

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature
15th Day

Wednesday, March 14, 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): — Before the orders of the day I have two groups of students whom I am sure you would all like to welcome here this afternoon.

We have one group in the speaker's gallery, which I believe are from Grade VIII at Athabasca School, with their teacher, Mr. McKague, and then in the gallery opposite we have a very interesting group, drawn from a dozen different public schools: they are a special interest group — special interest classes. They meet at McNab School every Wednesday afternoon and they study French and group leadership, their teacher is Mrs. Betty Debiene, a teacher consultant with the Regina Public Schools and also their assistant principal at the school, Mr. Dennis Sandis.

I am sure you will all be glad to welcome them here and hope they enjoy their afternoon.

QUESTION: COMMUNITY WELLS

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. It has to do with community wells in which the dominion, provincial and municipal governments share the costs. This morning at the municipal convention Mr. Hamilton had a representative there and he said that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Will you please direct your question, don't make a speech to your question.

Mr. McCarthy: — I just wanted to make it clear, I am not going to

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

make a speech, I can assure you. This gentleman who is the secretary, Mr. Hamilton, said that any well that was started before March 31st would be eligible for grants. I just wanted to ask the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Nollet, if his department is prepared to go along with that ruling? The Minister of Agriculture's representative said that any well started before April 1st would be eligible for a grant. Now my understanding of the minister was that the cut-off date was earlier, so there is a difference of opinion. I just wanted to ask the minister if his department is prepared to go along with that ruling.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Prepared to go along with the ruling? We suggested that the date be extended, we suggested to the federal government that it be extended by two months beyond March 31st, so that the municipalities would have an opportunity to complete the wells after spring weather comes, but applications can only be received up to March 31st.

Mr. McCarthy: — That is different then the ruling you had the other day.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well this ruling, we understood that the federal government made the ruling that the cut-off date for applications and payments would be March 31st and we have had it extended by two months to permit a clean up period and the municipalities would have an opportunity in completing their projects.

QUESTION: OLD AGE ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS

Mr. W. Ross 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 Social Welfare.

Can the minister state the date when the government anticipates that the increased payments can be made to recipients of Old Age Assistance and of Blind and Disabled Assistance?

Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will wait until tomorrow I hope to be able to answer the question fully.

Mr. Thatcher: — Thank you.

QUESTION: PROGRESS IN MEDICAL CARE PLAN

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, could I at the same time now direct a question to the Minister of Health.

Is the minister yet in a position to announce any progress which he has made in arranging for a meeting between his government and the medical profession in order to discuss the proposals for a medical plan.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from Dr. Dalglish, the president of the College of Physicians and Surgeons saying that a letter could be expected soon but I have not received that letter.

QUESTION: MOVEMENT OF FEED BY TRUCKS

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways.

I wonder, in view of the fact that in many areas of the province today the farmers are facing a severe shortage of feed and fodder and in the event of an early spring break-up would the Minister of Highways consider not placing a ban on the movement of feed by trucks to farmers in this province on the provincial highways.

Hon. C.G. Willis (Minister of Highways): — We will certainly give consideration to this Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

BUDGET DEBATE

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

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (the house to go into Committee of Supply)

Mr. K.F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate yesterday I pointed out to the government some of the conditions that are in existence throughout the province today because

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

they can be directly attributed to the government policies. One of the things that I brought to the attention of the government, and I would like to do so again today, is the harm that can be done by playing politics with the health of the people of this province, and because Premier Douglas was so anxious to announce a medical care program for Saskatchewan this government did nothing to incorporate the private groups within the plan first before they made any announcement. Then they announced the plan would come in effect April 1st, as a result a lot of people who had been covered by MSI prior to that time cancelled their MSI hoping to be covered by the government plan April 1st. In the meantime they suffered illness and as a result of that type of treatment are now stuck with a lot of doctor bills that they wouldn't have had had this government proceeded in the manner they should have, in a business-like manner.

Today I want to deal with some of the government policies that are helping to bring about conditions that we find in the rural areas. Yesterday I indicated that the rural areas and small communities of this province are suffering and deteriorating very rapidly, and something ought to be done to retain those communities, since they are the backbone of our province. It is true that the government, in order to cope with this problem of deterioration in the rural areas, did hire anthropologists, sociologists, economists. They commissioned a lot of royal commissions to have a look at it, they set up community planning boards, economic planning boards. They, in fact, plugged the ivory towers here in Regina with some seven thousand people and if you take an average salary of \$5 thousand per year for servants, you would have \$35 million payroll to try and tell us what ought to be done with the conditions in the rural areas.

What they failed to do however, is to take into their confidence people in those rural areas that are responsible for governing in our local government organization. They divorced themselves completely and alienated themselves from the people in the province and listened to their high priced experts and as a result of that, the reports were brought in, "this is just a natural trend and the government has no choice but to go along with the trend."

I would like to point out some of the things that this government should have done, and I appeal urgently that this government should once and for all quit playing politics with the people. In 1960 we were promised that natural gas would be extended to some of our communities in our area. As a result of that announcement during the election campaign the people ceased to make deals on oil heaters and appliances and what have you, waiting for the

natural gas to come in. They are still waiting. Everybody in 1961 was convinced that in 1962 this gas would certainly come to the community of Lafleche and further on, but what is the case? Yesterday the minister placed on our desks a great news flash that they were sending natural gas to some sixteen communities in this province. He of course recognized that this program ought to be expanded, but he says, and I quote:

“However any possible future extension to this program will depend to a great extent on general economic conditions in the province in the months ahead.”

Yet when we pointed out to this government that now is not the time to spend nearly \$9 million in building some huge mansion here in Regina but that he ought to extend the program and get users first and that first things ought to come first. What did he say? He said the building had to come first. What is more important Mr. Speaker? Is it more important to get users of natural gas or to provide plush offices here in Regina and deny the use of gas to the people in the community? Just think for a moment the effect that the natural gas coming to communities would have in those areas that are finding a tough time getting along. The local merchants could be making deals on appliances; there would be small trenching contracts to bring the gas feeds to the home; there would be employment; it would assist in helping these people pick up their economies and establish some of their business enterprises.

A second thing that this government could easily have done and has consistently refused to do is this. In our area there are two places that have for years requested this government to provide them with a liquor board store. This request has been constantly turned down by the former Provincial Treasurer and now the present Premier and of course the excuse is given that the act only allows to have so many points in the province. Now I don't think we would have to bend over backwards too much to amend the act from reading 80 — 83 and accommodate these points. It is my understanding that in Regina, when a development takes place, you can always accommodate a new shopping centre, without amending the act at all. Why do you treat the people in Regina in one way and the people in the country another way? What is the effect of this? It may sound like a small thing, but people in those areas during the Christmas season are going to larger centres and while at the larger centres, they make their purchases including sometimes liquor. While they are going there initially for the crock, they are also spending money on other merchandise and as a result the local merchant is losing business, furthermore it could provide some employment for at least another couple or another family.

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Then too, there has been no recognition given by this government to the problems of the municipalities. In our area, for example, the municipality by having to replace bridges alone would be taxed and use up the entire money they have available and yet even on a 100 foot span, bridge span, the best deal they can make is a 50-50 proposition. The bridge program alone is enough to break them because that area has many rivers and creeks through it, the bridge problem is serious.

Of course, there are other problems that are confronting them, that this government turns a deaf ear to completely and they will not in any way shape or form show that they are willing to co-operate with these municipalities and do something to increase their revenue.

Now I also indicated that the present policies of this government are creating an atmosphere of fear, apprehension and consternation in the minds of the people of the province, and this is rightly so. To begin with they can base their fears on taking a good look at what has happened to the CCF government since they have been in power. We all knew that there were two factions fighting for power within the party. On the one hand you had the moderate socialists, something like the former Premier and the former Provincial Treasurer, and they were trying to keep down and suppress this socialism. Now, those fellows flew the coop and judging by the speeches that were made in this house, both by the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer, we can well understand who is in power now and that is the extreme socialists who are wanting to preach togetherness, who are wanting to preach to the people that it is a privilege to pay taxes and they are preaching to the people that if you have good fortune, you ought to be glad to pay the taxes, for the wonderful services, we the government, are providing for you.

Now then these fears and apprehensions can be substantiated by looking at some of the other government policies, look at the fears of the professions in this province. If any government can step in and arbitrarily set up a commission which is virtually appointed by the government and under the thumb of the government, and arbitrarily put in legislation and socialize completely the medical profession of this province, we have a right to ask, who is going to be next? I can well imagine the furore there would be if you passed legislation in this house saying that from here on in all the teachers in this province are going to be subjected to a commission which will put in what they think is right. We would have to negotiate with the commission for our salaries;

the commission would determine how we are paid and that is exactly what you have done with the doctors. Now what would be the furore if you did that with the teachers, the lawyers, or any other profession, it is no wonder that you have a state of turmoil, and the real fears of socialism are not some bogey under the bed as you people claim. I would say to the farmers of this province that their fears are well-founded and justified. Why every day almost we can look . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Scare them all.

Mr. Klein: — You have scared them all, you don't need us to do it, you are the fellows that are doing it.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — Now what is the position the farmer is finding himself in today? I suggested last session that the farmer is on the road to being socialized and of course these fellows pooh-poohed the idea and they said, ah' bunk, over-excited imagination and what not. But when we examine the amount of land that is being put up for sale because of the arrears in taxes, and that we realize and recognize that at one time when the depression hit that practically all the land would have reverted back for taxes, then we can see the pattern the government is following. The burdens that have to be carried by the farmer with his meagre income are so great that he is going to have to go out of business, or expand his operation and therefore only one of two things can happen, he is going to have to become a larger unit or he is going to fade out of the picture as a farmer. That too, the government said, is something we can do nothing about, it is a natural trend in agriculture and bigger farms are just a natural outcome of our society. These people are hastening that outcome, with an ulterior motive I submit, and where do we find that ulterior motive, again we find it in the sayings and preachings of the bride of the CCF party, and it is now incorporated under the new marriage — the NDP.

Now labour also has some ideas as to what should happen to the veritable integration in agriculture and this is what the bride to the groom is suggesting, they are suggesting to the government, it is time for the government to consider, are farmers to take a co-operative road or are they to become exploited employees of private enterprise. Then they go on to say, this is a recent bulletin, and it is a submission made to the government —

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

then they go on to say we urge the government to establish immediately a program of collectivized farms and I quote:

“Labour legislation should be immediately applied to corporation farms to inhibit the irresponsible growth and anti-labour practices that have been experienced in the USA.”

What does this mean? A farmer has to either become larger or go out of business, that is recognized.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, would the hon. member give us the document he is quoting from.

Mr. Klein: — I have been holding it up and you should recognize it, ‘The Case for Employment in Saskatchewan.’

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I don’t know it. Give us the name of it and who published it.

Mr. Klein: — ‘The Case for Employment in Saskatchewan.’

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Who published it?

