

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature
11th Day

Thursday, March 8, 1962

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

ON ORDERS OF THE DAY

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to call attention to a group of students in the gallery. They are from Wascana School with their teacher Mrs. Howe. We hope they enjoy their stay here this afternoon. We are always glad to have students here. We hope you will enjoy it well enough to come again sometime.

I also believe that we have four visitors here from Montana, I believe, in the Speaker's gallery, and we would also like to welcome you very heartily this afternoon.

WELCOME TO BOY SCOUTS

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to draw the attention of the members to six boy scouts and their patrol leader sitting to your right in the Speaker's gallery. These boys are from the city of Saskatoon, down here I understand studying the different administrations. They have spent some time at the Mounted Police barracks, the mayor of Regina recently treated them to a dinner and spent some time with them. They are now here studying the legislature and I am sure members will join with me in saying how delighted we are to have them with us and hope that their stay here will be a pleasant one and an informative one.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with may I draw to your attention Sir, and to

Thursday, March 8, 1962

the hon. members of this house to a fine group of Grade XII students from the Hafford high school who are accompanied by their principal and his wife Mr. & Mrs. Holota, who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. This group is from the village of Hafford and the surrounding area, and they have travelled some 240 miles since this morning to be here with us. On behalf of all hon. members and myself may I extend to this group a sincere welcome and I want to assure them that we are indeed happy to have them with us here this afternoon. I trust that their stay, will be both educational and enjoyable.

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention and hon. members of this house, to a fine group of students in the Speaker's gallery from the constituency of Rosthern, the Mennon public school, under the direction of their teacher Mr. Fast. On behalf of all members of this house I would like to welcome them on their visit here and hope that their stay will be a pleasant one.

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with I want to draw to the attention of this house that about 26 years ago there was a little fellow born to the Snedker family and today we are honouring him with a little bouquet in memory of his birthday.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege for the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker). I object to the red colour of the flowers.

Having said that, may I sincerely associate the members on this side of the house with our congratulations and best wishes to the member.

QUESTION: RE MEDICAL PLAN

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I should like to direct a question to my friend the Minister of Health. Has the minister had any success in arranging a meeting with the College of Physicians and Surgeons to discuss the medical plan?

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I think I announced a few days ago that we had written to the College of Physicians and Surgeons again, suggesting such a meeting. All I know at the moment is something in the press, that we will be receiving a communication from the college after a meeting of the college — as again reported in the press — apparently this weekend.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Health?

Mr. Speaker: — We cannot ask supplementary questions arising out of the question just asked. If it is a clarification of his answer, that is permitted, but not to ask a question arising out of the answer to a question just given.

Mr. Thatcher: — All right. I will ask him another question then in deference Mr. Speaker. In order to facilitate a meeting between the government and the college, has the minister or the government offered any specific compromise to the college, as far as the medical bill is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Davies: — In answer to this Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to suggest any compromise until we know what is in the minds of the College of Physicians and Surgeons themselves.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

QUESTION: RE COUNTY ACT

Mr. D. 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. Will the county act be available to the hon. members of this house before the School Trustees convention?

Hon. Mr. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — It is my understanding that the school trustees convention is next week. I think they are both next week, both the school trustees, and the association of rural municipalities, and I think the answer is the same — that it is not likely to be available for either.

QUESTION: RE HISTORIC SITES

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I would like to direct a question to the Premier. The other day he said that there is not at present a director of historic sites in Saskatchewan. I wanted to ask him if this indicates any lessening of the program of marking historic sites and if not, are historic sites going to be marked in various areas of the province again this year?

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I answered as the hon. member has suggested, but also added that there was a program with regard to this carried out by the Department of Natural Resources, I think the Parks Branch, who acting with the archives are continuing to mark historic sites.

QUESTION: RE SCHOOL UNIT BOUNDARIES

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Education. I wonder if he could tell us whether the changes in the various forms of school legislation, to bring about a reconstruction of larger unit boundaries will be available before the trustees convention is held?

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — No, Mr. Speaker, the bill will not be before the house before the convention.

Premier Lloyd: — We realize that the legislation is not before the house, but I hope that members of the legislature will bear in mind the position of both the Minister of Education and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. With the conventions meeting, I think we all agree that it would be desirable to give them leeway to make at least general statements with regard to the legislative proposals, even though it has not as yet been possible to make these in the house. I would hope that the legislature would understand that ministers make statements of this kind.

QUESTION: RE PULP MILL

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources, a similar question to one I directed to him last year. Is the government at present negotiating with any business interests for the construction of a pulp mill in northern Saskatchewan? If so, what is the status of the negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, I believe even the last time that I had corrected the Leader of the Opposition to address the question to the Minister of Industry and Information, who I believe is negotiating with people at the present time.

Mr. Thatcher: — You announced a couple Alex, so you tell us.

ANNOUNCEMENT: RE DRAMA CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to announce to the house that the Maple Creek high school last evening won the southern championship of the high school plays, sponsored by the Saskatchewan Drama Association and will now be competing with the northern winners for the championship of Saskatchewan. I hope that they will have a little better luck than the high school curling championship from Maple Creek, who won the southern championship and then lost out to the north. This time I am certain they will go all the way.

HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I wish to inform this legislature that the Bantam C hockey play-offs for northern Saskatchewan were won recently by a very fine team from the community of Turtleford. I understand that the second game of a two game total goal series is being played on Saturday afternoon at Marquis. The Turtleford team have taken a two goal lead into the second game and I wish to congratulate them sincerely on the very fine showing they have made thus far.

MOTION: RE UTILIZATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly): —

That in order to encourage the utilization of natural resources in northern Saskatchewan, and to provide additional employment, the monopoly of the Saskatchewan Timber Board be terminated and producers be permitted freedom in disposing of their production.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in this province, we have in the Saskatchewan Timber Board a monopoly in the production, sale and complete control of all spruce lumber, pulpwood and many other forest products harvested and produced from crown lands. This monopoly exists today and has existed over most of the past 17 years under the socialist government opposite. The same people responsible for its being — creation and operation — never lose an opportunity to condemn monopolies, some of them possibly actual and many imaginary, carried on by others. This Mr. Speaker, is just one of the numerous inconsistencies of the government and the members opposite. The result of this crown corporations' monopoly has not benefitted either the primary producer of forest products or the consumer. Their policy has been and it is to pay as little as possible to the producer and to obtain the highest price possible for these products from the consumer. This is surely a far cry from the socialist slogan of "Production for use and not for profit." Admittedly we have heard less repetition of this slogan in recent years as compared with the years preceding the election of this government in 1944 and for a few years following that election. Rather, profits have received considerable emphasis and attention from our socialist friends in recent years in relation to all crown corporations, all those which have survived. It is only by virtue of the monopoly they enjoy and the profits which the crown corporations currently operating have been able to enjoy, and exact upon the people that they have been successful and have not folded up like the others.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — Arising out of the extremely high prices demanded for spruce lumber, particularly in those areas in close proximity to the forest, substitute materials in many cases have been utilized to a very large extent, much to the detriment and loss of the forest industry in Saskatchewan. Building construction on farms has

substantially been curtailed. The high price of locally produced lumber has contributed considerably to the cost-price squeeze confronting the farmers of this province by adding to the costs of their production. Here at least, Mr. Speaker, is one item adding to the farmers' cost which could have been and still can be eliminated by this government. The cost-price squeeze is something we hear endlessly referred to by our friends opposite. I submit to them respectfully Mr. Speaker, that there is an opportunity for them to practise what they preach in helping to reduce even in a small fraction the cost production of our farm people. The policies of the timber board have tended to sharply reduce the utilization of our potential forest product production. At the same time having due regard for application of reasonable and desirable conservation measures. We are not, according to reports of the Department of Natural Resources, according to reports of concerns that have made surveys, beginning to utilize the potential production that could be exercised from the forests in this province.

The loss of the full utilization of this natural resource results in a loss of employment to many of our people. A large percentage of unskilled labour can be employed in the bush as woods workers and also a large percentage of unskilled labour can be used in connection with saw mill operations. Many of our native Indian population and many of our Metis could be employed and would be employed in an active and vigorous forest industry in the province. Restriction of production has seriously affected the livelihood of these particular people, along with others. It has meant the decided loss of employment in the building trade in parts of the province, as well as the loss of employment for skilled mill and machine operators in connection with forest operations. There has been a loss of the sale of Saskatchewan products which could have been produced here both within and outside the boundaries of this province. And there has been, in my opinion Mr. Speaker, a substantial loss of revenue to the treasury of the province due to the lack of production within the forest industry.

Projecting these losses I have just mentioned, together with the loss of the potential employment that would have been created, a greater burden has been placed on the taxpayer of this province in connection with social government policy in the operation of the so-called Saskatchewan Timber Board.

Thursday, March 8, 1962

The current policies of the Department of Natural Resources and the Timber Board and the ceaseless expounding of socialistic doctrines and objectives by members opposite has resulted in an attitude of resentment by those who could provide a market for a substantially increased production of forest products in this province. Our government has failed to create an attractive and favourable impression on those who might be our best customers. We see our neighbouring provinces of Manitoba and Alberta have both been blessed, just in recent years, with an extensive expansion of the pulpwood industry in the way of pulp and paper mills. I would like to point out at this time Mr. Speaker, that every time we see an announcement, as there was in the press a few days ago, of the \$38 million pulp mill being started in the province of Alberta, it means our chances of getting one is that much less. It appears that possibly the only role we can play in the production of pulp wood of which we have abundance, would be to supply the raw materials to those mills in our neighbouring provinces. I think you will agree Mr. Speaker, and I think you will readily see the loss to this province in taxes, wages, and such like . . .

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — . . . that would accrue if such an industry was established.

The only time we hear a great deal about this particular type of industry coming into this province is shortly before a general election.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — Many, if not all of the mill operators working under contract with the Timber Board, are dissatisfied with the conditions and arrangements set down by the board, and which they must accept or go out of business. They have no alternative. Over the years many have been forced out of business. Many of the mill operators who operated in this province have been forced out of business or have been forced to go into other provinces in order to make use of the equipment they had acquired and wanted to make use of. Nobody can deny this. You can only go a few miles in the northeastern part of Saskatchewan into the province of Manitoba and you will see numerous men who conducted mill operations in Saskatchewan prior to 1944 and shortly after, who are now operating in the province of Manitoba.

Certainly Saskatchewan consumers of lumber have and presently do resent the high price asked for spruce lumber produced locally. The substantial profit exacted by the Timber Board on each thousand feet of native spruce lumber produced, accounts I submit Mr. Speaker, to a considerable degree for the particularly high lumber prices. Applying reasonable and sensible conservation policies, a Liberal government would make our forest resources available to all interested individuals. There would be no strings attached as to price or marketing control. Timber permits and timber sales would be granted on a competitive tender basis, open to everybody. This would result in stepped-up activity in the pulpwood and lumber industries, which I am sure every member of this house will agree is most desirable.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — I believe Mr. Speaker, and have no hesitation in suggesting to the government opposite, that a change in policy in respect to our forest resources and the elimination of the Timber Board entirely would remedy to a very large degree the current unfavourable situation in the forestry industry of this province. Such action would provide for a greater utilization of these resources. Such action would not only provide gainful employment for many of our people, but also additional revenue to the provincial treasury. I have no doubt that it would also provide the ultimate consumer with more reasonable lumber prices. With these remarks Mr. Speaker, I wish to move this motion, seconded by Mr. Allan Guy.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: RE PURPLE, TAX FREE GASOLINE

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

“That in order to provide some aid in reducing farmers’ costs of production, this House recommends to the consideration of the Government that the use of purple, tax-free gasoline in farm trucks be permitted.”

