager of the co-op and he didn't even have the decency to reply to my letter. The members did not receive their final payments until February 20th, more than ten months after they had earned it. I think it was all summed up very well in the words of one Indian fisherman who said, "we thought the government helped us to co-operate to make our living, but as far as we see it with these final statements I think we help them more than they help us."

I realize that time is very short and I had a few more things that I wanted to say, however, I want to make this one very short statement concerning the speech of the junior member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder). It was a speech which I feel had no place in this assembly or in this country and I could not help but notice the embarrassment on the members opposite when he gave his address.

Mr. Kramer: — Who wrote that for you?

Mr. Guy: — They are not happy, because this anti-American,

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

anti-capitalist, anti-free enterprise propaganda such as the speech which we heard from the member from Moose Jaw is doing more to encourage communism here in this province of Saskatchewan than anything in the last ten years.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Guy: — Well, Mr. Speaker, time is running out, I did have a few more things that I wished to say, I believe that I must be finished at 5 o'clock, is that right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes.

Mr. Guy: — Well with those few words then I would like to say, as you may have guessed, I will not support the motion.

At 5:00 o'clock p.m. pursuant to subsection (4) of Standing Order 30, Mr. Speaker interrupted the proceedings and put the question on the motion which was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 32

Messieurs

Lloyd	Thurston	Perkins
Meakes	Wood	Thiessen
Williams	Erb	Snyder
McIntosh	Nicholson	Stevens
Blakeney	Turnbull	Dahlman
Brockelbank	Stone	Michayluk
Walker	Whelan	Semchuk
Kuziak	Thibault	Klusak
Cooper (Mrs.)	Berezowsky	Peterson
Davies	Kramer	Willis
Johnson	Broten	

NAYS — 19

Messieurs

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

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 3 — An Act to amend the Co-operative Marketing Associations Act, 1954

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Co-operatives): — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 3, the proposed amendments on Bill No. 3 are for the purpose of amending the Co-operative Marketing Associations Act. I might just suggest Mr. Speaker that Co-operative Associations particularly the smaller ones have been in some difficulty as a result of the clauses, some of the clauses in the present Marketing Associations Act, and they suggested that we might give consideration to clarifying some of the sections in which they had reference to. I think if we go over the explanatory notes when we are in a committee as a whole it sets out quite clearly the amendments proposed in this particular bill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of an Act to amend the Co-operative Associations Act — 1954.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend the Saskatchewan Evidence Act

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, the principle behind this bill is one which is completely set out in the explanatory notes and any discussion I suggest might just as well be carried on in committee of the whole as in the house.

I would like to say, however, that this is one example of legislation which has reached the government by way of the Law Reform Committee. It had been suggested by the lawyers and judges but it came to us from the Law Reform Committee, they get their suggestions from the courts and the bar.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 6 — An Act to amend the Infants Act

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, this is a change which is a result of the inflation in values. We feel that it keeps intact the principle that was inserted in the Infants Act twelve or fourteen years ago and was recently doubled in value from \$2500 to \$5 thousand. I think any further

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

discussion of the matter could well be conducted in committee. I would move that the bill now be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 7 — An Act to amend the Jury Act.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, as hon. members perhaps know the Jury Act provides certain exemptions and exceptions from compulsory service. It exempts a large number of people from jury duty, but it does not exempt farmers. Among the exemptions are clergymen, lawyers, fire fighters, railroad men and so on. It will give farmers an exemption which they may have almost as a matter of course by merely asking for it during the crop season. At other seasons they would be in the same position as the other empanelled jurors. Mr. Speaker, with those remarks, I move the bill now be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 8 — An Act to amend The Dependent's Relief Act

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — The principle contained in the bill is fully set out in the explanatory notes. It is designed to recognize the claim of illegitimate children in certain circumstances, for benefit under the will or the intestacy of a deceased person. It gives them the right to make application in the event that they are not recognized.

I may say this proposal also comes to us from the Law Reform Committee. With these words Mr. Speaker, I now move that the bill be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 9 — An Act to repeal The New Judicial District Execution Act

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — The New Judicial District Act was necessary in the days when the province was divided into a number of judicial districts. At that time when a

change of boundaries was made it became necessary to have some law to determine how executions would apply in the area affected by the boundary change. Now that the province is all one district for the purpose of the district court it is impossible to change the boundaries, because Alberta or Manitoba would be bound to object. It isn't necessary to retain the act and unless we were to revert to the system of having separate districts then we wouldn't need this legislation. It is merely cluttering up the Statute Books.

With these words Mr. Speaker, I move that this act now be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 10 — An Act to amend the Intestate Succession Act

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, there is really no principle involved in this bill except the principle that the legislature should correct its mistakes. About eight or nine years ago an amendment was made to The Intestate Succession Act and through an error a reference to one section was omitted and it is proposed now to correct this reference. I suggest details would be better discussed in the committee of the whole and therefore I move that the bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 11 — An Act respecting Survivorship

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, we have had a statute on the books of the province for many years called the Commorientes Act. It is an act which has to do with establishing a presumption as to time of death, in certain cases where it is unclear as to which of two persons died first in a common disaster. Since the province adopted this act the Conference on Uniformity of Laws has codified and made uniform a draft act which has now been adopted in most of the other provinces in Canada.

There are some differences in phraseology — in wording — between the uniform act and the act which we have been accustomed to having in this province but there is no fundamental difference of principle.

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

We think it is in the interest of the people of Saskatchewan and in the interest of clarity and judicial determination of the meaning of this act if our courts can have access to judgments rendered in other provinces and be able to apply the effect of those judgments upon action in this province. This of course can only be done if the courts in the other provinces are dealing with an act of the same wording. It is therefore proposed that we adopt the wording which has been made uniform in most of the other provinces.

It is proposed to repeal the act, to change its name so as to be more intelligible, and to call it An Act Respecting Survival. So Mr. Speaker, with these words of introduction, I move that the bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend the Forest Act, 1959.

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources): — In this bill there is only one clause that is being deleted and a new one instituted which widens the section respecting certain offenses in provincial forests. I want to say that it adds other offenses for example, anyone that may cause pollution or contamination of water or soil in forest or leaving glass, broken glass that may be cause damage to other people. Now that is the only amendment of importance, the other one is an amendment to the schedule of the Forest Act. It either takes land out of agriculture and puts it under resources or lands from resources to agriculture. In this case I believe, eight or nine sections that have been already evaluated by agriculture, and the committee that looks over this consisting of people from both agriculture and natural resources have recommended that these eight or nine sections should go to natural resources. They are more suited to raising forest than for agricultural purposes. I would therefore with that explanation move second reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend the Northern Administration Act

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources): — There are three sections here that are amended, the first two are very minor, the first one is in connection with the change of section 2, which sets up the regulations, and in this case gives authority to make regulations under which children could be barred from public places after a specific time, in the northern areas. This has been requested by the people of the northern areas particularly of Buffalo Narrows and Ile a la Crosse. The amendment under section 3 widens up the power to establish and promote voluntary fire departments in the north. Section 3 is the one that was very contentious in the last session. What we are bringing in this time are only those clauses that are already in the Hospital Services Act and within the Medical Care Act. Clause 74A, 74B, 74C, D and so on are exactly the same as that in the Hospital Services and the new Medical Care Bill that was passed last fall. With that I would move second reading.

Debate adjourned by Mrs. Batten.

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