Mr. Cameron: — Written by the NDP.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Who published it?

Mr. Speaker: — I think the member must give the source.

Mr. Klein: — Good Heavens! The number of persons unemployed by reasons as of February 9th, Weekly Labour Report, Saskatchewan Department of Labour.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — And so then, let’s look at the effect this will have, the farmer is one up, he is either to become a corporate farmer or large farmer . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — What date? I must have the date, if it is a Weekly Labour Report that he is quoting from . . .

Mr. Klein: — That is all they have on the front cover, do I have to go through half the book to find out.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, if it is a Weekly Labour Report, what week is it?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I think the member . . .

Mr. Klein: — Surely if I showed the cover of the first page, I think that ought to be enough.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the member is aware of the rules, if he is quoting from a weekly . . .

Mr. Klein: — I have been trying to save my air time and daily time that's why I don't want to go through all this . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Who published it?

Mr. Klein: — It is published by a committee on Unemployment and Welfare Services, Saskatchewan Federation, TLC Room 4 — 1601 — 11th Avenue, Regina, Saskatchewan, Service Printing Company, Regina, number of persons, total 28 thousand, source Weekly Labour Report, Saskatchewan Department of Labour, etc. etc. What more do you want to know about it?

All right, what is the effect? This government the extreme socialist, has now married the labour group. The labour group is suggesting to the extreme socialists that they ought to go into a program of collectivized farming or legislate against the corporate farms and if they legislate against the corporate farm, the poor farmer is caught in the squeeze, a socialist squeeze put on by this government, because if the farmer is to stay in existence today as the government has already stated, he must be enlarging or expanding his holdings. If he does, he is bound to have to employ some men. The minute he employs some men, he can be labeled as a corporate farmer and you will introduce legislation against that corporate farmer. A father and son deal is a corporate farm, and so my fear about this government or about the farmer's fear of becoming socialized is a real fear not an imaginary fear as you would have us believe. Farmers are becoming aware of this, especially when we recognize the attitude that this government takes to private enterprise in this province. Then they castigate the Liberal opposition for chasing out private enterprise, Good Heavens! Some of the socialist speeches you are making in here are enough to stop development for the next, I don't know how many years, as long as you are in office anyway.

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — Now then in this complete pattern of socialism — and time marches on. (We have to limit our debate to this time and that is an unfortunate situation as there are many other problems I would like to deal with.)

However, I will deal with one I think that is most important. In your pattern of over-all socialization and control of every segment of our society you have attempted over a period of years to influence, dictate and hammer down the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — You have never succeeded in doing it by coming in the front door, and therefore now the NDP is prepared to take underhanded action to bring control of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities through the back door, and how are you going to do it?

I refer to a clipping that was in the Leader-Post, don't ask me too many details about it, you know that publication Mr. Minister, it was November 4, 1961. This was what was passed at the NDP convention.

“The clause gives the provincial council of the NDP the right to set up municipal organization for the purpose of coordinating provincial organization within the municipality to an effective unit to conduct municipal election campaigns.”

I quote further:

“An amendment was passed that requires that all MLA's and MP's be members of all committees within their constituency organization, as well as executive members of the organization, with the purpose of running municipal elections.”

Now if there is anything rank that smells to high heaven it is this invasion of the greatest form of local government that we have ever known in the history of this province. Now you are prepared to draw politics into it, and in the past men have been elected to the council because of their ability and not because of their

political affiliations. You are prepared to scrap all of these in the interest of your NDP and I would like to interpret the initials in very strong words, but I will just not do so. You are prepared to sacrifice the greatest form of government we have known in this province, the most efficient form of government, our local government, and you are prepared to drag it into the realm of politics. This is perhaps one of the worst things that could ever happen. Is it any wonder that we are afraid to go into the county system? We are afraid, people are afraid, in spite of the fact that the county system may have been a benefit to the people. We fear the government that is in power at this time when it is being brought in because undoubtedly you would have your henchmen — CCF henchmen — MLA's and MP's on the organization to infiltrate and see to it that your CCF henchmen are elected on these councils. That is why we fear the thing.

Now then, I could go on but because this whole atmosphere in the province today displayed by this government is one that is leading us directly on the path to direct socialism, I can in no way, shape or form support this motion or any other one you prepare to bring in.

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, before I carry on with this debate I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as Speaker of this house. While I did not support you, I feel that you have done a pretty fair job in the last two or three weeks, I hope you continue to be as fair as you have been.

I should like also to congratulate the new member from the west end of Estevan's Main street, namely Weyburn. We are indeed pleased to have such a renowned personality in our midst. I am sure he was very well known throughout the province the day before the by-election but after the by-election he was probably better known than his predecessor. Now I should like to tell Weyburn they have probably the finest representation they have ever had. You will be a real asset to this house.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. MacDougall: — It is gratifying to note with the exception of four seats along the east side and the south side of this province, we are solid Liberal and it will be a clue I think to the rest of the province to follow suit, and as

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

far as I am concerned, and I think most of the people of this province feel the sooner the government decides to take a chance on an election the better.

Now I want to hand out another bouquet or two. During the past few weeks we have heard a lot of criticism about biased newspaper reporting. I think it is only fair to say the reporters have done an excellent job in their reporting of the activities in this house, and if the government members find they are not reported as they would like to be, I would suggest maybe they haven't said anything, and I would say the newspaper men have been very fair to say the least.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. MacDougall: — Now Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about the proceedings of this house over the past few weeks. I think today the province of Saskatchewan is wasting sixteen or seventeen thousand dollars a year on this radio time. Radio time to me is just another piece of the socialist propaganda machine. We are cut down to half the time the government has and in all fairness we should have at least half the total time — it should be cut down the middle. I don't think as many people listen to these socialists as they think listen to them.

I think the business of the session is impeded and it is my firm belief that the whole procedure should be scrapped, outside of probably the opening day and the major speech of the Leader of the Opposition and probably the Premier. Otherwise we could scrap it.

For example Mr. Speaker, can you tell me what useful information is imparted to the people of this province when the people on your right hand stand in their place and in speech after speech abuse the Leader of the Opposition, quoting from 20 year old statements, which he probably made in error . . .

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. MacDougall: — . . . and he has realized that error, so he came back to where he started.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — . . . days value when the member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) stands up.

Mr. MacDougall: — I say this is a colossal waste of treasury money. Both sides of this house can dig up statements that were made 20 years ago but to what avail? I suggest the members on the other side of the house who object strenuously to being called socialists by the people over here — they are still changing their minds and if we leave them long enough we will have so many over here we won't know what to do with them.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. MacDougall: — Now I think there are some remarks I must attend to that were made by the Minister of Highways yesterday, I think they need a little attention. If I recall properly he mentioned something to the effect that the Liberals were responsible for the oil industry leaving this province, and I should like to suggest that there was some exploration going on in Saskatchewan before the old CCF took over. Shortly after the election these drilling rigs pulled out — they moved over to our neighbouring province of Alberta, and I suggest the reasons are quite plain. The oil industry was one industry that was high on the list of industries that the CCF wanted to socialize.

Government Members: — Nonsense.

Mr. MacDougall: — Therefore they were literally pushed out of this province, and they were not in any hurry to come back. The under-the-table deals that were made hastened to drop the confidence of the oil industry in this province.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker on a point of privilege . . .

Mr. MacDougall: — Mr. Speaker, these views were aired in the house ten years ago. I am not going into that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of privilege Mr. Speaker. When the hon. member refers to under-the-table deals, and I am the Minister of Mineral Resources, I want him to come across with what he means.

Opposition Members: — Oh sit down.

Mr. MacDougall: — Well I just told him I wasn't going to go into them. These were all aired ten years ago. You were here —

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

you read them — do you want me to go over them all again? You won't like to hear that any more than you like what I am saying now, Mr. Minister. But to this day I don't believe the government has ever given the oil industry any assurance that these under-the-table deals won't take place again.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege again, I suggest the hon. member withdraw any implication that there has been any under-the-table deals . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We are not talking about Weyburn. We are talking about the statements he made in this house.

Mr. A.H. McDonald: — If he doesn't make them I will.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. MacDougall: — These members were here long before I was and probably recall.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the minister has risen on a point of privilege, which is well taken. The member referred to certain under-the-table deals. He must either withdraw the imputation or else give proof of his statement. I think that is the courtesy of the house at all times.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would point out that in a session of 1950 and 1951 and 1952 we had a full investigation on the accusation about under-the-table deals. He is aware of it — he was a minister at the time — he knows about them — he is the one who made them — and then he asks the member today to withdraw a remark that was dealt with in this session in 1951 and 1952 and were proven.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of order, the committee of this house did not find anything like that, and the hon. member from Maple Creek is just making this up.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The minister's objection on his point of privilege was well taken. He says, on a point of privilege, that the member referred to under-the-table deals and he asks him to substantiate or retract that statement, and I think that is in accord with the rules of the house.

Mr. MacDougall: — Well Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot about it and if the minister insists I won't waste my time on the radio to argue with him.

Government Members: — Withdraw the implication.

Mr. MacDougall: — I won't . . . any under-the-table deals.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. G. Herman Danielson (Arm River): — In the 1949 session he stood here one night and he collapsed in his seat and he said "My conscience is clear," and he blamed . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! There is a point of privilege before the house and the minister has asked this statement to be withdrawn. I think the hon. member should withdraw the statement at this time.

Mr. Danielson: — No . . . he . . . insist on nothing.

Mr. MacDougall: — Well what about some of these deals with the co-ops?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. member must withdraw an implication, when it is a personal one like this.

Mr. McDonald: — The Minister of Mineral Resources seems to be very uneasy today, and the hon. member for Estevan has said there are certain deals he considers were made under-the-table. The minister has objected. You haven't even given the member an opportunity to refer to what deals he has in mind, and let the minister stay in his seat, hear all the evidence, and then he can go out on a ballot if he doesn't like it. There is nothing to be withdrawn.

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member will either substantiate his statement or withdraw it.

Mr. MacDougall: — I made reference to these deals with the co-op oil companies and he knows very well which ones I am talking about. As I told you before they were aired in this house, and I don't think I have to . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . happy to hear that . . .

Mr. MacDougall: — There is one question further that comes to my mind is why the regional offices of Shell for example, and the Co-op Oils are leaving to go to Alberta. Shell and Co-op pulled out of Regina because these people on your right forced them out. They taxed them right out of this province. All these employees which were contributing substantially because they (the employees) drew salaries here are now transplanted into Alberta, and think they should think of these things before they accuse the Liberals of driving industry out of the province. Furthermore, I should like to point out that it was this administration which allowed the farmers who held mineral rights to be bilked by sharp operating lease hounds from all over the country, who stole the mineral rights from under them.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. MacDougall: — And the dozing securities commission was no protection to the little people of this province. They slept right on through it, and on top of it all they were arrogant all the way through. Getting yourselves out of this re-negotiation mess will be no easy task. These farmers are not happy with the treatment they have had, however, that is up to the Attorney General to solve this problem.