Thursday, March 8, 1962

He said: Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to point out to you and to hon. members in this house the very critical economic situation the farmers of this province find themselves in after two years of drought and after a period of years of policies and lack of policies by the government sitting to your right Sir, that have had a tendency to a very great degree to add to this very critical situation.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — I think I can best illustrate that by pointing up the terrific arrears of taxes that have been accruing and are accruing due to the most unfavourable situation that the farmers find themselves in.

The first item that I want to draw your attention to, are the terrific arrears of municipal taxes which stand today at the staggering figure of \$14 million. Along with that are the arrears of school taxes amounting to \$10¼ million. The larger units alone Mr. Speaker, have the staggering figure of \$8½ million.

What about the power situation in respect to the farmers? We find the farmers in the position where today they owe \$3,681,000 for the installation of power. On top of that, the last information we could get from the government, they owed \$316 thousand in arrears of monthly accounts. Added to that was the most sinister piece of legislation ever placed on the statute books by any government in western Canada, I refer to the mineral tax, where the farmers find themselves in arrears there again to the tune of \$402 thousand.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — So, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will want to bring to your attention some items that I think will help to at least solve in a slight degree the economic position of the farmer. I need not remind any farmer in the province today, or any member in this house of the terrific increase in municipal taxes as a result of policies and lack of policies by this NDP government. To qualify that statement in respect to the farmers' economic situation I want to quote a very eminent professor in our University of Saskatchewan. I refer to none other than Professor Van Vliet. In a statement in the Western Producer

of February 15th of this year he had this to say, when speaking in regard to the farm situation. He said this:

“There will be continued tough sledding for the farmers in our time.”

He suggested present conditions in the province could well be a recurrence of the late 1930's with the worst years yet to come. He also suggested that young farmers, unless they inherit the farmstead should consider carefully the prospects of entering farming with very little capital.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out this to you, that today in this province 73 per cent of our farmers are operating three-quarters of a section or less. So when the eminent professor points out that 73 per cent of the farmers of this province could be in a very critical condition for years to come, then I suggest that this government must get down and do something practical and sensible to help alleviate this situation. These are the people, on the smaller holdings who bear the brunt of these severe hardships.

Then I want to refer to an item in the Canadian Press, November 15th, 1961. It said this:

“A government survey indicates that 70 per cent who may have sold all their grain by about Christmas are the smaller operators.”

These operators that I have referred to. Those farming an acreage of a few acres up to 400. So it is the three-quarter section class, which in Saskatchewan as I said, represent about 73 per cent of our farming population.

As this points out, perhaps 70 per cent of prairie farmers will have sold their available grain by last Christmas or shortly after. That is the end of the press release. And from my own experience Mr. Speaker, and I am sure from the experience of the members in this house, especially the farm members, I would suggest in all sincerity that this probably is the situation, because we all know that there is very little grain in reserve on the farms at the present time. So from now till the prospects of another crop the farmers in this province are probably in the most serious critical economic condition that they have ever had to face since 1937.

These are the people who are suffering most from the ever-increasing imposition of new and old taxes by this

Thursday, March 8, 1962

NDP government to your right Sir. These are the people who carry the heaviest load of the taxation burden in this province of ours. The NDP government is the only government of the three prairie provinces that has seen fit to discriminate against the farmers by not allowing them to use tax-free gasoline in their farm trucks. I want to point out to you Mr. Speaker, that our two neighbouring agricultural prairie provinces, Manitoba to the east and Alberta to the west, have seen fit over the years to allow this concession to their farming people. That I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is why in the province of Saskatchewan we have four and a half times as many people leaving the farms as we have in the province of Manitoba. And in the province of Saskatchewan under this NDP government we have two and a half times as many people leaving the farms as in the province of Alberta. The greatest export this province has ever had, to the everlasting shame of the NDP government to your right Sir, has been the export of its finest natural resource and I refer of course to the young people of this province. It is to their everlasting shame that over a quarter of a million people have left the farms and gone into cities, couldn't find employment and then had to migrate to other provinces. So this government can take no credit, when they say that only 27 thousand people in this province are unemployed, because the vast majority of the people who should be employed in this province have gone to other provinces to seek employment there, and show up on the unemployment figures of other provinces.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — What have been their excuses for not allowing the farmers of Saskatchewan this right — and not allowing the farmers of Saskatchewan the use of tax-free gasoline? I am going to emulate a few and most of these have come from government members on the other side, or some of their spokesmen during election campaigns.

First, and this is most important of all in the eyes of the people of this province, the eyes of the farmers of this province — it is because of their basic policies of socialization by taxation. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, they have sought to extract to the limit every possible cent from the people of this province. Thirdly and most important and most sinister of all is that they are able to have themselves in a position where they can extract further sums of money by harassing and convicting farmers whom they catch using purple gas in their farm trucks.

In this sinister way, the government has increased its revenues by virtue of substantial fines. Mr. Speaker, I am going to challenge the government to tell the people on this side of the house, tell the farmers of this province how much they have extracted year after year by continually harassing and chasing them to find out if they have purple gas in their farm trucks, not only on the road allowances of this province, not only on the highways of this province, Mr. Speaker, but right in the farmers' own farm yard and his own field.

Government members' only defence over the years for not granting this concession is, and again firstly, that farmers would go to church in the trucks instead of their cars. The lamest excuse that any 'humanity first' government could ever pretend to foist upon the people. Another one — the farmers would buy flashy half-ton trucks and by buying flashy, half-ton trucks would tour around the province and would become a second-class citizen. It has been said in this house and I was indeed amazed to hear the Minister of Highways making the statement just over a year ago. That is the position, that is the thinking of the Minister of Highways in this province. Third, that this would impair their grid road policy with the rural municipalities.

Mr. Thatcher: — Sounds weaker every year.

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, what is their policy today in regard to grid roads? I am going to suggest to the members of this legislature and especially to the government on the other side, that if they want to see the government's attitude towards the grid road policy that they look up this year's municipal annual report, the annual report for the Department of Municipal Affairs for 1960-61. In this report Mr. Speaker, will be found the greatest insults of all time to the farmers and to their municipal representatives. Here in this report we find the government who have saddled the people of this province with the most staggering debt load in its history, a debt of \$500 million — a debt that represents \$500 for every man, woman, and child in this province — a debt that future generations will be saddled with. This is the government who has accrued a debt of \$500 million severely censuring the rural municipalities whose net debenture debt is an insignificant sum of \$296 thousand, against \$500 million by the government who intends to dictate to them. They have the audacity in this report Mr. Speaker, to state some rural municipalities have incurred debts.

Thursday, March 8, 1962

They suggest stricter controls are going to be placed on the municipal councils.

Mr. Speaker: — You must stick to your motion.

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on their excuse that they collect gasoline tax in order to build grid roads. And that is what I am going to come to now. They suggest they are going to place controls on the municipalities. They have suggested in this report that the rural municipalities have gone into deficit financing. And why have these municipalities gone into deficit financing Mr. Speaker, as is stated in the report? The reason that the deficits are going to appear is because of the ever-increasing amount of responsibility that is being placed on these municipalities by the provincial government for the grid road system.

Mr. Speaker, when this government came into power in 1944, there were a great many more miles of road in the highway system of the province than there are today. They immediately shirked their responsibility by taking a mileage of roads out of the provincial highway system and placing the responsibility for these roads entirely on the municipalities. Over the years Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that these municipalities have had to come to grips with the situation and try and provide these services to the farmers of the province. Here we find because of favourable weather conditions last year, as compared to other years, the municipalities went ahead and used their surplus of funds they had in their councils — used this to good advantage and went ahead and worked on quite an extensive grid road program. This is the debt against the municipalities. They didn't deserve the condemnation they received by the minister who is in charge of this report. This was a good program of public works. So because they have by careful means built up these reserves and used them for the benefit of the farmers, then it is indeed an insult to find themselves receiving condemnation.

I would suggest to the minister in charge today, that a great deal of consideration and a great deal of research be given to this report because the municipal councils done in my area had to take some of these monies and try and build and maintain portions of road which should be in the highway system of this province. But they have to do it at their own expense and at the expense of the farmers. I refer of course to that portion of No. 47

highway between Stoughton and the Trans Canada, which is now the responsibility of the municipal councils and I refer again to the portion of No. 35 highway from Francis to the Trans Canada highway, which again has been dumped on the shoulders of the municipality.

So Mr. Speaker, if this government through its Minister of Municipal Affairs, or its acting minister, seeks to censure the municipalities, then if they want to see that they leave the municipalities in a better financial position, I suggest to them that in this year's estimates — this year's budget, they provide the necessary sums to put those two portions of road into the highway system. These are the two that I am familiar with and I am sure that every member in this house has similar circumstances in his own constituency.

Now Mr. Speaker, it was intimated in this report that because of this situation, maybe the provincial government would have to take drastic action — maybe they would have to put controls on these.

Mr. Speaker: — I hope the hon. member will soon show that it all ties in with his motion.

Mr. McFarlane: — Yes. It also stated that maybe they would have to see that conscientious men would be placed on the councils to carry out the work of these councils.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is where the farmers want to really wake up and pay particular notice to this. Their government is going to take it upon themselves to see that men that they appoint be placed on these councils. The reason for that is, Mr. Speaker, that at their NDP founding convention here in the city of Regina a motion was passed stating that NDP people be nominated for rural and urban municipal council positions.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McFarlane: — Now Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out why these deficits were incurred and I have pointed out that if the provincial government, as the members have said over the years, had turned over this tax from purple gasoline that the farmers pay, over to the municipalities, and in all sincerity helped the municipalities out, then some of these deficits

Thursday, March 8, 1962

wouldn't have occurred. It was just a matter of the rural municipal councils using their cash reserves to build more and more roads under favourable weather conditions. That is what happened a year ago. The government shirked its responsibility by placing hundreds of miles of secondary highway into the municipal grid system.

The other reason I am going to suggest is this Mr. Speaker. Having the municipalities having had the experience of the local school districts when the larger unit was set up and having had the experience of their money being taken into the larger unit board, now when the threat of municipal reorganization is hanging heavy over their heads, when the threat of a county system is hanging over their heads — they are going to make sure that the farmers who are paying this tax on gasoline get the services and get the roads built in those areas or those municipalities before anything happens to their local municipal system.

Mr. Speaker: — I hope you will tie this in with your motion.

An Hon. Member: — He is doing that well.