Mr. Snedker: — Ah sit down Caesar Augustus.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order — my hon. friend is now referring to matters on which a judicial decision is pending in the court. I refer my hon. friend to . . .

Opposition Members: — Sit down . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . page 127 and 149 which is as follows:

Opposition Members: — Sit down you are wasting time . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! A point of order is being raised . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker the orders are as follows:

. . . besides the prohibitions contained in standing order 35, it has been established that in both England and in Canada that a member while speaking must not refer to any matter on which a decision is pending —

I submit . . .

Opposition Member: — The re-negotiation commission has never been before the court.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mineral contract re-negotiation is presently before the court . . .

Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mrs. Batten: — He has given his point of order. Let him sit down.

Opposition Members: — He can't make a speech.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — There is presently an application before the courts of this province dealing with this matter, and my hon. friend cannot refer to it — it is against the rules of the house to do so.

Mrs. Batten: — On a point of order, my hon. friend knows very well that the matter referred to by the speaker, has nothing to do with the matter before the court. He was talking about this government and the way they treated the farmers, the way the hon. Provincial Treasurer slept while the lease hounds went throughout this country and took contracts.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — This, Mr. Speaker, has nothing to do with the mineral re-negotiation board. The only reference made to the board was that the government can't get off the book by appointing a mineral re-negotiation board. The fact that the government did so appoint them has nothing to do with anything before the courts.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege I would like to speak to this later on, after four o'clock if you don't mind and with your permission I will do that.

Mr. MacDougall: — Mr. Speaker, I will close this off. It is up to the Attorney General to solve this and it is his baby. Let us not therefore have any more of this garbage about Liberals driving out industry from this province. This government never accepted any of the facts of their own shortcomings until their own organization began to crumble from within.

Now then Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn briefly to some of the affairs in my own constituency. I should like to congratulate the Minister of Highways on his announcement concerning certain highways that were in very bad repair, and it will be most pleasing to the people in that area to know that their highways are going to be looked after this year. We in Souris-Estevan would like the Department of Highways, however, to consider making highway No. 9 from the United States boundary to Carlyle a dust free surface. This park is more widely used than Waskesieu and we can certainly use the tourist trade in Saskatchewan at this time, at any time for that matter. Now blacktopping No. 9 highway will no doubt increase the tourist trade, and as Moose Mountain Park does get the great volume of American tourists some of whom have cabins there, the safety factor is very important. No. 9 was recently rebuilt from Alameda to Carlyle but I must say on weekends it becomes very hazardous with dust.

Now I want to compliment the Department of Natural Resources for their assistance in establishing a regional park to Estevan. This is a \$110 thousand project and I believe it is the largest of its kind in the province today. While the province is contributing some 60 per cent

of the capital costs of these regional parks, I think the day is coming when they are going to have to consider paying the portion of the maintenance as well.

As long as these parks are under construction I suggest that there won't be too much in the way of maintenance. However, four or five years hence maintenance costs will undoubtedly increase substantially. If the burden becomes too heavy for a local community, then the DNR should be looking down the road toward helping with the maintenance of these parks. I understand the objective of this government is some fifty parks of this type. After we reach a point of say thirty parks I think probably they should sit back and have a look at them for a few years, just to see where they are going and how they are going to be maintained and paid for.

Regional parks in my opinion are a good thing, I think Saskatchewan is probably the first province to try them out — it gets the people working together without much overhead and therefore your costs are cut down.

There is one factor which also merits immediate consideration and attention, and I would urge the government to set up some policy whereby the purchase of these lands, the lands are vested in the name of the crown, they should have some purchase policy whereby these regional parks are set up on a similar basis all over the province. For example, I know one regional park that cost them \$50; another park is leased for a year at \$1 a year, and in our case the price of the land would be substantially higher, something around \$40 an acre. I believe that crown land that is held in the name of the crown belongs to the people of the province, and it is kind of silly for natural resources who haven't got that big a budget to be paying agriculture a large price for land to be used by these same people.

Once again I urge this government to take a long look at these park projects and work out a solution which will be more equitable across the province. Personally I am all for encouraging local people to do as much as they can for themselves, and we must encourage them.

The Estevan Chamber of Commerce approached me with the idea of opening up the Boundary Dam for camping and for setting up cabins. I urge the minister in charge of the SPC and the DNR to take immediate steps to facilitate this dam area for recreational purposes.

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

I think the surveying of the east shore line with a view to having choice locations set aside for the general public and the remainder subdivided into lots and leased to individuals would be a definite asset to our area, because we are in a location where we are about 90 miles from any other lakes. I also urge the DNR to take a second look at locating three or four boat docks, either floating or permanent, along this dam area this year, at least I think this is a worthwhile project. There is much fishing that goes on there, and boat launching is almost impossible at the moment.

On Monday Mr. Speaker I got a rather rude shock when I received a copy of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation news release which was reported by my friend from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) a while ago. We were informed that gas was being expanded to some 16 more communities in the province. I find that on examining the list of these towns to be served that we in Souris-Estevan have a larger list of larger towns, and we are only eight miles from the source of supply. Now the largest town to be serviced under this program is Cabri, with a population of 800. The next largest is Lemberg, population 500. The third largest is Neudorf — population 400.

Now I compared this to a list of the towns along highway No. 18. I looked at Oxbow for example, 1246 — eight miles from the source of supply. Carnduff, population 1,000 — Gainsborough, population 425, Alameda — 304, and so on. Here we are in the heart of oil and gas industry down there, and yet I don't know what we must do to get gas put into these larger towns. This in view of the fact that there are some large buildings going in there — there are some large schools going in there — there has been a big hospital put in at Oxbow. I think the time has to come when we will have to take a realistic look at this thing and try and get gas put into these areas. However, I notice he didn't close the door completely and I hope he will take a second look at it this year and try and take another look at that Oxbow-Carnduff area for gas.

At this time I should like to say a few words on behalf of the municipalities. As you know the south part of the province was hard hit as were other areas last year by grasshoppers and drought. The prospects of a plague of hoppers at this time is excellent for this coming year, and in view of this fact at the request of the southeast Saskatchewan R.M. Association, I urge the government to assume a larger share of the cost of

grasshopper control chemicals. I also feel the government road allowances should be sprayed for grasshoppers. It becomes an unbearable burden for the farmers to spray for these insects unless help is forthcoming. I have had many letters asking me to bring this to the attention of the Department of Agriculture, and I think too, that this year a plentiful supply of grasshopper poison should be maintained on hand so that we don't run out in the crucial season as we did last year.

It is very unfortunate that the Municipal Affairs Department did not see fit to have their bill regarding the county system changes ready before the SARM convention. However, a unanimous resolution at the recent meeting of the southeastern rural municipal association, stated, and I quote:

“We are not in favour of any boundary changes that are present municipal boundaries remain as they are.”

And later on in that year, or earlier this year I should say, meetings were held in almost every municipality in my area, and committees of boundary changers ran into rather a solid wall of resistance everywhere they went in my constituency, and I imagine they run into this same wall of resistance in every constituency.

This in itself should deter the government on any action on boundary changes or county set-ups at this time. Most rural people are opposed to changes without a vote by the people concerned.

I want to warn this government that the Alberta government is in difficulty with their county system and we should take heed and go slowly in any event. We can learn by their costly experiments.

Now I am not too happy with the budget set up and I see my time is running out. I am not happy to be paying these togetherness taxes, and so Mr. Speaker, I want to move the following amendment.

That all the words after “That” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

“this Assembly urges the Government to give consideration to such policies as will:

- (1) avoid budgetary deficits;
- (2) reduce the public debt;

- (3) reduce the huge annual interest payments thereon;
- (4) reduce excessive administration costs; and
- (5) reduce the heavy and oppressive provincial taxation.”

Seconded by Mr. Ross Barrie, member from Pelly constituency.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I should like to take the opportunity of congratulating you on your elevation as Speaker of the house. I know your British background will certainly put you in a position to hand down good, fair rulings in the house, which will be conducive to the British parliamentary procedures.

I should like as well to congratulate all members, all speakers who have spoken so far in the house, but particularly so Mr. Speaker, for the members on your left. The members on your left have made a very good contribution to the debate so far, and no doubt you have noticed Mr. Speaker, the excellent contribution. It must have been because it has certainly got a rise from the government side on several occasions, oftentimes trying to deny the right of free expression. If they feel sometimes they would like to get into the debate they can always do so at some further time.

I too would like to add my little grain of salt to this debate, but I think at this point we should also take the opportunity to welcome the many members of the municipal delegations who have come to the legislature from day to day. They come in from time to time . . .

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — . . . to see what is going on, which is an indication that these municipal men are very very concerned what goes on in this legislature. Municipal governments are the most basic, the most fundamental types of government, and I believe sometimes they must be preserved at all costs. Going on to more serious parts of the debate I would like to mention a few words on the budget and repeat what has probably been said by our critic.

This is the year of the highest taxes in the history of this province. More is paid out per capita in tax dollars than is actually received in services, most of which is probably wasted on useless administration costs.

The figure in excess of \$500 million as of December 31, 1961, of a provincial debt is the highest in the history of this province. This rapid increase of debt is leading us into an economic slavery, and will be compared to peanuts to any other era in the past. This has been the slogan of the socialists from time to time of not getting involved into some economic slavery by the money lenders, these shyster lenders, and they are doing just that, and they have really got us into trouble. A deficit of \$2.5 million dollars and with no plans whatever to boost the economy. Deficit budgeting is acceptable providing there be substantial benefits that could be realized in the foreseeable future. We have a deficit budget and we can't see anything in the foreseeable future where we will derive immediate or direct benefits out of it. But can you imagine interest payments of \$22.5 million and more, the highest in the history of this province.

Interest payments of \$22.5 million! Do you know that is almost twice as large as the McPherson budget during the Anderson regime? More than twice as high as their total budget. This is our interest alone. These are not my figures, they are right in the estimates. Right on page 52 of the estimates, and then when the minister brought down his budget, I believe he brought it down bordering on falsehood, trying to delude the public into believing that everything was rosy. It isn't; it is grim. And then he went on to say that the debt of the province is only \$25 million.

Premier Lloyd: — Net debt! Net debt!

Mr. Coderre: — Yes but you notice you heard the word net was hardly noticeable you know you can say something in such an undertone that you can't even hear at times.

Premier Lloyd: — . . . that fat head of yours.

Mr. Coderre: — If that is the case then why are we paying \$22 million interest? There is greater emphasis on the net debt possibly than there is on the debt. I have mentioned time and again I don't care who you owe money to, either you owe it to your grocer, your oil dealer, or anybody else, you still owe that money, the facts are we owe today well in excess of \$500 million. When you take into consideration besides that, your contingent liabilities, you will find you will go considerably higher.

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Who are they trying to fool anyhow? Maybe the government is under the impression that they can fool some of the people most of the time, but I am telling you they can't fool them all the time.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, in the past budgets were laid down in the house by the Provincial Treasurer and they were a factual account of what the government intended to do insofar as its financial program was concerned.

One of the most significant things of this budget is that it was loaded with political propaganda and every budget that has ever been laid down in this house by this present administration has been nothing but political hogwash from start to finish.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — And then they practically leave out agriculture completely. I believe that without a healthy agricultural economy, the rest of the economy is ill. Without the farm dollar the business man, the professional man, and even the wage earner, he will find it darned tough. The Provincial Treasurer admitted to some degree or to a degree that the agricultural economy was still king, so far as this province is concerned. He says it is still the largest single industry, and one with a great potential for the future. They have only started to realize that, because their socialist planning, their enterprises they have started, have all bogged down. They are now realizing again that the agricultural industry is king in the economy, something that we have been saying for the last sixteen years, and we will keep on saying, that without agriculture the economy of this province is lost. We must boost, we must help that economy and keep it on its toes.

The average production of the agriculture economy over the last few years has been in excess of \$800 million a year. Approximately half of the total wealth of the province, and then they only budget a measly 4½ per cent for agriculture. I think the government is attempting to control the economic life in all forms of government — by controls, and then it is definitely detrimental to the provincial economy, because without proper industrial or agricultural growth we are destined to economic slavery, the only way we can overcome this

stagnation will be through promoting maximum industrial and agricultural development through the use of the free enterprise principle, under which individuals, companies, co-ops and what have you, risk their capital and use their skill, energy and initiative to produce in a high degree of efficiency. That is the only way you can have a booming economy — not by control and socialism.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — I would be remiss in my duties if I didn't mention some of the needs of the constituency of Gravelbourg. There is the matter of No. 19 highway which goes north and south. I would suggest to the Minister of Highways that he consider extending it to the U.S. Montana border, this would facilitate traffic to the south Saskatchewan dam, and to northern areas of Saskatchewan. The Minister of Industry has said time and time again that these vast areas of the south Saskatchewan River would some day become the vast resort area of the province. It is noted that there is a distance of approximately 85 miles between No. 2 and No. 4 highways. I support wholeheartedly the various clubs and local governments who are requesting the government to pursue the matter in this respect. I suggest that the Minister of Highways do have a new look in that situation.

Very serious consideration should also be given to the oil surfacing of No. 43 highway, and No. 58 highway. I notice in the report from the Minister of Highways some work is going to be done in rebuilding No. 53, also oil surfacing should be considered. There are two very important factors in this respect. These roads are used daily by the bus company and in view of increasing the riding comfort as well as the services in that area, it would be a tremendous use to have them oiled.

We must not forget as well that Wood River beach is south of Gravelbourg, which is an area that is going to serve a vast part of the southwest and roads should be provided in that vicinity. Do not forget Mr. Speaker, and I should like to mention to the Minister of Highways, that on Sunday afternoons when a thousand or two thousand cars come out of this area onto the gravel road it certainly is very hazardous, and it is very very important to consider the oiling of that road, because if one life is saved, then it certainly is worth all the expenditure. There have been a few lives lost on that particular road already and greater consideration should be given in that respect.

Further to the words from the members of Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) and Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein), I too was shocked when the minister in charge of the Power Corporation laid on the table a news release which was indicating the various places in the province who were to receive natural gas I think the minister should hide his head in shame when he lays a report like that, when other areas have certainly made good requests in that respect. I have more to say on that a little later, very important requests with financial considerations behind it. In view of the fact that the Power Corporation is a public-owned business, and that it has a tremendous effect on the economy and possible taxes of the province, I feel the time is long past due when we should have proper safeguards and proper safeguards should be established to control properly the affairs, the plans, of the Power Corporation. By safeguards I mean proper investigation board to look into all aspects of operation, promotion, patronage, and what have you in the organization. The operation of the SPC as it is has become a one man operation, a person whose decision is made and has often been made on a political basis. I will show you that in a few moments. Whatever he advises whether right or wrong, the government and its board of directors in that respect comply. No members of the board even know probably what a kilowatt is. I think all they think of is their political safety. Then sometimes they probably think when the word kilowatt is mentioned, that they misunderstand. The political stagnation makes them understand this as “Kill a what — a Liberal?”

That is their thinking constantly.

Government Members: — That is an idea.

Mr. Coderre: — The board of directors of such an enterprise as the Power Corporation should be made up on the basis of good knowledge of all aspects of the corporation itself, and I suggest if you must use employees of the government to act on the board, within the government staff, that you have many good people who are capable of being on the board, engineers, people who understand and who could probably lay down proper policies, not heelers and others as has been done. With these safeguards to the taxpayers it will make it possible for decreases instead of increases in power. Let proper safeguards, proper administration we could have increase in power production. Mr. Speaker, take for example the case of the increase from a five horsepower to a ten horsepower transformer. Does the minister dare say that is a decrease in power cost?

It is a natural increase because a person wishes to consume more power they increase the costs.

Hon. R. Brown (Minister of Industry and Information): — . . . Up to date policy. No such thing.

Mr. Coderre: — The intentions of course are to make some changes. The demand meters on school, community halls etc., they are all made to attract more dollars to the corporation.

Now instead of building a fabulous castle, the power building, estimated at \$6 million and it is already beyond the \$6 million, it will end up to \$9 million and probably \$10 million before it is over.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — Oh for heavens sake.

Mr. Coderre: — Five per cent education tax on buildings . . . costs are going up. They are rising.

You go ahead and look at it — there will be some day Mr. Speaker when the minister in charge of the corporation will have to swallow everyone of these words.

The cost will be in excess of \$9 million, and you can be sure of that before they move into that place.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — You won't be around. Inspect the contract.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Coderre: — It is not the question of cost Mr. Speaker. This is a capital expenditure which should have been put into power expansion not just wasted on extravagances. This \$9 million Mr. Speaker, should have been put into distribution of the product that is being produced in the province, our natural gas or any such thing would have shown a twofold return to the government.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — And operate out of a tent. We are not Indians here.

Mr. Coderre: — He does not like to be criticized. The minister in charge doesn't like to be criticized because they have built themselves that castle, for some of their tools and

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

themselves who like to have a penthouse on top so they can look over the city you know, smoke a big cigar, we are the big corporation, the big monopoly.

They say they are against it, but they like to be a part of it.

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher: — . . . togetherness.

Mr. Coderre: — I maintain Mr. Speaker that if that \$9 million that they will eventually spend on that corporation should have been used to bring gas to many areas of the province, and that the returns would have been twofold to the province, in gas and in profits from the distribution of this gas.

As well, by bringing gas to many of these small communities, these small towns in the rural areas, would give an incentive to promote some form of industry in these small towns. They are being denied the right by these socialists who believe in centralization, they are being denied the right to start small industries in these small areas.

Opposition Members: — True. Hear! Hear!

Government Members: — You know what kind of a gas program they would have had if the Liberals were sitting . . .

Mr. Coderre: — Surely the minister doesn't think that this Power Corporation building is industrial growth? If they had been putting out gas distribution and putting more gas then they could probably have considered it industrial growth.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — What do you think you have down in Gravelbourg?

Mr. Coderre: — The cost of that building would have brought gas to at least 90 good sized towns in this province, the saving alone to the people in these 90 good sized towns in a matter of a few years could have built them a corporation building, and it wouldn't have cost the taxpayers one cent.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — I was very disappointed when he laid that report down. I think that business rather than political

consideration would be the factor deciding when towns and villages were to receive natural gas. I am sure good gas pay loads would be connected to the system, and that it would increase the revenue substantially. Such towns as Gravelbourg, Vanguard, Lafleche, and I could name many others, have excellent gas pay loads.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — More debt!

Mr. Coderre: — Ha . . . the minister says more debt. Is it not better to go into debt Mr. Speaker, to provide a service to the people . . .

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — . . . than to go into debt to build themselves a monument like that corporation building, the liquor warehouse, the telephone building, and many such things they are proposing, and the penthouse for the big monopolists on top.

An Hon. Member: — General Brown . . .

Mr. Coderre: — As I said Mr. Speaker, many of these communities are being left off the gas pay load for purely political reasons.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — I didn't build . . .

Mr. Coderre: — Some of their tools that have been in the political area that have been peddling this hogwash around, that if you would have elected a CCFer you would have had gas here. Is that not political rotten patronage.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Coderre: — As I see it, if there had been a provincial election this fall, or next spring, that you would have seen a hustle and bustle of these crews coming into the areas I have just mentioned, the wheels of operation would have been going.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Are you for or against the amendment?

Mr. Coderre: — Am I for or against what?

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The amendment — you had better read the amendment.

Mr. Coderre: — I will get there in a few minutes. I am for it. It is just a question of robbing Peter to pay Paul, and that is just exactly what you are doing.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — I should probably say a few words about this amendment to keep the hon. minister quiet. Our criticisms on the experiments of the government are not criticisms that this money would be used to useful purposes. There is nothing wrong with borrowing or expending for useful purposes, something that the whole economy will benefit by, but that is not their intention.

Towns like Gravelbourg with their many institutions, hospitals, colleges, certainly need natural gas. The saving in the cost alone would be tremendous. But they import mosaic from Japan to put in that building instead.

I can't understand them. I probably should mention this — don't forget the metropolis of Coderre, it is only six miles from the gas line. We are looking for it too.

I am trying to criticize by creation rather by finding fault. You can't create unless you find fault, and my God there are so many faults, you could say everything was at fault.

Government Members: — Agreed.

Mr. Coderre: — After eighteen years of socialist stagnation and infiltration into all phases of business and public life, this government has crippled the economy to the point where I don't know where we are getting at. I think they have concerned themselves so much with mergers, their friends, their marriages, and what have you. I don't know where they are ending up. There was a time when ministers from across disliked the word merger, especially if it involved big business. Now they really like the way merger sounds.

Some people call it marriage or shotgun marriage or anything else. Not too much mention has been made of the merger of socialists and labour unions.

Government Members: — Ask the member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker), he is the expert.

Mr. Coderre: — And I feel some mention should be made in that matter, because whenever a political party takes control of labour unions, it paves an unfortunate situation for the wage earner. Affiliating with unions, having to contribute to political parties, which are not of their choice, the proposals as put forth by these groups have been for one thing only — a question of raising political funds for themselves. It has been mentioned in this house time and again that the Trade Union Act be amended by adding a section showing that it shall be unfair labour practice, without any collective bargaining agreement, to contain compulsory maintenance of membership clause, if the union in agreement is directly affiliated with a political party. This way I feel we will be safeguarding the wage earner in a free democracy — not a false democracy that these people to your right have, Mr. Speaker, but a truly free democracy, by protecting our wage earners from further brain washing.

I propose to deal to some degree with the CCF and the NDP marriage and the political check-off. It is not contributing to the well-being of the wage earner to have to contribute to a political party not of his choice. There are two ways in which wage earners contribute inadvertently today to some political party that they have no desire to do so.