Mr. McFarlane: — This NDP government's only solution to the farm problem has been to eliminate the farm units and the farm population. Now by virtue of the mess that they have got themselves into with the rural municipalities and rural municipal officials, they are endeavouring to eliminate the rural municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of order Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is obviously reading his speech.

Mr. McFarlane: — I am reading notes.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Further on the point of order. He has had his eyes constantly on that paper. He is reading his speech and there is no other explanation for it.

Mr. McFarlane: — All I am going to say is this Mr. Minister, if I am reading my notes, and the reason he objects, is because it is hitting hard, and no member of this government from the day he was elected in 1944 has sought more to try and wreck the municipal system and have a different

type of municipal system than the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the discussion being raised now would be better raised when the minister introduces the bill on municipalities, which the house is aware is coming down. I think your discussion is too far removed from your motion. I would ask you to get back to discussing your motion.

Mr. Danielson: — There is nothing on the order paper about . . .

Mr. Speaker: — That is agreed. But it is relevant . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — I am just going to say this. As a result of continuous ridiculing and interference by this government, relations between it and municipal governments are now at their lowest ebb of any time in the history of this province.

Mr. Thatcher: — That is right.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — At this time I wish to suggest two means in which the economic plight of agriculture and the farmer can be alleviated. The first is my challenge to this government to resign immediately.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — They no longer have the confidence of the farm people. They no longer have the confidence of the farmers' parliament, and I refer of course to the rural municipal government. They are riddled with dissention. They are devoid of aggressive and practical programs. They are a haven of power-lusting bureaucrats.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of order again. The hon. member is reading every word.

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. Speaker: — Order! When a member is on a point of order, I must hear the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The point of order is that it is so obvious that the hon. member is reading every word that he is saying.

An Hon. Member: — Sit down Brock.

Mr. McFarlane: — It is so obvious Mr. Speaker, that if I am doing what he says, reading these remarks, then the people are sure enjoying them. In the meantime Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I don't like to interfere with the member, but I hope that he won't read his notes too extensively.

Mr. MacDougall: — You didn't say that to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. McFarlane: — They (this government) are just putting in time until the people of this province have the opportunity to wipe them off the political map.

Mr. Speaker, this government who sits to your right is just a group of sitting ducks, paralyzed by their own self-inflicted wounds.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — In the meantime Mr. Speaker, in order to in some degree alleviate the economic suffering of the agricultural industry and particularly to help the farmers of this province in their most critical times, who every time they fill their car and truck gas tanks, are forced to pay \$2.25 of tax to this NDP government, I move . . .

Premier Lloyd: — . . . when a point of order is raised, certainly when the Speaker gets on his feet, the member is supposed to take his seat. He is obviously reading, but it isn't well written and he is having difficulty with the reading . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Why don't you use the same for your ministers?

Mr. Speaker: — I do not object to the members staying closely to their notes, but I do wish they would stay closer to the resolution.

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to tell you that I am moving a motion as it stands on the order paper for the use of purple tax-free gasoline, seconded by Mr. Gardiner, the member for Melville.

Mr. C.H. Thurston (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this resolution . . .

Hon. Mr. Guy: — Don't read it . . .

Mr. Thurston: — Don't worry about it. I want to say first that I am going to oppose this resolution.

Mr. Thatcher: — Farmers friend!

Mr. Thurston: — Mr. Speaker, I expected that from the Leader of the Opposition, but I want to tell him that all my adult life I have worked with farm organizations in trying to bring about better conditions for agriculture. One thing that I learned early in my association with these groups was that they have never asked and are not asking now for special privileges. Farm organizations down through the years have simply asked for parity prices or for their fair share of the national income — nothing more or nothing less.

We know Mr. Speaker, and I am going to try to keep to the subject matter before us and not wander into the whole municipal field, and I think members will agree that farmers today in Canada — we only have about 13 per cent of the population engaged in agriculture. Now certainly there is more than that percentage in Saskatchewan. I suggest Sir, that Saskatchewan, like other provinces is having less and less farmers. The reason for it is the cost-price squeeze, the modern mechanization that we find ourselves in. It has always been my contention that if any group asked a government for policies or for programs to aid them in their industry, they should propose policies that would gain the support of the majority of the people. To me Sir, tax concessions above would not obtain the support of the majority of the people.

Thursday, March 8, 1962

To me Sir, I would be prepared to take a chance on losing the support if by removing the tax on farm trucks would put the farmer in a position where he would be helped.

Mr. Speaker, in trying to give some statistics on this, I wasn't able to find the proper statistics on how much the gasoline tax was for farm trucks. Therefore, you can only estimate what it costs an individual farmer. I can use my own case Sir. My farm is five miles from the shipping point to which I haul my grain. I farm just about a section of land — not quite — the railway track cuts it down to about 600 acres. My annual mileage for my truck for farm purposes is about 2500 or less during a year. Using 14 miles to the gallon, and I think this is a pretty fair average for a farm truck. I am saying it is an average. That means that I use about 180 gallons in a year and at 14¢ a gallon it is some \$25.00.

Now Mr. Speaker, I can agree that my mileage may be a little less than average, but I doubt if it is very much below the average if we take farming operations in exclusively. Now I would gather from what the mover said that he is suggesting that we should let farmers use their farm trucks for pleasure purposes. Now on the face of it Mr. Speaker, this looks fine, but what about those farmers that haven't got trucks, and there are many in this province who haven't got trucks. What is he going to suggest about the farmer who has an old truck, that is in shape to haul his farm products, and his wheat, but not in a shape to take his family out in? Are we going to say to him, you can take your truck and use purple gas in it and take your family to church or on pleasure trips, but the man across the road who hasn't got a truck, he is going to have to pay the tax on his car, which I think would be very, very unfair.

To me, tax-free gas for trucks is not the answer. I am convinced that if a farmer received one or two cents a bushel more for his wheat that it would far more than make up for the tax he pays on his gas.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thurston: — To me, Sir, this is the answer to the economic condition that farmers are in. He must receive a price for his product that will meet his production costs and leave enough for a decent standard of living. We are just kidding ourselves if we think, by relieving the farmer of this tax on gasoline, that we are putting him in a position where we're going to do very much about his

production costs. What we would be doing, Mr. Speaker, would be depriving the provincial government of the revenue that is needed, without doing very little to aid the farmer. I firmly believe, if we take the tax off the gas for the farm trucks and deprive the government of this revenue, certainly we will not be in a position to aid the municipalities. If we do that Mr. Speaker, in the long run we may be adding to the farmers' costs. We all know that the better the road, the less it costs to operate a vehicle. Our government has recognized this down through the years. Last year, this legislature voted \$7.6 million to aid municipalities in providing these better services.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thurston: — The mover mentioned that the debenture debt of municipalities is only some \$296 thousand, and I am proud of this. I would suggest Sir, that maybe this \$7.6 million has something to do with keeping their debenture debt from rising.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thurston: — Mr. Speaker, I cannot stand up in this legislature and on one hand ask the government to reduce its revenue and in the same breath turn around and ask the same government to increase its social services. I know that the opposition across from us has some magic formula, so they say, and they can do this — they can reduce taxes and at the same time increase the social services.

Mr. Thatcher: — All we have to do is get some good government.

Mr. Thurston: — I would be disappointed Mr. Speaker if the Leader of the Opposition hadn't said that, because I think he must have been talking to our Prime Minister. It seems to me to be only a few short years ago that our Prime Minister, when he was in the opposition was making the same statements. He was making the statement that the Liberals there were terrible. Their administration costs are high. They are extravagant. Put us into office and we'll show you what we can do.

Now Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the House

Thursday, March 8, 1962

of Commons as you know, and I haven't seen the public accounts. I don't know whether the government at Ottawa has reduced administration costs. I know that our Liberal friends say they haven't. It is true Sir, that they have increased services. I would suggest by deficit financing. I am not going to complain about deficit financing. I would think that in certain ways we are justified. Take for instance public utilities. I think any government is justified in borrowing money for these kind of services, because not only do they meet our needs today, but they will serve the needs of generations to come. That is also true in schools and hospitals, and it is necessary for health services and welfare. But Mr. Speaker, I don't think it would be good policy to have deficit financing for roads. Roads are something that are built today and we wear them out, and they are something we can't pass on to our future generations.

But Mr. Speaker, getting back to the farmer and his production costs. There are other savings that this government has given to aid the farmer with his truck costs. It has been intimated that the farmers in this province have to pay the highest tax of any province in Canada. Now I would like to make a comparison of farm truck registration fees and insurance rates in the three prairie provinces. We know Mr. Speaker that in any province you cannot drive a motor vehicle without a license, and I suggest Sir, that it is also true with insurance. We had courage in this province to make it compulsory but also we have at the same time that we had the courage to make it compulsory we had the same responsibility of seeing that the people get insurance rates for their cars and trucks at a fair rate.

Now Mr. Speaker I would like to inform my friends who are so worried about what we are doing to the farmers in this province, and what the provinces to the left and right are doing, what I find in this regard, first take the registration fee. I might say, Sir, that we base them on the same basis in the three prairie provinces, maximum weight, not wheel base. Taking Alberta first the maximum weight, not exceeding 4,000 pounds \$10; exceeding 4,000 pounds but not exceeding 6,000 \$15; exceeding 6,000 pounds but not over 12,000, \$25; and everything over 12,000 — \$35.00. That is Alberta.

What about Saskatchewan? Up to 5,000 pounds in Saskatchewan the same as Alberta \$10; 5,000 to 7,500 \$12.50; 7,500 pounds to 10,000 \$15; and 10,000 to 12,000 pounds \$17.50 and the rate progressively goes up to anything over 20,000 pounds in Saskatchewan \$30.00 with this difference that any truck up to and including 1951 model \$10.00.

What about Manitoba? Manitoba has gross weight not over three tons or 6,000 pounds \$12.50; and for each additional half ton or portion thereof an additional \$2.50.

Now Mr. Speaker, taking a 10,000 pound truck which is roughly speaking a one ton truck and I would think the majority of the farmers use a one ton truck and what do I find? In Manitoba you would pay \$22.50; Alberta you would pay \$25.00 and in Saskatchewan you pay \$15.00.

Now what about our insurance rates? Taking a 1956 one ton truck where there are no drivers under 25 years of age and no accidents in the past three years — rural Manitoba only \$30.56, rural Alberta only \$44.50. Anywhere in Saskatchewan \$25.00. But if you have been unfortunate enough to have had one accident during the last year what is the situation. Manitoba \$43.48, Alberta \$63.92, Saskatchewan \$28.

Now Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the figures another way. Let us add them together, because they are expenses the poor farmers have to pay. Take in Manitoba if you are on the rate that you haven't had an accident the last three years, what is the situation on the same truck? Manitoba \$53.26; Alberta \$69.80; Saskatchewan \$40. Now let us take other figures, where you have had an accident in the last year, what do we find? Manitoba \$65.98; Alberta \$88.92; Saskatchewan \$43, or a saving in that figure of \$45.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thurston: — Those figures, I suggest Sir, will purchase a lot of gasoline at 14¢ a gallon. These Mr. Speaker are the kinds of benefits that we should be giving our farmers and because the farmer may only drive his truck a thousand miles then he is getting a saving, but if I drive my truck fifteen or twenty thousand, I think the only fair way that I pay my share of the road cost is by the gasoline tax.