Through the affiliation of a union to a political party and whereby the membership contributes approximately five cents a month, which really doesn't amount to a row of beans when you take it into consideration, but the most brazen method of them all is when the union takes, or some of the union organizations take 200 odd full-time paid organizers at an average cost of \$15 to \$20 thousand each, going out at the command of some of these unions to peddle purely political propaganda. If you take into consideration these 200 odd organizers, there are more of them in the field, but those who are directly involved in pushing the NDP movement, this socialist movement, bordering on other isms if you wish, if you take into consideration this 18 to 20 thousand of these 200 union organizers you will find the amount is at least \$3 million to \$4 million. Inadvertently many of these wage earners

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

that do not believe in the political party that their organization is active in, are inadvertently contributing to that.

Some members across shake their heads and say it is not so. Stanley Knowles, who was a member of the CLC organizing force took a tremendous amount of his time to promote this socialist — NDP or socialist — labour marriage. He was a paid member of an organization; he promoted this merger with other socialist friends from Saskatchewan and elsewhere. Is that not inadvertently taking some of the money of these wage earners into promoting a political organization? Many of these organizers I know do not believe in the political movement they have to push through. Some of these organizers said, well I am a paid organizer, I am appointed by it, I joined the labour union because I believe in the movement of labour, and still I am tied in because this is my job, and I still think I can do some work for it, but I had to go ahead and pedal political propaganda. They have been instructed by some of these American labour bosses to do some of these jobs. They have no choice. What is going to become of this marriage?

It is going to produce nothing else except what the communists will enjoy. Now some members across say there he goes again bringing up this communist business — the principle of communism is to divide and conquer and that is precisely what the socialists have been able to do, by infiltrating into some of these labour unions, by taking some of these gangsters within their fold and building up an organization and dividing the labour union itself. Divide and conquer is a communist slogan . . . and they are just doing exactly that by getting into it by manipulating the people, the wage earners who are involved. Not all of them, but just enough. It only took a handful of communists to take over Russia — it can only take a handful to take over our labour union.

What a danger it is, because this is one of the organizations, our labour movement is one of the organizations that could truly combat communism.

Political dues and check-off, is that not a communism movement, — isn't that a way to try to divide the two? We could mention quite a bit on the check-off, whether they should check-off, check-on, sign on and everything else. I do not believe, and will never be convinced that it is the right thing for a wage earner to have a political check-off. If that wage earner wishes to contribute to a political party of his choice he may do so.

Any individual may do so. I could probably further my discussions and arguments for the next two hours in that respect. Opportunities may come again when I can further elaborate on these rights of the individuals.

Some people say they can check-off. If they do they are divulging their right of a secret ballot. In any way it always binds the member in some way or other. If he does wish to check-off he has to sign and tell everyone what he is, without his wanting to divulge what his true political affiliation is.

There is a great danger if you permit this political check-off or check-on, whatever the case may be. Assume that our unions would have voted themselves in to participate actively in this new socialist movement, or the same old socialist movement. Assume a member in that organization does not wish to belong to the socialist movement. He would sign off, that would show his disagreement with the union, and in showing his disagreement with the union it would indicate his disloyalty to the union. It would make him subject to being expelled from the union. I am not going to bore the house with reading what has happened to many members of the labour union, because they have disagreed with their union bosses and have been expelled, and by being expelled from a union then they lose their job, because he must be a union member to hold his job. This is unfair. We can't allow to have these things done. Many members, in order to keep peace in the family in the organization of the union would rather pay the five cents, but it is morally wrong. There are some indications of intimidation in that action. Similar acts of finding out will make the person a marked man, would and could possibly subject him to union disciplinary action. Disciplinary action has taken place, this has been mentioned before, I will give you one case where a group of men,

“The United Steel Workers of America shut the American Steel Industry in 1959 for 116 days. At the convention of this union held in Atlantic City in September a union member from Pennsylvania disagreed with the union leader's policy, circulated leaflets around from his criticism, four Sergeants-at-Arms promptly seized the dissident member and severely beat him up, and he was taken to the hospital.”

Is that not creating fear?

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Do you know who the United Steel Workers of America are, Mr. Speaker? That is one of the American dominated organizations that Mr. Argue has mentioned. No wonder he left that party. This is the type of stuff that can go on with threats. Are they not gangster tactics? I am not accusing all union organizations with gangster tactics, the odd action here and there, let's clean the house up. I said, and I will say again that the wage earner is not just a mere chattel, since the human dignity of the working man must be recognized too and consequently cannot be bought and sold like a piece of merchandise as is the case with some of these labour unions. The rights of every individual whoever he may be is the right of association with whom he wishes. No legislation should be on the statutes of this or any province that would deny that right to any one. In fact legislation should be here to protect this right.

Some labour leaders might like to add political powers which they now exercise. Sections of the public think now that union leaders have too much power. Many labour union leaders are very concerned with the very unpopularity of the unions. Many labour unions are very concerned of other labour unions, who have taken part in this socialist merger. To show you, I would like to quote from the Leader-Post of February 21, 1962, and I would suggest to the many hon. members across that they listen to this. The NDP idea originated with political CCF politicians and self frustrated as the result of the 1958 election and now they are trying to ride back on the backs of political labour unions. Some of these labour unions have voluntarily signed in to this new socialist movement and it is felt amongst the labour people themselves that that was a very bad move. As I said a moment ago in order to prove it I quote the Leader-Post, this is quoted from Ottawa February 24th, 1962:

“Glido Basso, treasurer of the Nickel Belt Riding of the New Democratic Association has expressed support of the stand by Hazen Argue in alleged union domination in the NDP.”

Now labour unions are very concerned with the labour domination; a member of the NDP is very concerned. Mr. Basso said that the party leaders are a group of power-mad dictators, who with their rubber stamp stooges pretend to be interested in labour but interested only in the almighty dollar. Hazen Argue wasn't prepared to be a rubber stamp Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Why don't you quote Thatcher? He thinks the same way.

Mr. Coderre: — And then he goes on, and this is a member of the NDP, a member of the New Democratic Party Association, he said:

“We joined the NDP because we thought it was a grass-roots organization. He said a good clean up is needed, and he congratulated Mr. Argue for what he has done.”

Hon. Mr. Walker: — There are three of you now.

Mr. Coderre: — These are some of the reasons Mr. Speaker, why our labour unions are having trouble today.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Coderre: — When it hurts Mr. Speaker, you hear them growl. It is just like grabbing a mouse by the tail, you hear it squeak and scratch, and that is what they are doing. The reason our labour unions have lost some of the Canadian support, public support is because of socialist political interference. If you would keep your cotton pickin' fingers off the labour unions they would do a much better job in this world.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — Many groups in our society have learned by error that it was wrong to be affiliated with a socialist.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Tell us more about the Liberals.

Mr. Coderre: — In a minute my dear friend. Many groups, the Farmers' Union was tied in politically at one time, they left because they realized that you were trying to infiltrate that movement. The co-op movement in this province which was into being long before the socialist movement was in has finally realized the dangers of this socialist infiltration within the organizations and they are throwing off the yoke and the shackles.

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

No one has denied an individual the right of associating with any organization, but the organizations as groups have seen the folly of being part of a political party.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Throw it all away.

Mr. Coderre: — I am going to go back to it. I believe that American union bosses should be kept out of political affairs. The Goldbergs, the Hoffas and many of the like, it's no wonder that Hazen Argue has left the socialist party. He had the courage of his convictions in removing himself from those who were forcing a squeeze on his people, the individuals that he represented. He had valiantly fought for the farmers and when he realized that some danger of these power and politicians within the labour movement, not all Mr. Speaker, but a few bad apples could spoil the rest.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Did you see this morning . . .

Mr. Coderre: — He left and joined a political force whose philosophy is one that the individual shall decide for himself what change he should take and do, not as groups, as individuals. It is the power behind the new socialist party that Argue moved away for. Here are some of the names of those groups: Gerard Picard, Associate President, Quebec Federation of National Trade Unions.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — He is an American?

Mr. Coderre: — Eamon Park, United Steel Workers of America.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Another American.

Mr. Coderre: — All in the employ of these organizations, these international unions.

Mr. Danielson: — There is one in Moose Jaw too.

Mr. Coderre: — Fred Dowling, United Packing House Workers.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Another American.

Mr. Coderre: — These are the boys who are politically mad; these are the boys that Gildo Basso says are politically mad. One of your own members of their own party Mr. Speaker. They are even divided among themselves. Some of these power-mad men have infiltrated into the movement and they say we should gain power. Other more level minded labour bosses are saying no, let's keep our hands away from it. It is a dirty thing to get involved with these socialists; they will infiltrate into our organizations; they will destroy us. These are the dangers that Argue couldn't stand and left. He took the way to freedom rather than slavery.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh nuts.

Mr. Coderre: — Slavery by . . . all right, I am going to quote many of these. As I have said before, a man should be free to join those organizations he wishes, when he feels he wants to and let no group tie them in.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You are more worried than we are.

Mr. Coderre: — Some exercise the word freedom, freedom to distort and warp has been used quite often. I mentioned a few moments ago what has happened, these freedoms have been infringed upon so very often, some people have fear of these freedoms, it was mentioned a few moments ago from the hon. member from Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) who said many municipalities have fear of the socialists, the capitalists have fear of these socialists. We haven't got capitalists in this province, gosh only knows I would like to see all kinds of capitalists in this province. If we had had these big monopolists and capitalists these 27 thousand people that we have unemployed might be employed and working today. Some of this dirty capitalist money might be rubbing off onto our economy. Instead of a deficit, we might be operating with a surplus. Some of this big capitalist money could rub off; it doesn't apply in Saskatchewan; we haven't got any. They have chased them away, these socialists, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Very little rubbed off.

Mr. Coderre: — What has happened to some of these Hoffa organizations? It still doesn't matter, some of these labour organizations in the United States are still infiltrating in here.

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It is the Liberals.

Mr. Coderre: — What has happened, when an organization, and I quote from the Leader-Post of September 18, 1961:

“A charge against a city truck firm for increasing the salary of employees without union consent was dismissed in police court by magistrate so and so. The Teamsters Union alleged that Dale Brothers Limited violated the Alberta Labour Act by giving sixteen employees a 10¢ hourly salary increase without permission of the union bargaining agent.”

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Is this foreign news?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Coderre: — What is wrong with that? When management or anyone wishes to give anything to anyone, why should there be interference? Interference dictated from across the line in the United States.

The only freedom deserves the name of pursuing our own good in our own way as long as we do not attempt to deprive others, or to impede their efforts to attain it. You want me to tell you about Liberalism? Before I do Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what has happened. The reason for the future downfall of the socialist government to your right is because not one new single idea for getting Saskatchewan out of the mess caused by their old ideas, therefore, it will be the bankruptcy of socialism in Saskatchewan and I am afraid it could be the bankruptcy of Saskatchewan itself. What has happened to socialism the world over Mr. Speaker? It has rotted. It stinks, as it is doing in Saskatchewan. Socialism has left a stink everywhere it has been. I am not saying that, socialist friends are saying these very same words. I will show you what Lord Milburton said in his speech of resignation from the socialist party from the British Labour Party in England in 1949. He said:

“I was born free, I spent the bulk of my life in teaching what freedom means” (and now note, the members across the floor) “I was very loathe at my time of life to reverse this process to try to sell the advantages of slavery to a people who were once born free.”

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Another second hand politician.

Mr. Coderre: — Yes, but it was born out of the swamps of socialism, that is where it came from. Now these days the individual rights of people are being infringed upon more and more by all forms of governments. The time has come where we have to stop this infringement on the rights of individuals and we must have good government to do it. Governments that will bring back the true democratic principle.

I could have gone here for hours but I don't like to because whatever you do mention, it falls on deaf ears across the floor, but I think there is something radically wrong with the government.

The socialists have often preached the question of civil rights and rights of people, but by their actions and the actions of the boards which they have appointed, with their semi-judicial powers and rights, I believe is wrong, morally wrong. What is wrong with our form of judicial justice, good old British justice? Government attitudes toward these rights in a democratic society has come to the point where the individual has no recourse to the courts. What has happened in Saskatchewan? The Saskatchewan government like many of the others for example in other provinces elsewhere have only been too prone to put its own judgment and its own authority with its own machinery into judgment of other people. Don't you think that within conscience that this should be revised to give opportunities to people to have recourse to the courts? Why should you be the judge, the jury and the executioner of the laws? It is time to stop; it is time to do something about it.

I would like to say that in Saskatchewan we need investment capital, but we lack the fundamental requirements to generate and attract capital. What we need is a favourable investment climate. Capital and not labour has been the instrument of progress in this country, everywhere for that matter. I think that we need to recognize that capitalism, that a capitalist society in the sense that we have it, we live on the fruit of capital. It is not the strength of our muscles or the sweat of our brow it is the tools and the money and the machinery and the energy that drives it that have been the reasons why it has made us, the western world, the wealthiest part of the world. It has raised our standard of living, above any other part of the world, it is only on the fruit of capital with its investment in the machinery that has made it possible for us to produce that.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You are nauseating.

Mr. Coderre: — Countries like China where they need millions of people to go ahead, to build irrigation systems and dams have not succeeded to produce anything of the sort. Countries like India where they use the fruits of labour alone, it cannot do. It takes a united community of labour, capital and management to make it the best country that we can live in.

What we need in Saskatchewan is a proper climate and the only way that we can do it is to safeguard this proper climate, to have the government across to say to us before this legislature is over, go ahead you will have your chance, you will have an election. Prove to the people of Saskatchewan that you are right. You will find that the people of Saskatchewan will decide very quickly that socialism has now had it.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — We sure will.

Mr. Coderre: — We will, give us that opportunity.

In closing Mr. Speaker, I can say this, that we must preserve all forms of democracy, our freedom, we must preserve and maintain our majority of rights, all changes in forms of government without the proper consultation of the people concerned has always led to a loss of freedom. Anyone who is conversant with larger administration will realize that these losses of rights and liberties are dangerous in a society for us to live in. Let us preserve them Mr. Speaker.

For some of these reasons I have mentioned and many others that I have probably left out due to time, I wish to say that I will support the amendment, and not support the motion.

Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, we listened to three quite provocative speeches this afternoon, but I do not propose to comment on the contents of any of them. I am sure that some of my colleagues will have something to say later on. However, since this is the first time that I have been on my feet since you became Speaker Your Honour, at this very late date I would like to extend my congratulations. I had the good fortune to represent part of the

Wadena constituency in the House of Commons and the fine people in that area deserve this honour which has come to their constituency and to you. I also had the pleasure of knowing your parents, and I cannot think of any finer wish to extend to you than the hope that you would measure up to the vest teaching you had as a boy from your mother and father who left a splendid record of achievement in the community where they lived for so many years.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — As I intimated, I hope that I will not be making a provocative speech this afternoon or tomorrow, I have a very interesting department and I would like to discuss with the members a few of the problems, but I have a critical comment to direct to the Prime Minister of Canada. I think people in Saskatchewan will resent very much a speech which he made in the House of Commons as reported in Hansard February 8, page 668, when he refers —

“I asked him to tell the house what extra payment and allowances had been made in the province of Saskatchewan, for the government of that party has been in power for about eighteen years as an examination of the social security measures shows that the government generally pays less than several other governments by way of assistance to the aged and other groups. I give them this opportunity; I asked them to place on the record the facts in this connection, I wait with interest the contribution they will make.”

The Prime Minister knows that there isn't anyone in the House of Commons to speak for this party for the province of Saskatchewan at the moment but in introducing the legislation in connection with disabled persons' pensions he did give the impression that the people in Saskatchewan were being dealt with in a niggardly way. I took the trouble to examine the last annual report of the Department of National Health and Welfare and they set out in this report the amounts payable in the various provinces in Canada and I must admit that for the disabled persons' pension, the province of Newfoundland is the only province that pays more to people in this group than the province of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan came second; we are well ahead of Prince Edward Island, Ontario, Nova Scotia and Manitoba. I submit that the people of this

province will resent the Prime Minister of Canada who represents a Saskatchewan constituency, taking time in the house to make this sort of comment regarding his own province. I think he knows well the excellent care we are providing for our elderly people.

In his own city of Prince Albert, there is excellent accommodation provided by the Sisters, by the Elks in Prince Albert and all through Saskatchewan we have had the best co-operation found anywhere in Canada where municipal, provincial and federal authorities co-operate to provide better accommodation for our elderly people. Saskatchewan was the first province to enter into arrangements with the federal government to provide hostel accommodation in connection with the low rental housing for our elderly people. This is a program that municipal, provincial and federal authorities have developed with a great deal of enthusiasm and I think the comments the Prime Minister made are in very poor taste, when all across the province through Central Mortgage and Housing federal authorities before he became Prime Minister and since he became Prime Minister, the Central Mortgage and Housing authority had co-operated with the provincial and municipal authorities in providing accommodation for our elderly people.

In 1944 before the war ended, the federal government completed a very interesting national health survey dealing with some of the problems that we would be confronted with at the end of the war and at that time there were only ten convalescent hospitals in all of Canada with a total of 830 beds. Hon. members will be interested that in Saskatchewan we now have four provincially operated geriatric centres with accommodation of 658 people and when the fifth one which will be built in Swift Current this year is completed we will have accommodation for 778. Compare this with a total for all of Canada in 1944 of 830 beds. We have 66 low-rental housing projects and nursing homes under construction at 42 different points in the province and collectively they accommodate 4,273 people, these housing and nursing home projects are sponsored by municipal, religious and charitable groups and operated on a non-profit basis. They are supported by non-repayable construction grants and annual maintenance grants from the province under the provisions of the Saskatchewan Housing Act of 1953.

Since 1953 we have paid or are committed to pay \$2,891,000 in construction grants, plus annual maintenance grants of \$40 per unit in housing projects and \$60 per bed in hospitals and nursing homes where meals and

other services are provided. I challenge the Prime Minister of Canada to name any province in Canada that has a better record, taking into consideration the population and the resources of the people.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — In the year just past a number of new low rental housing projects for senior citizens have been completed and others are under construction or contemplated. In Regina the Hewitt Place project is to cost \$300 thousand. It will receive a provincial grant of \$60 thousand. The Elks Senior Citizens' Lodge in Moose Jaw costing \$160 thousand will receive a grant of \$32 thousand. In Assiniboia which was one of the first and largest projects in the province sponsored by 32 rural and urban municipalities, they have recently added twelve bachelor suites to bring their accommodation to 160. For this addition the province has made a grant of some \$15 thousand. At North Battleford, Indian Head, Wynyard and Moosomin and at many areas in the province projects are under construction or in the planning stage — Oliver Lodge in Saskatoon — being built by the United Church to replace the temporary one that has been in use for many years. The estimated cost is \$320 thousand and qualifying for a grant of \$64 thousand.

The hon. members for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) and Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) and the Provincial Treasurer were all in Gravelbourg one fine day last fall when one of our finest nursing homes was officially opened. It was constructed as a wing of St. Joseph's Hospital and administered by the Grey Nuns of the Roman Catholic faith, and built at a cost of \$350 thousand. That is a tremendous project for a small community. Our grant was \$70 thousand. These projects provide for additional needed facilities in areas in the province where they have demonstrated need.

An addition to the Joan of Arc Home at St. Hubert near Whitewood, which was founded in 1907 was built. It accommodates 110 people. They completed extensive renovations which cost \$216 thousand, qualifying for a grant of \$43 thousand. This is administered by the Sisters of our Lady of the Cross.

Again Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my personal appreciation to the large number of public-spirited citizens all across Saskatchewan who have done a

tremendous amount of work in getting the wheels rolling on the local level to raise the eight per cent of the cost and having the headaches in connection with the operation, while the provincial government makes a grant of 20 per cent, and the federal government, through Central Mortgage and Housing makes loans available for 72 per cent, repayable over a period of some 40 years.

Just in this connection I think I should mention that after the increase in the pensions — shortly after the election in 1958 hon. members will recall that there was a good deal of help given to those who clip coupons — interest rates went away up. The elderly people in Saskatchewan who are living in the accommodation that has been built in 1962 are going to have to pay \$5 a month more for their rent because of the increases in interest charges only. Now this isn't always mentioned but it is a detail that is of real significance to the people in the communities who build these houses and find that they have to repay the capital costs with these high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to the very large family of children that are the responsibility of the Department of Social Welfare. The report at the end of February 28th tells me that there are 2,482 children in Saskatchewan who were wards of the Minister of Social Welfare. I mentioned this to a group of children from Saskatoon who were here this afternoon and somebody asked if we had a Christmas party for the family and I was able to say that Christmas parties were arranged, but not for all together.

The department is involved in providing basic service in the protection of children. This service deals with family and social situations which threaten the well-being of children. Complaints come to the department from relatives, from neighbours and municipal officials. The family itself may come for help. First, with the help of the family an attempt is made to try to find out the problems that are causing the family break-down. Parents are helped to find the solutions and thereby to strengthen the family. This service is preventive. Family break-down is like a disease. To effect a cure, families need help before the problems are so acute that nothing can be done. In 1960-61 over 1200 such families were known to us. The same kind of preventive service is given to families of youngsters who have been in contact with the law. Three hundred and twenty families were given help because of this problem. Only when it is clear that children will be harmed by remaining in the home, is a child apprehended or taken from the home. The final decision is made by a court and at the court the

parents have an opportunity to be heard. They may of course have counsel. The removal of a child from his home is not a simple matter and every safeguard possible is set-up to assure that such a plan is in the best interests of the child. Children were removed by the courts from 304 families in 1960-61 — some for a temporary period only and during the year 471 children were returned to their parents.