Now the mover mentioned Mr. Speaker, that in Alberta and Manitoba the farmers there are allowed to drive with tax-free gas. That is true, I am not aware of what the situation is in Manitoba but I do know in Alberta, but he should have gone on and told a little further, that in Alberta you have restricted use and you can only haul your own products with a farm truck license that you get with use of free gas. I understand that if you even haul a cattle beast for your neighbor you are subject to purchase

Thursday, March 8, 1962

another license, a higher priced license, then you also have to pay the tax. What do you do in Saskatchewan? True we pay the tax but with our license we can haul much more, not only can I haul my own products, not only can I haul produce from my neighbors, I can haul gravel for a municipality, and I have a good example of that Mr. Speaker, a few years ago a flash flood came along and washed out a culvert close to my farm home. The municipal councillor phoned me and asked me if I would put a load of gravel in there until the municipality had time to fix it, so I did. I drove up to the gravel pit and back, but I happened to back in beside a big gravel truck. We were both loading, and he asked me what I was hauling gravel for, and I said, for the municipality, to fill in a hole, and he said are you being paid for it. I said I sure hope I am as it was a hot afternoon. Well, Sir, the language isn't fit to use in this house what he called the CCF government for allowing me, a farmer, with a farm truck license, to haul gravel which he had to pay \$156 for the same license to haul the gravel for the same job. Mr. Speaker, that is another reason that we would be setting up special privileges.

Mr. Speaker, I am also sure that the majority of the farmers do not oppose paying this tax. I am not quite sure whether it was 1959 or 1960, I believe it was 1960, the S.A.R.M. convention passed a resolution. I haven't got it before me, but it is much the same as this resolution. Mr. Speaker, after looking at this, municipal men know what I have been trying to say. That they can't come to the government and ask for more grants and then ask for more tax reductions, and they wisely voted down this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting, surely the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) isn't suggesting that a cabinet minister would go and threaten a group of people that they have maintained are the local government of this province, surely he is not suggesting that by a threat like would make these delegates, these councillors at the convention, vote against something they did not believe in . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — After they were threatened . . .

Mr. Thurston: — And also Mr. Speaker, I would say at the same time at our farmers union passed a similar resolution saying they did not approve of removing the tax from the farm trucks.

Now Mr. Speaker, it appears now we have agreed to put another resolution on the order paper this afternoon, a lady member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) will be moving this resolution, but there is much more I want to say on the subject but time does not permit.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: RE WORLD PEACE

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City) moved:

That, this Assembly requests the government of Saskatchewan:

1. to support and encourage the concept of world Peace Year; and
2. to urge the Federal Government to take steps at an early session of the United Nations, to bring about a declaration of a World Peace Year.

She said: Mr. Speaker, the resolution that I am about to move is rather a far cry from the question of purple gas, but I think all members will realize that the subject we are dealing with is an extremely important one.

Some months ago a delegation from the Voice of Women met with the Saskatchewan cabinet and asked in their brief that the government would do certain things they felt might help to reduce tension in the world and find some peaceful solution to some of the problems that affect mankind, and in this brief they suggested among other things, Mr. Speaker, that the government be asked to support and encourage the idea or the concept of a world peace year, and that this government urge the federal government to have their representatives to the United Nations bring a resolution to the United Nations asking for a proclamation of a World Peace Year.

Now some time previous to this the national organization of the Voice of Women, had sent a brief to Prime Minister Diefenbaker making very much the same suggestion. The Prime Minister had told them that he would give the matter consideration, later on he wrote them and told them he had taken it up with his colleagues,

Thursday, March 8, 1962

and pointed out to them that India had on the agenda of the United Nations a resolution asking for a World Co-operation Year, and that he had instructed the Canadian delegation to work very closely with India on her resolution for a world co-operation, and I feel Mr. Speaker, that a World Peace Year could very well be integrated into the idea of a world co-operation year, and because I can see very great possibilities in this suggestion, that I am moving this resolution today.

Now then what value could you expect from the declaration by the United Nations of a World Peace Year? Well, of course Mr. Speaker, it would depend on the kind and the scope of projects that were undertaken during such a year.

For years we know there have been very excellent suggestions and solutions presented by educators and scientists and statesmen about these world problems, but while there is a wealth of ideas in the field, they are scattered and are not followed up. Now if there were some vehicle whereby all these ideas could be gathered together in evolving a program for peace, and followed up, some substantial progress might be made. Now this could be one useful project undertaken during a World Peace Year, and it has been very difficult in the climate of tension that has been building up in the world to follow up these kind of suggestions. A World Peace Year could focus attention on peace and might give new significance in which they could work. And then a World Peace Year Mr. Speaker, might provide opportunities for member nations of the United Nations, governments of the great powers to work together and make some specific proposal for world co-operation, and a period of co-operating on a small project might lead eventually to more co-operation on larger and more crucial matters. But my great hope for a World Peace Year would be two things; first that it would spark scientific research for peace and secondly just as important that it might change the psychological climate in which we are now living, and this climate must be changed before we will get very far in working for peace.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that a few years ago the United Nations declared a World Refugee Year. Now, of course that did not solve the complete problem, the refugee problem, but very, very substantial progress was made, and in a World Peace Year if the focus was on peace then I think also it might do much to start us on the right road, and certainly it could do nothing but good.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in a very difficult period in the history of world affairs. We have come to the end of an era in our civilization, and we are in a period of transition between the pre-atomic age and the age of atomic power, and this is a period in which old methods and old ideas ingrained for generations must be discarded and new methods and new ideas put in their place, and this is true, not only in the field of science since the splitting of the atom, but it is equally true in our methods of settling international affairs. For the scientists the transition was less difficult because scientists have been trained to look at facts objectively, and to face facts that are before them, and so it was much easier for them to discard outmoded ideas and start afresh with new ideas, and a new set of facts, and work from there. And this the scientists have done, they have accepted the challenge, and the result has been that the progress they have made has been almost unbelievable. But in the field of international affairs, and international relationships this approach is much more difficult, because of the power and the pull of tradition and because of the mental and emotional blocks that get in our way when we are dealing with human beings, and human emotions. We must remember that war has been a salient feature of all societies of which we have knowledge and it is as deeply imbedded in our thinking and in our experience as religion or law. It has always been assumed that, horrible as it might be, when international disputes reach a final impasse war was the only solution, and the victor got the spoils and the victor could dictate the terms of peace.

To discard this concept Mr. Speaker, so deeply embedded in our lives and experience, is one of the greatest difficulties that the nations face today. Our dilemma is that there could be no longer any victor in a large scale war, and our intelligence tells us that it would be pure insanity to engage in an atomic war, and race suicide. Norman Cousins in a very excellent book called, "In Place of Folly" states this:

"We must find a way of averting war unless we crave the distinction of being the last generation of man on earth".

Now President Kennedy has said, there is no alternative to peace. This is so, Mr. Speaker, and I think we all agree. Isn't it also true that we have to start with this as an axiom, that there is no alternative to peace and this is the only intelligent and realistic approach. So the problem now is not how to win a war that can't be won, but how to avert a war with honour, and this is

Thursday, March 8, 1962

possibly the greatest and most frustrating challenge ever faced by mankind.

Walter Lippman has said this:

“It is enormously difficult to make peace but intolerably dangerous to make war, and useless to make war about fundamental issues. We are living between a war that cannot be fought and a peace that we do not know how to achieve, and the power which used to deal with the divisions and conflicts in the past, namely organized war, has become an impossible instrument of use.”

Now in facing these facts that stand out starkly before us, how realistic have the nations been in trying to face these facts in solving the problems that confront us.

We have had disarmament conferences, without much success, but the chief emphasis Mr. Speaker has been and still is on stock piling, larger and larger piles of armaments that we dare not use, and trying to preserve peace through a balance of terror. You will note that of the United States defense budget \$40 billion that was spent on scientific research for methods of waging war, but when Senator Humphreys asked for \$400 thousand that is just one-one thousandth of the same amount, for studies relating to disarmament, he was refused.

Also, Mr. Speaker, how much real effort and research has been directed towards solving the problems that would exist if the cold war was suddenly relaxed or discontinued? If we had the answer to this type of question it certainly would do much to speed up disarmament.

I read a very interesting little book by Walter Milner, called “World Without War”, and I thought by the title this would be very idealistic picture of a world that was almost a millennium, but I was thoroughly disillusioned before I finished the book, because he points out the problems of peace are almost as staggering as the problems of war itself, but with one great difference Mr. Speaker, and a very important difference, the world would be intact, we would have a calmer atmosphere to work in, we wouldn't have lost most of our most brilliant people in an atomic war, and time would be on our side.

Milner reminds us that even in a disarmed world, the conflict and the divisions which were troubling us

would still exist, and have to be worked out, and he asked this important question. Could the cold war be relaxed without major depressions in the western world? Now this is a real problem when you consider that one-tenth of the national economy of the United States would have to be converted very rapidly into other forms of production, or economic chaos would result, and of course the answer to this question depends entirely on how much previous planning is done before this situation which we all hope for comes about. But how much research for this sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, is being done in United States or in Canada or in any country? Very little we all know. Now this sort of thing could be a project for the United Nations and for the member nations, an excellent project to begin in a World Peace Year, because if we were ready to deal in an orderly way with this problem it certainly would spur disarmament negotiations. Now while in the west the economic problem may be the greatest one in relaxing the cold war, Russia has its problems too. Because fear of attack has had a very unifying effect in Russia, but if that threat were removed, the threat of fear of war, it might produce very serious political repercussions in that country. This may be one of the reasons for the stubborn and unreasonable attitude of Russia in disarmament negotiations. Then there is another stumbling block, that there is no fool-proof method as yet to detect atomic stockpiles and secret atomic tests — that is none that the nations trust — because the nations distrust each other.

Now the answer to this particular question, Mr. Speaker, is equally valuable to both sides, and if this were resolved it also would be a spur to disarmament negotiations. Admittedly it is a difficult problem but it is not beyond the competence of a race of men who have produced miracles in science, but it won't be solved Mr. Speaker without a lot of research without adequate personnel and without a sufficient budget. Now such research possibly could be done actually through the United Nations itself by drawing on a group of scientists from many countries, including both Russia and the United States, thus any findings that were produced would be less suspected and the distrust would be minimized and maybe eliminated. This could be another possibility for World Peace Year.

We must realize this Mr. Speaker, if peace is to be won it can't be won by wishful thinking, nor by assuming rigid positions nor by pious platitudes, because it will take as great an effort to win the peace as it

Thursday, March 8, 1962

would to win the war which can't be won, and even greater because we are so late in starting. Then also, Mr. Speaker, and I do want to stress this, peace can never be won by relying on the balance of terror as we are doing today through this futile armament race. Somehow before we make much progress we must explode this fallacy that this is the way toward peace, and perhaps the World Peace Year would help.