Another branch of our department that received some criticism from time to time — the corrections branch. I would like to make a few references to some of our problems. I am very sorry to report to the house that the latest count dated March 13th, tells me that in the Regina jail there are 228, Prince Albert jail for women — 23, in the Prince Albert jail for men — 268. This is a matter that is giving authorities concern all over the place. The Sheaf from the University of Saskatchewan sent a reporter, along with a group of students and here is a very interesting article. I suggest to hon. members that you see this issue of the university Sheaf, February 2nd — ‘Life on the Inside’ written by a student and he says:

“At the time of our tour there were 717 inmates in the penitentiary. (May I mention in passing that it was built for a maximum population of about 450).

I might explain that the penitentiary in Prince Albert is operated by the federal government. Those who come in conflict with the law and serve sentences for over two years become a federal charge. Those under two years are a provincial charge. I should also explain that the penitentiary in Prince Albert serves both the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. I am happy to say that the federal government has announced that they are going to build a federal penitentiary in Alberta and this will relieve the present pressure in Saskatchewan. But the students pointed out that the day they were there that only eighteen per cent of the inmates were from Saskatchewan, while 80 per cent were from Alberta and the remainder from across Canada. I give this information to indicate that the problem we confront is not unusual and it is not different — the fact that in the penitentiary which serves the two provinces, such a high percentage are from Alberta would indicate that there is a problem there. The student pointed out that there are no female inmates in the penitentiary — that the only penitentiary for women is at Kingston. May I, through

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

the lady members of this house, express my appreciation to the women of Saskatchewan for their excellent behavior. You will note that although more than half of our population are women we would have to have at least accommodation for 20 times as many, if there were as many women in the jails as there are men. This ratio of 23 women for the whole province compares very favourably with something over 500 for men. The same situation . . .

Mr. Batten: — . . . jails for our . . .

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — I would like to say to the hon. member that part of the deal with the federal authorities is, as she knows, that those who are serving over one year will become the responsibility of the federal government, as recommended by the Fauteaux commission. It was suggested that there should be no sentences between six months and a year. Only those who are serving less than six months will be a responsibility of the provincial authorities. There has been some delay in the federal government coming up with a plan as to when these new arrangements will become effective, but since the federal government will be building a new penitentiary in Alberta it would appear as if this quite large facility in Prince Albert will be available to take some of the pressure off our provincial jails but we are aware of the fact that the women who are serving sentences in the jail in Saskatchewan deserve better accommodation than they have and we will be dealing with this problem. We are aware of the problem but in the meantime I do wish to say thank you to the women of Saskatchewan for keeping the populations in the jails to these very low levels.

This article in the Sheaf points out that the average prisoner, of course, does not look any different to the average man on the street. The greatest percentage of the inmates fall within the age group of 18 to 22. In the past some have been as young as 14 years. The average level of education is about Grade V or VI. In most cases it becomes necessary to bring the men up to the level of Grade VIII before it is feasible to teach them a trade. But these young people after spending four hours in this very crowded institution went back to the university with pretty strong feelings that society had a responsibility to have a look at this increasing problem and to make plans to do something about it. The warden was very glad to have them come, and may I say to hon. members on both sides of the house. I think your education as a member is not completed if you haven't been to jail. I assure you that if you go to jail on my

invitation, you will come out again without any difficulty. I am sorry I can't extend an invitation to take a carload of sightseers there. The inmates in the jail are quite sensitive. They are people, many of them have had a pretty rough time, but they do appreciate having people who are genuinely interested in the penal problem come to see what they are up against and to discuss their problems.

I am very happy to say that we have three camps which we are operating in connection with the Prince Albert and Regina jails and in these camps, the men are given a great deal of liberty which they do not have in the institutions. In one of the camps there were fourteen inmates with one officer. When the officer took sick the inmates saw that he got back to camp and no one took off. We haven't had any serious problems regarding people who are in these camps trying to escape.

Last summer I took a party representing the press and radio to visit the Prince Albert jail and one of our camps. It was the first time members of the press had been in jail and we advised them to feel free to talk to anyone and some of the representatives of the press took tape recordings of what was said to them and some of them reported over radio, TV and the press, their impressions as a result of visiting the jail. May I again say to members on both sides of the house, I hope that while you are a member you will arrange to visit one of our jails and discuss with our staff, discuss with the inmates in the jail just what is going on.

The Commissioner of the RCMP in his last report that was presented by the Minister of Justice discussed one very interesting case. This is a man with a BA from Toronto, and a BA and an MA from Oxford and an MA from Harvard and a Doctor of Divinity. He was originally charged with issuing forged cheques but was acquitted. In another brush with the law he was convicted and paid his lawyer with a bad cheque. The forging of old age pension cheques kept him in ready cash for quite a considerable period. When he was forbidden to perform marriages a petition was submitted containing 51 signatures, all written by the reverend gentleman. According to the RCMP commissioner's report, he is at present an exemplary prisoner and a prison librarian. The dean of one of his colleges described him as the genius type.

Now, how does one, with a brilliant mind, all these unusual educational advantages end up in prison? That is a question that can't readily be answered. Some two years ago a distinguished professor from Holland,

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

visited Canada and while he was here he reported that in his country quite a number of distinguished lawyers, judges and professional people were interned by the Germans during the war, and they saw the inside of prison for the first time. They resolved that they would do something about it if they ever got out, and they did get out. Holland has a very progressive program for dealing with these problems, and he said, I understand that in Saskatchewan you have a wonderful program for the treatment of cancer. Sometimes you get half a dozen top specialists to save a life and that is a great thing. But in Holland, we sometimes take a half a dozen top people to try to find out what went wrong along the way. Can you save the life of someone who otherwise might spend a lifetime in prison? Holland is doing some outstanding work and I think that certainly all the provinces in Canada have the very difficult problems that we have here in Saskatchewan. If you are interested in getting some very interesting material in this general field, the 'Pathfinder' published by the inmates in the penitentiary at Prince Albert is available for \$1.00 a year and there are always some interesting articles.

Here is a block on the inside of this first page a tribute to a prisoner who died in prison.

"We are certain that we represent the sentiments of all who knew him when we express our heartfelt sorrow at this untimely passing. As a friend, there was none better. A dreamer ill-equipped to face life's crises all alone, yet he was kind and cheerful, always in adversity — farewell dear friend."

A tribute paid by one of the editorial writers. The Pathfinder as I said is available for \$1.00 a year.

This brings me to one other branch that receives a good deal of comment and I would like to say something about social aid. I will be saying some more tomorrow, but I would like to say at this stage that I appreciate very much the co-operation of members on both sides of the house in helping to interpret this program to the people of Saskatchewan. There have been some exceptions. The member for Rosthern, in speaking to the Hanley Liberal association, as reported in the Star-Phoenix, February 16th said that social aid was being dished out on a wholesale basis to buy votes. He charged that social welfare was being abused in mass production. I want to say that this is very unfair to his colleague, the member

for Melville (Mr. Gardiner). The member for Melville isn't here but I want to say that he is the one who in Lemberg decides who gets social aid or who doesn't get it. I want to say that since I have become minister, and as far as I know before that, there hasn't been a single criticism of the day to day decisions made by the member for Melville in this capacity, and the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Thiessen) also has a similar responsibility when he is not here. I haven't had a criticism regarding his administration. If it is used to get votes, the only person who could use it is the member for Melville, and I think it is unworthy to make this charge because I would have heard of it on either grounds. If the member for Melville was refusing social aid to people who didn't vote for him, or he was giving it to people who did vote for him, I certainly think I would have heard these criticisms and so the decision as to who qualifies is made by a responsible person selected by the municipality.

When my predecessor, Tom Bentley, was introducing the social aid legislation in the 1959 legislature, he pointed out that Saskatchewan's first act respecting rural municipalities placed the responsibility on the municipality to grant relief to any needy person who is a resident of the municipality. That was over 50 years ago. That was in the session of 1908-09, legislation putting responsibility on rural and urban municipalities. The extent of the problems during the thirties compelled the provincial and federal government to come to the aid of the municipalities. Even in this the principle of local responsibility was recognized and it is substantiated by the fact that municipalities entered into an agreement to reimburse the government for a percentage of the total relief to the residents in their area. If it has been used to get votes, it has been used by the people at the municipal level. We have agreements with almost 800 municipalities in this province. I think that in nearly all of these, an excellent job is being done. The person who wants social aid must go to the municipal officer and he or she fills out an application and the local welfare officer makes a decision then and there as to whether or not the person is eligible.

Now I receive a great deal of criticism of our social aid program as I go through the province and it doesn't all come from people from other political parties. I think it is understandable that a great many people who work hard and have difficulty in balancing their budget resent the fact that other people who aren't working at all are getting social aid, which is a great deal more.

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

than was available back in the thirties and they don't have to go to the council meeting. This is a criticism — here is a typical letter that comes to me —

“It has been and is becoming more pronounced as time goes on that there is altogether too much social aid being handed out here in our province of Saskatchewan. I may state that Saskatchewan is fast becoming a province of beggars.”

An Hon. Member: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Now, who said hear, hear?

An Hon. Member: — The member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt).

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: —

“There is altogether too much laxity. What I would like to see is the local paper print and publish the names and amounts being handed out locally.”

Anybody say hear, hear?

An Hon. Member: — The member for Cumberland.

Mrs. Batten: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather improper for a member who is giving a speech to conduct this cross-examination. If he is going to give a speech we are quite willing to listen to him. If he is going to address questions to us, then do we have the opportunity to get up and answer him, or do we sit still, or is our silence going to be taken as consent? I realize that he was brought up to speak in a pulpit and it makes it difficult for him when he becomes a politician, but at the same time these questions that are thrown at us either have to be answered by us or else if we are given an opportunity to do so during the speech, we will be quite prepared to do so. Otherwise he should limit himself to speaking to you Mr. Speaker.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, surely it is obvious that the questions are purely rhetorical questions. If the members opposite fall into the habit of answering them, nobody can blame anyone but themselves.

Mr. Speaker: — I think that the point of order raised — the minister is speaking and asking questions that way, but I don't think any member is obliged to answer and that silence wouldn't show consent.

Mr. Cameron: — On a different point of order. The minister is quoting from a letter. I would ask that he table the letter or submit the name of the person who wrote it.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — I have no objection to tabling it, and I am sure the writer has no objection either. I would like to finish the letter and again Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for interjections, but when somebody says hear, hear, I gather that the person is endorsing the views expressed in the letter, and I want to discuss this a little later.

“Surely, we have the right to know where our money is being spent. There was a time when it was well-meaning, but now it is really a farce. It seems as though it is not only Nipawin (this letter comes from the Nipawin area) but elsewhere where I have travelled, surely the taxpayers couldn't be expected to support those that will not make any attempt at helping themselves.”

So Mr. Speaker, at the request of the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) I would be glad to table this letter because I am sure the man who wrote it feels very strongly. I want to say that this matter was discussed with the representatives of the SUMA and SARM and it was agreed that this practice which did exist through the thirties should be discontinued.