I would like to read a little quotation here from Norman Cousins:

“The incredible paradox we face is that both potential foes today seek security in the same terms. Each calls on the other to be deterred by its striking power yet both are becoming more insecure in direct proportion to the increase in their own power. Announcement of a military breakthrough by one power rather than producing a mood of defeat causes frenzied preparation to match and surpass, and no nation can long hold a monopoly. One nation's deterrent is another nation's incentive and never in history has the sovereign state been more powerful and less secure. Its capacity for waging war has never been so great, nor its ability to protect itself so puny. No matter how hard today's sovereign state tries to secure security through power, that power is never great enough for other states are increasing their power too.”

Now Mr. Speaker we had a perfect example of this in the last few days. You will remember last November Russia broke her pact and started atomic tests again. On Saturday we heard President Kennedy announce that unless progress is made in the forthcoming conference that for the sake of security he said the United States cannot afford to fall behind in this race, and already Russia has answered, all right if you go ahead so will we. And this is a perfect example of what I am talking about. And the fallacy of this approach Mr. Speaker, is that this approach to the hope of winning by superior power is that it is not only a negative answer but it is very dangerous, because this balance of terror cannot be continued too long without bankrupting the nations and eventually exploding into war. I would like to quote also here from Walter Lippman on this point. He says:

“Only a moral idiot with a suicidal mania would press the button for a nuclear war. Yet we have learned that while a nuclear war would be lunacy, it is nevertheless an

“ever-present possibility. Why? Because however lunatic it may be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to the point of lunacy when its nervous system can endure inaction no longer and when only violence can relieve its feeling. This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. The nerves of a nation can stand only so much provocation and humiliation, and beyond limits it will plunge into lunacy. This is as much a real fact as the megaton bomb and it is a fact that must be given great weight.”

It has been said Mr. Speaker, that since Adam and Eve ate the apple, man has never refrained from committing any folly he was capable of committing. Fear and frustration may produce the ultimate folly.

To me Mr. Speaker the greatest tragedy of the cold war is not the money that is wasted on useless weaponry, money that could provide peaceful solutions and help build undeveloped nations, this is a great tragedy, but to me it is not the greatest. The greatest tragedy is what fear and whipped-up hatred are doing to human personalities and to all our moral and spiritual values. Fear has a terrible effect on human beings, it cracks the thin veneer of civilization, and it blocks the normal channel of reason, and distorts all our ethical reasonable and kindly people to contemplate and to rationalize a kind of savagery unequalled in the dark ages, and it already has gone a long way in working its corruption.

We can now talk rather calmly Mr. Speaker, like this. We say, well maybe not all the people would be destroyed in an atomic war, maybe only 30 or 40 or 50 million of our people would be destroyed, and perhaps we could succeed in killing more Russians at the same time. Being human of course, we assume that we and our immediate families would survive, and because it is unpleasant to contemplate, we refuse to think of the kind of world we would have to survive in. We have learned Mr. Speaker, to look at people as statistics rather than as human beings.

Now I think all of us have heard the suggestion that if there is an atomic attack, those of us who have shelters should dive into them and shoot our neighbour who has no shelter. Now the fact Mr. Speaker, that there

Thursday, March 8, 1962

was no great public outcry from the whole of the population at such a suggestion is a signal of what is actually happening to us. We hear gloating that we now perhaps have a death ray that will eliminate human life and save buildings and property. By all means Mr. Speaker, let us save the property! And not only can we talk calmly about atomic bombs and destruction by radiation, but we have developed a use, if necessary of chemical, radiological and biological warfare.

Now chemical and biological warfare are not new. Five hundred years before Christ we hear of poisoning wells to confound the enemy. In the 14th century the Tartars of Crimea threw plague victims over the walls of Italian forts to spread disease among their enemies. Two centuries later the Italians had artillery shells that could deliver disease to an enemy, and we are told that in prehistoric America, blankets infected with smallpox were given to Indians to impair their fighting strength. We know about mustard gas and poison gas, but all of these things, Mr. Speaker, are feeble compared to the available atrocities that we could commit today. We have gasses now that can be quickly absorbed into the lungs and the skin and produce instant blindness, and interfere with the internal organs. We have nerve gasses that act like a superinsecticide, like D.D.T., and the effect is widespread, instantaneous and lethal in a few seconds and causes perspiration, vomiting and convulsions, and this can be spread over large areas by missile. In the same manner epidemics of paralyzing diseases can be spread, and we have some who argue that this is a cheaper and more effective way of pursuing warfare. Has there ever been a time Mr. Speaker, in the history of mankind when spiritual and moral values have reached such a low ebb? Such as the effect of fear and frustration of the cold war. And isn't it time something was done to change the emphasis. But as long, Mr. Speaker, as we put our faith in the deterrent, as long as we believe there is no alternative to war, or that a war could be fought and won, fear will persist, and the final answer will be the annihilation of most of the population and the loss of all our values that are worth preserving. It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that every organism has within itself the seeds of its own destruction. This seed is germinating dangerously today, and the only thing that can stop its reaching maturity is a rapid change in our emphasis and a diligent search for alternative methods.

If any progress could be made, however slight, during a World Peace Year, certainly it would be very much worthwhile, and it is well to remember, Mr. Speaker, that

in the dangerous time in which we are living, time is of the essence, and time at present is not on the side of civilization.

Finally Mr. Speaker, if we are to wage the kind of psychological war against prejudice and outmoded ideas that must be waged, against these things that stand in the way of peace, as Norman Cousins puts it:

“It is well to know the faces of the enemy.”

He says this:

“The enemy is not solely a totalitarian power with a world ideology. The enemy is many people — he is the man whose sole concern is that the world stay in one piece during his lifetime, future generations don’t concern him. He is invariably up to his hips in success and he regards his good fortune as proof of the correctness of everything he does. Second, the enemy is a man who believes there are mammoth forces in the world today that the individual cannot comprehend and can do nothing about, and he spends his energy trying to convince other people of their own helplessness, that there is nothing they can do anyway and so it is safer and more popular just to follow the crowd. The enemy is the man in government high or low who keeps waiting for a public mandate to develop big ideas of his own, but who does little or nothing about trying to bring this mandate about. He has an obsessive fear of criticism and to such a man the worst thing that could happen is to be accused of not being tough enough minded in his dealings with other nations and other powers. Fourthly, the enemy is any man in the pulpit who talks about the sacredness of human life, but never relates that concept to the real and specific issues that threatens such sacredness. He is the enemy because this crisis is as much a spiritual crisis as a political one.”

And I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that the enemy is to man of small mind, who through ignorance or from ulterior motives, seeks to discredit and to smear earnest people and earnest organizations, that are sincerely trying to

Thursday, March 8, 1962

find a way out of this dilemma, a way to work toward a world of peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe that mankind has the native ability to solve its international problems without war, and because I believe that alternative methods must be found without delay if we are going to counteract the powerful influence of the proponents of military force, and because I realize that it is going to take a concerted effort of the best minds that can be found anywhere in this world, psychologists, educationists, journalists, economists, the best minds we can produce to do the kind of research that is necessary, and because I believe that some of these projects could be undertaken during a World Peace Year, it is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I have moved, seconded by the member for Bengough (Mr. Dahlman) this resolution.

Mr. H.R. Dahlman (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I am certainly pleased to have the opportunity to second this motion as prepared by the member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper). I think everyone in Canada today, yes I would say all world citizens, should feel very apprehensive of the perplexities of the problems of disarmament and building world peace.

I think especially all of us who have the privilege of sitting in the chambers of government should feel that responsibility and act upon it. I think we will all agree that the United Nations today are doing a wonderful job, but the job seems a little bit too big to progress at the rate at which we would like to see it progress, this job of disarmament and working for peace. I think we have to have a different grasp, a little bit of a different approach in assisting the United Nations in solving this problem. I think we have to regard this as a responsibility of the individual and associations, and yes, local governments, and other organizations, in bringing about a situation where we can influence major governments. I think it goes without saying that in order to do that, that we must take another look at that which is involved in disarmament today.

The number one problem seems to be the prevention of war, but today we are preparing for war. If the arms race increases then our thoughts are turned to counter weapons which are building up at a rate that is taking us to the brink of race annihilation. I think we need organizations to work internationally who are civilian groups in all nations, to assist and influence governments.

The emphasis today is preparing for war, ladies and gentlemen, we are preparing for a war that we cannot have. When Pope John, His Holiness Pope John, spoke in his inaugural address, he had this to say.

“Why must the resources of human ingenuity and materials be turned to the production of instruments for war, rather than to the production for the common good?”

I think civilian institutions and organizations can be set up that will be supported by our churches, world churches today, and other organizations working in the interests of peace. Not only is war impossible today because it would mean the annihilation of every living thing, or so scientists tell us, but now that we have gone into the age of orbit missiles, I suggest to this assembly that it has now gone beyond our ability to pay for war. We are in the space age. The cost of sending a man into orbit is a fantastic figure, and I suggest that we can't afford war even if it could be held without race annihilation. The emphasis should be rather than preparing for war, would be preparing for peace. Now how would you bridge the chasm between war and peace? I think there is only one solution and that is through the use of science and reason, rather than emotional and traditional thinking.

I think we have to get away from political hysteria today and reason our way out of this mess. Since science has developed armaments to the point now where they are beyond our control, we have to use yet another science to bring us out of the dilemma. That is why I am trying to deal today, Mr. Speaker, with the need for peace research institutes.

Dr. Alcock, who has been mentioned and I am sure most people have read about and know something about him, spoke in Regina not so long ago. He has written a book entitled “The Bridge of Reason”, and this bridge of reason is in fact the transition period from a war economy to a peace economy. Economic, industrial, and social reorientation is necessary, man has to think his way out of his problems. His ability to reason critically and constructively has caused his progressive rise in the sciences, his cure and solutions in the field of social disease, of which war is the greatest, will have to be resolved by his ability to reason. Now who are these people that are involved in this peace research as is proposed by Dr. Alcock? There should first be mention of Dr. Alcock himself.

Thursday, March 8, 1962

He was the director of engineering for the Canadian Curtis Wright Company before undertaking full employment in full time peace research work two years ago. He was born in Edmonton, educated in Vancouver, he won a scholarship to Queens as Canada's best high school mathematician. He went on to California Institute of Technology and then joined Canada's National Research Council as an electrical engineer. He was loaned to the British radar development team where he worked with Sir Bernard Lovell for the duration of the war, and designed the radar antenna that detected Berlin's core for R.A.F. pathfinders.

In 1945 he went to McGill on a fellowship where he worked on design of the cyclotron. Subsequently he joined the Canadian Atomic Energy project at Chalk River where he did research on neutrons. And in 1949 he received his doctorate degree in physics from McGill. He is the inventor of nuclear devices which are now used in industrial plants around the world.

He was a man who had established himself, who had a home in Oakville, Ontario, at a salary of about \$15 thousand a year which he sacrificed to go into research in an attempt to organize the research institutes in Canada.

Now I want to mention some of the directorate which I think we should regard as being very important, because these are men of high integrity. Dr. Brock Chisholm of Victoria is the former Director-General of the World Health Organization. He was Director-General of Medical Services and Deputy Adjutant-General of the Canadian Army in World War II. He is a world figure in the field of psychiatry — a leader in applying the sciences of psychology and sociology to world problems. We also have Walter C. Koerner of Vancouver, who is a director of the Toronto-Dominion Bank and of Western Canada Steel Limited. He is chairman of Rayonier Canada Limited. Mr. Koerner is also a member of the Board of Governors of the University of British Columbia and brings to the board of the Canadian Peace Research Institute both the background of an industrialist and financier on one hand, and that of an educationalist on the other.

Dr. Hugh Keenleyside of Victoria is the former Director-General of the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration. He is chairman of the British Columbia Power Commission. Professor Kenneth E. Boulding of Ann Arbor, Michigan, is a former Professor of Economics at the University of Michigan and co-director of the

Centre for Research on Conflict Resolution. Francis G. Winspear of Edmonton is the president of fourteen companies in western Canada. He is also director of the Toronto-Dominion Bank, vice-chairman of the Life Insurance Company of Alberta. The Very Rev. James S. Thomson is the former Moderator of the United Church of Canada. He is also former president of the University of Saskatchewan and former Dean of the Faculty of Divinity at McGill. These are some of the members of the Board of Directors of the proposed Research Institute.

Now the social sciences, I think we all agree, are different to physical sciences in these ways. They are less developed, they are more complex, they are less exact, and they are most important. Progress in physical sciences must yield to reason and attitudes in design and purpose. Philosophical, spiritual and human values must take priority.

Now in beginning the program of disarmament the speaker who moved the resolution stated the procedure is complex. You can't have physical disarmament without first having international agreements on aid, trade and a multiplicity of scientific research exchanges, must forerun the actual physical disarmament. I think that direct stopping of production of arms and the dislocation of industry, the economic maladjustment that would result from such an action would cause a great hardship during the transition period. As a matter of fact it would leave us in an almost hopeless economic chaos.

We must have first research in the fields of international agreements, international trade, economic and industrial reorientation.

Now some people might question what effect this would have on the east. Well in theory it would bring prosperity. The transition from arms to civilian goods production in the east would be a relief to an austere life for many of the underprivileged peoples of the Asian countries. I think we can all understand that if the nations of the world today weren't burdened with a heavy responsibility and a heavy cost of armaments that we could enjoy a high standard of living for every man, woman and child living. It would seem to me that regardless of where we live that we would all yield to the philosophy of peace, and production of goods for the common good rather than for military purposes.

What effect would it have on the west?

Thursday, March 8, 1962

The affluent economy would slump. Foreign aid would take diversion of surplus production, which means again we would have to have trade agreements for those nations who could use the surplus of food which we produce. As one man once said, there is only one Christian way to get rid of surplus food, and that is through the bellies of hungry people, and in this regard I think it would be very acceptable to those that would receive and certainly a relief to those of us who over-produce.

Transition from arms to aid would be an economic gain to the west if properly organized. The production of arms is a total loss to the people who produce them, they become obsolete, they have no trade-in value, it is something we have to have for protection, but otherwise have no economic value. The production of civilian goods Mr. Speaker, for aid would bring rich rewards in the building and expanding of new useful markets and customers as well as building international goodwill. I think business men could sponsor the change and become the champions of disarmament. No one can make a fortune in war and go unpunished today Mr. Speaker. I think defence contracts could be replaced by mutual aid contracts.

Again, in striving through the United Nations to bring about international understanding to the degree where disarmament is possible, I think we have to speed this thing up by giving this additional inspiration through our civilian organizations. I think today accidental war is the most dangerous, and the danger is building up as new inventions and new instruments of war are developed.

Mr. J.B. Witchell, former electronic engineer of the Canadian Defence Research Board stated, and I quote:

“Engineers could construct a working model, a simulator, as they are called which will reproduce the conditions which will soon exist when two complete ICBM systems are set up in opposition to one another and geared for instantaneous counter attack. The model would demonstrate mechanically that when two such systems are brought to the required degree of sensitivity, they will form an unstable combination and war will become absolutely certain.”

Dr. Leo Szilard — a well known person for his promotion of the A-Bomb during World War II and his demotion of it after, said:

“No one man working alone is likely to come up with an adequate analysis of all the problems involved. Moreover it will take political and social inventions to evolve or organize a world community that may remain indefinitely at peace. But real progress could I believe come rather fast if it were possible to gather from among the several nations involved men who could work as a team and, being free from government responsibilities could experiment with ideas and explore the feasibility of various approaches without in any way committing their government. There is room for more than just one team to try their hands at the task.”

And yet another quote by External Affairs Minister Green:

“After all, the people of the middle and smaller powers are either going to be bombed or killed by radiation as well as the people of the nuclear powers, and they have a right to make their wishes heard. In addition, they have the responsibility to do something about the question of disarmament. We do not believe that they can sit back and leave it wholly to the nuclear powers to work out a solution.”

Organizations such as the Voice of Women of which some of our first ladies of the nation are members, and another group and I think we all know who Fred Davis is, under the chairmanship of TV personality Fred Davis, a committee whose names constitute a Who’s Who of the communications industry in this country are donating their time and abilities to planning and producing a national publicity campaign for Peace Research that covers extensively every media of communication. Committee member Pierre Berton reports:

“My faith in the land was somewhat restored today when I attended a strategy luncheon of people in the entertainment business who believe that Dr. Norman Alcock’s scheme for a Peace Research Institute ought to be supported.”

Thursday, March 8, 1962

These are some of the well known Canadians who are taking an interest, and taking an active part in publicizing and helping in sponsoring the work of the research institute. I think we all sometimes ask ourselves this question: Why is it the fate of our generation to have to face this task?

In my opinion Mr. Speaker, just when we are on the verge of humanity breaking through its chrysalis, we are also on the brink of annihilation. I think we could resolve it this way, that we take our present position as being at the freezing point and a little push either way will make the difference of the deep freeze or the thaw. When the future is so pregnant with possibilities. Mr. Speaker, I think every Canadian in every walk of life should make it his responsibility in his own way, and be willing to lend his few talents which he possesses in the search for ways of bringing peace. Here we have an institution that is being set up this year in Canada under the leadership of Dr. Alcock, who plans to set up a Canadian campus, an institute where 25 outstanding scholars and scientists will be employed. A cost of about \$4 million is estimated this year in setting up the institute, some of it to be subscribed. Donations will be asked for from the general public, and also aid from the federal government, to start in this great crusade of involving the average "Joes" with the problems of peace research. One could go on and discuss this problem at length, but Mr. Speaker, I think with the explanation and the wealth of information that the member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) gave us, this assembly is quite aware of what is involved in this resolution. My only desire Mr. Speaker, is that we stand up unanimously and support this resolution and it will add weight to the efforts that other people are making across Canada and eventually across the whole world.

Motion agreed to unanimously.

MOTION: RE VETERINARY COLLEGE

Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats) moved:

That this assembly respectfully requests that the government in consultation with the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan, immediately give consideration to the establishment, at Saskatoon, of a veterinary college with a course leading to a degree.

He said: I think Mr. Speaker, that the motion itself is self-explanatory, however, for the sake of those who possibly do not have such a close association with farm people in farm areas as some of the members of this house, I will make a few brief remarks in order to indicate the necessity of a faculty of veterinary science being established in Saskatchewan.

Briefly I propose to show the necessity of a faculty of veterinary science for western Canada; the desirability and suitability of the city of Saskatoon as a location, and in addition the fact that in my opinion there would be little or negligible expense to the province of Saskatchewan in the establishment of a faculty of veterinary science at the university of Saskatoon.

I do not think it is necessary for me to go to any great length in emphasizing the importance of livestock to the agricultural economy of the province of Saskatchewan. Down through the years, since the formation of the province, it is generally recognized that the production of livestock and the income received from its production has been a balance wheel to the agricultural economy of the west. Very particularly in my own constituency the production of beef, cream, poultry, eggs, hogs and turkeys, has helped us to get through bad years, wet years, rusty years and dry years. Particularly the fact that we have adjacent to or in our constituency, five creameries which help to increase the agricultural income for the farmers in my area, as they have also helped to increase farm income in other parts of the province.

I draw your attention to the livestock population for western Canada, which has a definite relationship to the need for veterinarians. I draw your attention and the attention of the hon. members of this house to the comparative figures for the years 1951 and 1961 as taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

In 1961 the total cattle population in eastern Canada was 4,457,200. In western Canada in the four western provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, the total cattle population in 1951 was 3,479,300. By 1961 the population of cattle in eastern Canada had risen to 5,606,000, an increase of 1,148,000 head. In western Canada in the four western

Thursday, March 8, 1962

provinces, the livestock population in 1961 was 5,505,000 head for an increase of 2,025,700 head, almost double the eastern increase in the same ten year period.

The sheep population in eastern Canada and western Canada did not keep pace with the increase in cattle population unfortunately. However, we have had a tremendous increase in the turkey population in western Canada over the last ten years. I draw your attention to an article in the Western Producer of February 22, 1962, where it is stated that the 1961 Saskatchewan marketings of 15.4 million pounds of Saskatchewan turkey meat was nearly equal to the total marketings for all Canada in 1951. Total Canadian marketings in the year 1951 were 18.3 million pounds. The total turkey meat marketings for Saskatchewan in 1961 were 15.4 million pounds — that is the official estimate. It is also estimated that an additional eight million pounds was marketed privately or used for local consumption in the province of Saskatchewan in 1961 no less than 23 million pounds. There were 66 million pounds produced in all Canada in the year 1961 and Saskatchewan accounted for more than one third of all Canadian production.

Just in connection with turkeys Mr. Speaker, I could not let an opportunity such as this pass without paying tribute to one of the men who pioneered the turkey industry in my area, a resident of Saltcoats who brought the first Petersime incubator from Kansas City to Saltcoats in 1936, and pioneered the production of turkeys by the hatchery method in the province of Saskatchewan. This advance assisted greatly in increasing the income of our farmers from turkey sales.

I hardly need to say that in the production of turkeys, sheep, cattle and other livestock, farmers who are in that business stand in need at all times of veterinary services for reasons which I will state later on.

The horse population in this province has unfortunately dropped and we no longer use horses for draught purposes.

However, we do raise racing horses that are raced in this country and then exported to eastern Canada and the United States to be sold for sums ranging up to \$8 thousand and \$10 thousand each, some of them for more and some of them for less. They too stand in need of veterinary care and attention.

The gross income from farm livestock in 1961 for western Canada according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics is as follows: the gross income from cattle in 1961 was \$219,404,000; for sheep and lambs \$2,811,000; for hogs \$84,967,000; for poultry \$19,452,000; for a total of \$326,634,000 gross income for livestock products in the three western provinces. These figures do not include eggs, dairy products, honey, wool and sundries. When, however, we do include in that figure eggs, dairy products, honey, wool and sundry agricultural products, we come up with a figure of \$437,512,000 worth of gross income which farmers in the three prairie provinces grossed for the sale of livestock products in 1961. This is a tremendous sum. I think all members of the house will agree with me that the contribution which livestock is making to the farm income of the three western provinces is large indeed. Naturally that implies and emphasizes a need for veterinary care of our livestock population.