I also had criticism through the province to the effect that reeves and councillors can't find out who are getting social aid and if they are — but again I am sure that if the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) were in his place and the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Thiessen) — would agree with me that our officials have instructed municipal councils that it isn't public policy to have people come into the council meeting with the press there and go through the embarrassing questions, but if any reeve or councillor wants to go in to see the welfare officer of the Lemberg village any day, and ask is it right that John Brown is getting social aid? — The secretary says 'yes' or 'no' and we say that the reeve or councillor should be given that information and if he

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

wants to he may go over the situation and say — this man certainly must have given false information. We encourage the reeves and councillors to be familiar with the regulations, to consult with the municipal officials handling these problems.

Mr. McFarlane: — Are all the regulations written . . .

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — Yes. Every secretary has them and is familiar with them.

Another criticism that has been made to me is that the local welfare officer turns down an application and our people from one of the nine regional offices come in and say — you turned down so and so. You should change your mind, or you should give them more or you should give them less. When I was visiting back in the constituency I represented for so many years in parliament this was a criticism that came from one of my very good friends. I said, well this is the sort of thing I want to run down. We'll go to the village office. When we reached the village office I said to my friend, will you repeat the criticism you have made. And he went over it, and the village secretary said, I have only been secretary for a year and a half and I have only had three applications in that time. Nobody came and said you are giving too much or too little. Oh, he said, I thought half the people were getting social aid. No, he said, just three. My friend hadn't seen one of these applications, he has never received social aid.

All I said is that we expect every person who applies to fill this out completely. If a secretary is too busy to watch it — there is a question as to how much money you have in the bank, and if that hasn't been filled out, our people want to know. They want to know why it wasn't filled out. This is the sort of detail we must watch because we want to make sure that the municipal welfare officer who is dealing with this is able to say that the application was properly and fully completed and the person qualified, and the municipal authorities have authority to prosecute anyone who makes a false application.

The hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) isn't in his place, but he will probably remember this. There were two men who were drawing social aid in Weyburn and Estevan at the same time. Now you can't live in two places at the same time. You can't qualify for social

aid twice and action was taken and they were dealt with according to the law of the land. So if there are criticisms about the administration of social aid, these criticisms must be directed to the people in the municipality who are making these day to day decisions. Again, I think that on the whole the people who are administering our social aid are doing an excellent job.

We had discussions with representatives of the two organizations before this legislation was brought in, and we meet with them regularly and go over the regulations. People I meet through the country get a bit excited as my friend did, who thought the schedules are too high. I haven't met anyone living on them who says they are too high. When you say would it be better to cut them in half — would it be better to cut them off altogether. Oh no. People who remember the hungry thirties and remember how difficult it was, they think something between what we have and what we had then would probably be desirable.

At another place I was asked, if I realized there is someone on social aid who has recently bought a hi-fi combination TV outfit for \$850. I said that is a new one. I have heard a great many complaints but that is a new one. I couldn't imagine a storekeeper giving this sort of credit and certainly this is a very large amount and I would like to check it. This was last November and this man promised he would tell me where this happened. I haven't heard from him yet. As a matter of fact, I didn't take his name so I don't know who to follow up. I think that if you are at a meeting and if someone makes this complaint and if he promises that he will send you the information that it is up to him to supply this information. Eight hundred and fifty dollars is a very large amount.

I have also been disturbed by the number of people who are in a salary range of from \$5 to \$10 thousand, who say to me when they meet me, jokingly of course. Ah! you are the Minister of Social Welfare. I am going to give up my job and go on social aid. It is said jestingly. I don't think it is funny. I think it is a mistake to assume that being on social aid is much better than working at a salary of \$6 or \$7 thousand. I want to thank members on both sides of the house for what you must be doing, because there hasn't been a critical speech so far on this, with the exception of the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) and I must apologize to the member for Maple Creek. He did ask me last November to discuss farm social aid with him. I promised I would and

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

we set a date, but as hon. members will recall, we had a very heated discussion that developed about that time. I apologize for not seeing him. I can't deal with what he said, tomorrow, because that debate is closed. But I think the problems he raised are important and I want to satisfy him that the farmers in Saskatchewan are getting social aid.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nicholson: — I will not mention that tomorrow either, but I will mention some criticisms I got from time to time and will stay away from what was said in the house, and I apologize for the fact that although I did arrange to have him meet my officials last November before he went back to his constituency — that we didn't get around to having the interview come off, but I hope that before he goes back he will come over to my office and we can have a few hours to go over this very important subject.

I would like to move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

(debate adjourned)

MOTION RE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER SERVICES REQUIRED BY MEMBERS

Premier Lloyd moved:

That a Select Special Committee under the Chairmanship of Mr. Speaker be appointed to consider the services and facilities required by Members, and to report to the Assembly their findings thereon; such Committee to consist of Messieurs Brockelbank, Erb, Johnson, Thurston, Thatcher and Horsman.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the motion as it stands speaks for itself and doesn't take much comment in order to interpret it. Hon. members will recall that it is now something over a year ago that the policy was adopted of making available a grant with regard to the expenses of the office of the Leader of the Opposition. At the session of one year ago, a select special committee examined this and made some recommendations with regard to it. It is suggested in this resolution that the arrangements which now have been in effect for something over a year might well be re-examined. I would think that the comment

with regard to it would be better in order at the time of the report rather than at this particular time, so it suggests the setting up of a committee to consider the situation. I am therefore, Mr. Speaker, prepared to move this resolution seconded by Mr. McDonald.

The question being put it was agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 1

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

That **Bill No. 1** — An Act to amend The Marriage Act be now read the second time.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — You will remember Mr. Speaker, that all that had to be said on this subject was more than exhausted, and we were going to leave it to the minister to close the debate. I adjourned it in order to give him the opportunity to find out what organization it was that had asked for an act in regard to the publishing of banns.

Mr. Speaker: — It is my duty to warn the house that the mover is about to close the debate. If anyone wishes to speak he must do so now.

Hon. W.G. Davies (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I wanted to comment first of all on some of the things that were said at the last discussion of this bill. I was rather astounded to hear of them and I want to make some comment this afternoon in that respect. First of all I want to make it clear and I have checked this from the records, that at no time did I suggest that procedures had been checked with members of the ministry other than those that had to do with the publication of banns. If anyone is in any doubt about this I can read from the records. I think several times during the speech of both the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) and the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) there was the suggestion that we had somehow pulled the wool over the eyes of members of the ministry by attempting to drag in a whole lot of other matters that were not those we had checked with them.

I want to make clear again that I said at that time only that we had checked with them on the publication of banns, since this matter seemed to be one that we should check with them on.

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

There were also some comments made with regard to the marriage commissioners and I am going to come to the matter that the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) has made mention of, but I don't want to be distracted from the course of dealing with the comments that were made the other afternoon.

An Hon. Member: — I can't hear you.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — I will attempt to talk so you can hear me. Mr. Speaker, it is somehow claimed that by permitting a marriage commissioner to perform a ceremony outside of his office we were engaging in a "socializing" practice, at least this is what I derived from the remarks of the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker). I think it was said that we were going to be setting up marriage commissioners and charging \$5.00 to all those getting married and therefore imposing another alleged iniquitous piece of taxation on the people of Saskatchewan. Certainly I think this was the impression that was conveyed to the house when this debate took place. I want to remind the hon. members that procedures for marriage commissioners have been in effect in this province since the year 1898. Therefore I suppose the previous old-line party governments, including the governments headed by the Liberal party would have had something to do with it.

I want to point out too that in every province west of Ontario, to my knowledge, there is some procedure for wedding ceremonies to be performed by a marriage commissioner. Now in this province there are only twelve marriage commissioners. All of these are members of the district courts, that is judges of the district court. I am at liberty to say that this amendment was proposed by Judge B.D. Hogarth of Regina who thought that it would be . . .

Mrs. Batten: — I suspected him.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — He thought Mr. Speaker, that there would be some advantage in performing the ceremony outside of his office. There are times when there are quite a number of persons accompanying the bride and groom. The judge's office is not a very suitable place for it, and he had in mind as a matter of fact, one of the court rooms in the new court house in Regina.

Now the amendment of course, permits the marriage commissioner to use his judgement in this respect so that

the ceremony could be held in other than the courtroom or other than the office of the judge. But I suggest that the judgement of the persons concerned here, will probably not go to extravagant lengths, as has been intimated in some of the discussion on this bill.

I have checked with regard to the matter of marriage banns, and I find from the Vital Statistics department, — from our Mr. Reid to be more precise — that he has a number of inquiries from mainly Protestant denominations on the form in which the banns should be proclaimed. There are a few difficulties in construing the present legislation for persons who belong to two different religious denominations — do the banns have to be proclaimed in two separate churches, even though the ceremony has only to be performed in one? This is one of the questions that Mr. Reid has had rather often, I have only correspondence here for the last year and a half, but one of the letters comes from the pastor of the St. Thomas Wesley United church; another one comes from a pastor of the United Church of Canada, the Rev. John A. Gray. I have also one from another United Church minister and one from an Anglican minister. All of these ministers have inquired about the manner in which banns are presently proclaimed and thought that some change should be instituted. That is why the change is proposed in the bill that is before you. It will provide as I stated before for a minimum method of bann proclamation. It will not in any way interfere with the banns that are proclaimed by a religious body that has had this practice over a long period of years.

I remind the house again that the amendment on banns that you have before you has been submitted to a number of ministers, including the Regina Ministerial Association and they have felt that the amendment is quite all right.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 13

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

That **Bill No. 13** — An Act to amend The Northern Administration Act — be now read the second time.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — In view of the fact that the hon. minister has the opportunity to close the debate, I can't ask him any further questions. There were some questions that members on this side of the house had for him, but I think it might

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

be better to let this go at this time and we can question him in third reading.

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two comments on this bill. First of all I want to thank the hon. minister for bringing in a bill at this time that is much more compatible to the people of this area than the bill he brought in last year and then took back.

I fully appreciate the difficulties that he has had over the past years. A return that I asked for only the other day showed that there is need for some means of recovering some of the money which the Department of Natural Resources paid out. For the year 1961 they paid out almost \$69 thousand and they only recovered less than forty per cent of it. For that reason I am in sympathy with that part of it. However, I do hope that the minister and his officials will use this bill with discretion. I hope that they will realize that a good part of this money that isn't collected is not outstanding because people will not pay, but it outstanding because people cannot pay.

I am wondering what effect the bill might have on a winter works program in the north. I can see where people who haven't paid their hospitalization and their health and education tax — \$24 respectively, would not participate in a winter works program if they knew that the money earned would be taken under this act. It would then mean that these people would have to go on receiving more social aid and it would also take away, perhaps, some of the initiatives that they might have.

Those are the only remarks that I want to make till the bill is in committee. I do hope the minister will use discretion.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

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