The question of the future demand for meat products is of prime importance, because the livestock population and the livestock economy can only be based on demand. The only demand that you can possibly have for livestock products is a demand from people, and because I am going to discuss a little later on the need for veterinarians ten years hence, as well as the need at the present time, I think it would be just as well to look at the figures regarding population now, and what the population may be (if it increases at the present percentage rate) ten years hence.

The Canadian population in 1951 according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics was 14,900,000, by 1961 it had risen to 18,200,000, a percentage increase of 23.645 per cent. If you project these figures to 1971 at the same percentage rate of increase you would find that Canada would by that time have a population of 23,645,000 people, or a population increase of 5,445,000.

We cannot look at the demand or consider the demand for meats and agricultural products without looking at the whole North American picture because the market which our western farmers have is not just a western Canadian market, and not just a Canadian market, but a market of the whole North American continent as has been amply demonstrated over the past few years, by the heavy flow of our cattle to points south of the border.

When we look at the American population we find

Thursday, March 8, 1962

that according to the World Almanac in 1951 their population stood at 154,126,000 people. By 1961 it had risen to 182,123,000 people for a percentage increase of 19.16 per cent, a little less than our own Canadian increase. If you project that percentage increase to 1971 you will find an estimated population in the United States of 215,190,000 people, or an increase of 33,067,000 people by that time, and I draw to your attention that everyone of them will be hungry when they are born, they will all have appetites.

The total population for the North American continent in 1961 is estimated to be 200,323,000 people. The total population projected by the same percentage increases for 1971 would be 238,835,000 people, for an overall increase of 38,515,000 people by 1971.

Now I draw to your attention Mr. Speaker, and to the rest of the members of the legislature that I merely used the percentage increases that have taken place in the past ten year period. I did not use the acceleration table which is usually used by economists when they are projecting population figures into the future. Had I done so the figure would have been larger.

The population of the province of Saskatchewan in 1961 was estimated to be 832,000; their percentage increase to 1961 was 6.37 per cent. In passing let me say this has not been as large an increase as other areas of Canada have enjoyed. I think it would be just as well if we endeavoured to raise our population figure by endeavouring by every means within our power to make life as profitable as possible for livestock producers, in order that we may increase our human population by improving farm working conditions.

The demand created by increased population can only be effective if the increased population have the wherewithal with which to buy the goods which the farmer produces and wishes to sell. I am no economic prophet of the future, but personally I do not believe that in the immediate or in the long range future we will suffer any great economic reverse; just the contrary, and for two reasons — I believe that the people whose population expansion I have outlined to you will be capable and able to purchase increased amounts of farm products, and meats, particularly livestock products, by reason of the fact that they will have the necessary purchasing power to do so. My reason for this is that we now stand on the threshold of inter-planetary communication and I believe that the tremendous expenditures that are going to be made in this field on the

North American continent will be a massive economic stimulant to the whole North American economy; also the new trade conceptions which are now appearing in the world and which people are now talking about.

I was interested in the recent announcement of the reciprocal reduction of tariffs between Canada and the United States. I believe that the wholesale reduction of tariffs which I hope and expect is going to take place across the world, (they can't reduce them too fast or too low to suit me) will be another economic stimulant to the North American continent and will place even more purchasing power in the hands of our people.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Snedker: — Now I have indicated that there will be an increase in population with increased purchasing power. I think it logically follows that there will be increased production of livestock in response to that demand here on the western plains. I am particularly thinking of the development of the Saskatchewan River Dam and the irrigation that will take place there at a future date which will obviously make possible the production of irrigable crops and forages such as around Taber, Alberta, and possibly the production of sugar beets, which will lead to beet pulp and by-products with which farmers can feed cattle. I think that around the South Saskatchewan Dam in the future we can envisage a tremendous feeder industry.

I am not referring now to the raising of cattle, but the feeding of cattle, and to feed yards which I feel confident will spring up around the Saskatchewan River Dam development. I also think it is quite possible that a packing industry will spring up in that area in the years to come. If these things happen then we will indeed need increased veterinary services for wherever there are feed lots and feed yards that also implies the movement of cattle from the ranges to the feed lots and we must have the necessary veterinarians to service these cattle both by vaccinating before they leave the ranges and also looking after them when they get into the feed lots. Also in connection with a packing industry we must have an adequate number of veterinarians for meat inspection purposes.

I have said that we would probably have a very

Thursday, March 8, 1962

large increase in the feeder cattle operations of farmers around the South Saskatchewan Dam and also in the rest of the province. Livestock feeding operations can only be based on cattle production. There are two things that the livestock feeder has to have before he can be in business. He has to have feed on the one hand and the weather must take care of that, and he has to have a supply of cattle on the other hand.

In the southern portion of our province, which is eminently suitable for the raising of livestock I think in the future will have a tendency to drift, in response to demand, more to cattle production and possibly away from production of cereal grains. All this indicates an increased need for veterinary services.

I draw to your attention Mr. Speaker a quotation from the Country Guide in the last issue of February. This is the quotation:

“One of the most significant developments in the Canadian beef industry in the last ten years has been the shifting of the heart of the industry to western Canada.”

This statement was made by Mr. H.J. Luckey, general manager of the Meat Packers Council of Canada, in his address to the 66th annual convention of the Western Stock Growers' Association held in Calgary. Over three quarters of the beef cows and heifers are now found in the western provinces he said. With the tremendous upsurge in the production of beef in western Canada in the three western provinces, we see a definite need for an increased number of veterinarians, in order to diagnose and treat the ills from which livestock always have and I think unfortunately always will suffer.

The increase in livestock production is indicated by the increase in livestock yard facilities that have sprung up in the past ten years. In 1950 we had four stockyards operating in the province of Saskatchewan on a full time basis. I refer to those at Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Regina and Prince Albert. Now we have in addition to those, four other full time yards which operate under provincial regulations, making a total of eight that are now full time markets for the marketing of cattle in the province of Saskatchewan. In addition to that we now have fourteen part time yards that are holding auctions one or two days a week. This is an increase of 18 stock yards in the past ten years. In addition we also have an

increased number of feeder sales which have sprung up all over the province in answer to a demand by buyers and sellers; the demand of buyers who want feeder cattle, and the demand of farmers who wish to sell their range cattle off the range or off the farms as the case may be. This expansion all implies a need for increased veterinary supervision and care.

The increased movement of livestock from one place to another, from the ranges or from the farms to feed lots, implies a need for increased veterinary surveillance and increased veterinary care, in order that feeder operations may be profitable and also in order that producers of other livestock may have profitable operations.

The diseases which cattle suffer from in this province run into quite a list, some diseases are much more prevalent than others. One of the most outstanding examples of diseases in cattle is brucellosis which our veterinarians are now rapidly getting under control. This disease has been an arch enemy of cattle production ever since cattle were raised in Saskatchewan. Fortunately by the use of modern methods and modern technique, calfhood vaccination and so forth, we appear to be getting on top of this disease. Black leg, malignant edema, coccidiosis, shipping fever, mastitis, lock jaw, foot rot are all diseases which cattle suffer from. If I gave the whole list we would be here for some considerable time, but these are just a few.

The production of hogs in this province is based to a great extent on the barley-hog ratio. When it becomes profitable to feed hogs with a plentiful supply of available feed and there is a good demand for pork, the production of hogs increases. It rises and falls according to supply and demand whether it is up or whether it is down the poor old hog is still plagued by numerous parasites and diseases. Erysipelas, virous pneumonia, rhinitis, pasteurellosis and numerous other diseases are typical of types that attack hogs in our province.

The producer of turkeys also has his problems with regard to disease. The production of turkeys in this province too, is geared to the demand for the meat in relation to the availability of feed, but in addition to that the producer of turkeys has to be ever on guard against parasites and diseases which beset him at all times. In all the other groups of livestock which I have mentioned and particularly in regard to turkeys we

Thursday, March 8, 1962

have the question of dietary management and mineral deficiencies, and it is very necessary for our livestock producers, be they producers of hogs, cattle, turkeys, sheep or poultry that they have the necessary advice available to them in order to avoid as far as possible both disease and mineral deficiencies.

I haven't said anything very much so far about sheep. The population is down. Unfortunately our old woolly friend has always been attacked by numerous parasites, but modern methods have now overcome a lot of these. If the farmer who is raising sheep is in a position to use them and receives the necessary advice from qualified specialists, he can now overcome a lot of the problems which beset us in the years gone by when we were raising sheep and we had a lot of things go wrong with them and we didn't know what to do. That is no reflection on the veterinarians at that time either, we just got along as best we could and a lot of the time it wasn't so good.

With regard to our horse population, we find the service of veterinarians very much in demand by anybody who is raising horses. Neither can we forget our household pets, they too have been entrusted to our care and sooner or later we must answer to divine providence for our stewardship of them also.

I would like to draw to your attention Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the house the comparative conditions of raising livestock between 1930 and the present day. When we raised livestock in 1930 and earlier years we fed them some hay and some oats, and hoped for the best. Then our livestock could range all over the western plains over large areas of land, they picked at will and ate the things they thought tasted best to them, and we raised big horses and big cattle. When we broke up the land and confined our livestock to small areas they had to eat just what was there, then we ran into mineral deficiencies. We found our cattle getting smaller, we found our horses getting smaller and we didn't know what the reason was. Now of course we do. We know that there is a mineral deficiency; we know that certain minerals have to be fed to our animals, and it is highly necessary if livestock production is to be profitable that competent veterinary experts be available to our farmers in order to tell us or to advise us as to what nutritional additives we need in the diet of our livestock.

In regard to the health of our animals, we have had a terrific change in the methods which we use now

compared to those gone by. Now we have antibiotics, aureomycin, vaccines, bacterious and incidentally we now have modern anaesthetics, which made possible surgical procedures that were never contemplated 30 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want anything that I have said in my remarks to be taken in any way as derogatory or casting a reflection upon the veterinary surgeons who have served our province so well since its inception. I don't think any group of people are more devoted to duty or have served this province better than have the veterinarians we have at the present time, and have had down through past years.

I could not let an opportunity such as this pass without especially expressing appreciation to a man who I believe is the senior practicing veterinarian in the province of Saskatchewan; I refer to our own veterinarian at Saltcoats. No road was ever too long, no day was ever too cold for that man to go out in answer to a call and assist a farmer who was in trouble or relieve the suffering of some poor beast. I want to pay tribute to him together with all the other veterinarians that have served our farm people so well. What a difference between 30 years ago and today. Years ago when a calf got white scours (now we call it bacterial diarrhea, I think that is the correct term) we used to give them burnt flour and hope for the best, it usually wasn't very good. Now of course the calf gets a gram of aureomycin as a preventative for every pound of body weight or sulpha drugs as a cure.

I remember when the first black leg epidemic hit our country the cattle died like flies and we didn't know what to do about it. Now of course we have bacterius and have had them for a number of years.

Years ago we didn't know what brucellosis was, the old cow lost her calf and that was the end of it. Now of course we know what it is, our veterinarians can diagnose it by taking blood samples and tests, and we have calfhoo vaccination for prevention. I think that shortly the disease will be licked in western Canada, at least I most sincerely hope so.

Years ago when our cattle had foot rot, we didn't know what was wrong with them, so we dosed them with a little creolin. Now we have more modern methods, a milligram of aureomycin per pound of body weight for prevention and massive doses of penicillin for a cure.

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Thirty years ago we didn't know what malignant edema was either, the cattle lived or died, one way or the other. Now of course modern methods of diagnosis by veterinarians can tell us what the disease is and how to cope with it.

The respiratory infections from which our cattle suffered particularly the cattle that were shipped from livestock markets back to the farms for feeding purposes cost farmers dearly. I can remember shipping two carloads of cattle home from Winnipeg a good many years ago and every one of them got shipping fever, the whole lot of them, ten of them died and those that didn't die might just as well have because they didn't do any good anyway. Now of course we find that with modern methods we can immunize cattle before they go to the markets, we can also treat them with sulpha and antibiotics and massive doses of penicillin and at least save something from the wreckage which this disease has in the past caused.

The cost to the livestock industry of disease is estimated to be \$40 million for all of Canada per year. The share for western Canada of that amount is estimated to be \$20 million. The province of Saskatchewan on that percentage basis would lose \$7 million per year through loss to livestock producers due to disease. That points up the necessity of further research and for an increased number of veterinarians in this province in order to cope with the problem in an effort to save our livestock producers as much as possible of that estimated \$7 million loss.

In addition to the diseases from which cattle suffer, we also have diseases which are transmitted from livestock to man. We have the virus diseases, cowpox, encephalomyelitis, infectious anaemia, foot and mouth disease, influenza, pustular dermatitis and numerous others that are classed as virus diseases and which are transmittable from livestock to man. Bacterial diseases such as anthrax, brucellosis and bacterial food poisoning are transmittable. Tuberculosis is one of the most outstanding examples of that, another disease which fortunately appears to be nearly eradicated. Then there are the helminth infections, taeniasis and trichinosis, not as yet apparent in western Canada but already apparent in parts of the United States. These are parasites which man can contract from contact with cattle and swine. The outbreak of equine encephalomyelitis which we had years ago is still a threat to horses. The cases of polio from which humans suffered years ago are generally thought to

have been a form of this poliomyelitis that human beings contracted from horses.

Now I come to the supply of veterinarians who are available at the present time to help care for our livestock industry in the province of Saskatchewan. In 1950 we had 85 members registered in the Saskatchewan Veterinary Association. By 1961 this number had risen to 110 members of the Saskatchewan Veterinary Association, and it will readily be seen that the increase in the number of veterinarians has not kept pace with the increase in the livestock population. Of the 110 veterinarians in 1961 70 were general practitioners; 35 in the service of the federal government, three with the University of Saskatchewan and two with the provincial government. The estimated need at the present time in the province of Saskatchewan is for 40 more general practitioners, plus twelve more in the service of the federal government and one more in other services for a total required increase of 53. The estimated requirements to cope with the increased livestock and human population by 1971 is estimated to be 250 veterinarians or an increase of 140 veterinarians by 1971.

The urgent need for veterinarians emphasizes the need for a faculty of veterinary science at the university of Saskatoon. The Ontario Veterinary College at Guelph where our students have been in the habit of going in the past and are still going is the only veterinary college available in Canada, where students may go to study veterinary science in the English language. We have one other veterinary college in the province of Quebec at St. Hyacinthe where studies are conducted in the French language only. I understand that the province of Alberta has already endeavoured to place some of their students in the United States and that the results have not been too favourable. This emphasizes the need for additional educational facilities here in western Canada.

The Ontario Veterinary College at Guelph in 1950 graduated 40 students originating from western Canada, including the province of British Columbia. In 1951 they graduated 28; in 1952 it had dropped to 22; in 1953 there were no graduates, due to the fact that that was the year Guelph had changed their course from a four year to a five year period. In 1954 there were seventeen graduates from western Canada; in 1955 there were but nine. In 1956 there were ten graduates from the four western provinces in the Ontario Veterinary College at Guelph; and in 1958 there were eleven. In 1959 we were back up to fourteen;

Thursday, March 8, 1962

and by 1960 we had dropped down to twelve graduates for the four western provinces from the Ontario Veterinary College at Guelph.

It takes five years for a student to complete his course in veterinary science. That is generally recognized to be the requisite period of time in order that a student may completely acquaint himself with modern techniques, modern drugs and modern conditions. We have 110 in Saskatchewan and it is estimated that we need 250 by 1971. I don't think it will be possible to reach that total by then even if we did have a faculty of veterinary science in the province of Saskatchewan, because it is a five year course. However, that doesn't prevent us from trying to come as close to the necessary number as we can. The cost of sending a student to the Ontario Veterinary College at Guelph is estimated by the Registrar of that college to be \$750 per year each year for five years. This does not include travelling expenses but does cover food and accommodation within the college dormitories. I quote now from a letter from the Registrar of the Ontario Veterinary College as follows:

“Although the pressure for entrance to this college seems to mount every year, our committee on admissions is still very strongly committed to the idea that students from western Canada should be accepted at the Ontario Veterinary College on an open competitive basis, all other factors being equal. Naturally, in a situation such as we experienced last year where we found it necessary to reject almost as many qualified Canadian applicants as we accepted, some people will have to be disappointed. It is for this reason that we all look with such anticipation to the probable arrival on the scene of another veterinary college in Canada.”

I have here Mr. Speaker, a clipping from the Western Producer which I will quote:

“The Saskatchewan Dairy Association on February 15th urged the University of Saskatchewan to re-examine the feasibility of establishing a college of veterinary medicine in Saskatoon. In a resolution approved by its 53rd annual meeting here, the association said the shortage of veterinarians was a decided handicap to the industry.”

This is the feeling of the dairy people in this province Mr. Speaker. I also draw your attention to the issue of the School Trustee of February 1961. The 47th annual provincial convention of the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association to be held March 12-15, 1962 in the city of Saskatoon will have on its order paper a resolution as follows:

“Whereas the livestock industry is becoming more and more important to the Saskatchewan economy, and Whereas the closest veterinary college is at Guelph, Ontario, Therefore be it resolved that consideration be given to the establishment of a veterinary college in conjunction with the University of Saskatchewan.”

It is significant that this resolution is being submitted by the Maple Creek superintendency, an area with a heavy cattle population, where there is a lot of range land and where the production of cattle is of great economic importance to the residents of that area.

I now quote from the Albertan, Edmonton, January 26, in part as follows:

“Disjointed pleas for college first were taken firmly in hand in 1958. The four western universities, four veterinary associations and provincial Department of Agriculture formed a joint study committee. A year later, warning that classes at Guelph rapidly were reaching maximum size, the group endorsed a college in the west. It also coupled a pleas for more research with a warning that at least five years should elapse between the establishment of the college and graduation of the first classes.”

I mentioned that previously Mr. Speaker.

Further quotations from the Edmonton Journal; they are referring to the cabinet of the province of Alberta.

“The cabinet in turn conceded it had begun canvassing United States’ colleges for openings for Alberta students.”

Thursday, March 8, 1962

A little later on they said they hadn't been too successful in that regard.

I quote further from the Edmonton Journal, Mr. Speaker, January 26th, in part:

“Although the committee did not propose a site it often has been emphasized that a veterinary college should be on a university campus having agriculture, medicine, pharmacy, arts and science faculties.”

I draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to the attention of members of this house that Saskatoon already has these faculties. We already have in the university at Saskatoon a faculty of agriculture, of medicine, of pharmacy, and of arts and science. In addition we also have a veterinary laboratory with three veterinarians doing work in the fields of research and diagnosis. We also have at the present time a one year pre-veterinary course established in the university at Saskatoon.

That would indicate to me Mr. Speaker, that in view of the facilities which we already have available to us in Saskatoon; I refer to the four faculties that I mentioned previously, also the veterinary laboratory, and the fact that we have already established a one year pre-veterinary course, that Saskatoon is the most logical place in the three western provinces to establish a faculty of veterinary science.

Now in regard to the cost of the establishment of this faculty, Mr. Halmrast in the Calgary Albertan, estimated the cost to be three or five million dollars. I don't think that figure is too close to the mark. I think it is highly inflated, and for a very good reason. I don't blame Mr. Halmrast for giving a highly inflated figure as he is going to fight to have a faculty of veterinary science in his own province at Edmonton. He would be a poor member of his government if he didn't but I firmly believe that he threw that figure out to try to scare us. I think the figure was highly inflated. I think his idea behind the whole thing was to say three to five million dollars because the province of Saskatchewan hasn't got too much money and he would bluff us out, but I won't swallow that one. Neither do I believe it is necessary to house students in marble halls or ivory towers. Good solid accommodation should be sufficient.

In addition to that if we establish a faculty of veterinary science in the province of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon, we could certainly expect that the province of Manitoba and the province of Alberta would contribute to its cost, and we should certainly expect federal grants. The fact that Saskatoon would serve the three western provinces, that it would serve a livestock industry which is serving all Canada, is a very good argument in favour of the federal government paying grants for this purpose.

In view of the fact that we already have a veterinary laboratory at Saskatoon primarily for research but conducting diagnosis, and in view of the fact that we already have established a one year pre-veterinary course, I think this should be taken as part of our expenditure on our share of the cost of this faculty for all western Canada. I don't think it is unreasonable to expect this.

In addition, the construction of the new campus in Regina would relieve some of the pressure on the university buildings at Saskatoon. I understand, and this is only hearsay, I don't know whether it is true or whether it isn't, that the faculty of law may be removed from Saskatoon to Regina. That would leave some of the facilities available in Saskatoon for other purposes. I would suggest in all sincerity that we could not put them to any better use or purpose than by the establishing of a faculty of veterinary science. This would serve our farm people, and our agricultural economy by training our veterinarians here on the prairies where they are more closely in touch with diseases that are associated with our cattle and other livestock here on the plains. It would also save parents the expense of sending students who wish to take up the practice of veterinary medicine, to colleges in the United States or the province of Ontario.

I believe Mr. Speaker, that we can do this with little cost to ourselves and with great saving and great assistance to the agricultural industry of the province of Saskatchewan.

I therefore take pleasure in moving this resolution and I hope it will receive the unanimous support of the legislature of the province of Saskatchewan, to which provincial livestock production means so much.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take any length of time talking about the resolution this afternoon. The member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) has made a very

Thursday, March 8, 1962

exhaustive statement as to the industry and as to the reasons behind the moving of the resolution. However, I may say that the Minister of Agriculture, Hon. Mr. Nollet, has been active in studying this question. There has been in recent months a series of meetings between the ministers of agriculture in the three prairie provinces, and the university people in these prairie provinces, and I feel the Minister of Agriculture would want to make a statement to bring the house up to date on the present status of his discussion. Consequently as he is not able to be here I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:20 o'clock p.m.