

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**20th Day**

**Thursday, March 22, 1962.**

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

On the Orders of the Day:

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. I. H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to draw your attention to the pupils sitting in the last two rows of the east gallery from the Torquay School, the Grade VII class. They are brought here today by Mrs. Bergum, their teacher and the five drivers, Mr. Bergum, Mr. Salte, Mr. Friess, Mr. Bode and Mr. Tenold. I trust these pupils will have an interesting afternoon.

**Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I too, would like to draw the attention of this house to the fine group of students from the metropolis of Coderre. They are accompanied by their teacher Mother Mary Edward and the drivers Mr. Cosette and Mr. Nelson. I am sure that their visit to the city and to the legislature this afternoon will be a very enjoyable one.

**Mr. J.H. Staveley (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I think that as long as the speakers are on this side of the house at the moment, I also would like to draw your attention to a very fine group of students sitting at the very top of the Speaker's gallery. These students, accompanied by two of their teachers, are from the Talmage School about 20 miles northeast of Weyburn, their principal and the teacher of Grades VII, VIII and IX are with them and I know you would all want to join with me in extending our best wishes for a very enjoyable experience this afternoon. This is the first time they have been up here.

**March 22, 1962**

**Mr. E. Whelan (Regina City):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to draw your attention and the attention of all hon. members to an intelligent, smart-looking group of students in the west gallery from St. James School in the city of Regina. They are with their teacher Mr. William Ganow. I hope that their stay in the Legislative Assembly this afternoon will be enjoyable, educational and informative.

**ANNOUNCEMENT: RE MAPS**

**Hon. C.G. Willis (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I want to draw the attention of the legislature to the smart-looking maps which have been placed on their desks today. These are new 1962 Saskatchewan highway maps. I would particularly draw your attention to the fact that the map is smaller this year — five inches shorter, five inches narrower than last year. For the pictures that we have used tinted pictures, rather than full colours. This has made the map more economical. The highway system itself is shown against a white clearness. We have shown pictures of our highways, here the junction of 6 and 11 north of the city. Pictures of the Uranium City road; pictures of the Prince Albert bridge. All in all I think this is probably the best map we have published, one that would be acceptable to the vast majority of motorists in Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the remark of the hon. minister's that it was the best map that was ever published. I would like to point out to the hon. members that when my department was responsible we didn't spoil it by putting a picture of the minister on the back.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, I am quite interested to know who the good looking lady is on here?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — On a point of privilege, I didn't get one.

**BUDGET DEBATE**  
**(Adjourned Debate)**

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

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, just before I adjourned the debate on Tuesday afternoon I drew to the attention of the house the Liberal strategy of discrediting the government by making wild, inaccurate, unsubstantiated charges and statements. I stated this, that it was either a deliberate falsehood or it was due to ignorance because they were too lazy to check and look up facts. I then followed to expose their most popular pronouncement and that is that Saskatchewan provincial taxes are the highest in Canada, as completely untrue. This again I believe was done by the opposition either deliberately to misinform the Saskatchewan people or they were doing this due to ignorance of facts and records which are easily available to them as well as to any member of this side of the house.

I went on to prove, by referring to the records of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, that in two of the three major provincial tax fields namely the vehicles gas tax and the vehicle and driver licenses field, Saskatchewan was one of the lowest taxes in the Dominion of Canada. That the Liberal provinces of Newfoundland and the Conservative province of Nova Scotia, the Liberal province of New Brunswick and again the Liberal province of Quebec was one of the highest in the Dominion of Canada. Liberal Newfoundland and Conservative Nova Scotia led with the highest gas tax of 19¢ per gallon in the Dominion of Canada. The second highest in the Dominion of Canada was Liberal New Brunswick. In the licensing field for example again Liberal province of Quebec led as the highest in Canada with the Liberal province of New Brunswick following immediately behind as the second highest in the Dominion of Canada.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Not up to date Alex.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I did not realize Tuesday afternoon that the Leader of the Opposition was mumbling and interfering as he usually does. But I noticed in the press later on in the evening that the kept on interjecting, “What about the sales tax?” Now I am going to come to the sales tax.

**March 22, 1962**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Talk about Alberta and Manitoba.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Why Alberta and Manitoba? Why not go to the Liberal provinces of Canada? Mr. Speaker, again I want to point out that as far as the sales tax is concerned that the sales tax in the province of Saskatchewan was first levied by a Liberal government. . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You said you were going to wipe it out when you went in.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — . . . and may I point out again that they levied this tax on twice as many items as it is being levied on today. Mr. Speaker, this sales tax was increased as of January 1, 1962 from three to five per cent. Out of the increase of two per cent which will provide approximately \$18,600,000 — \$3½ million is earmarked for education — \$15,100,000 is earmarked for the medical care program.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — When?

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Fifteen million, one hundred thousand dollars, Mr. Speaker, is not a new levy or a new expense on the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have been paying this individually for medical care. Some were paying this to private insurance schemes such as M.S.I. or the Group Medical. Then again some of the people of the province of Saskatchewan were paying in the form of local government taxes, where they had a municipal scheme. This tax is not a new expense of the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the opposition in speaking of the sales tax, never acknowledged that eight provinces of the ten provinces of Canada levy a sales tax. They do not admit that all the three Liberal provinces of Canada levy a sales tax. Mr. Speaker, the opposition does not admit that Quebec a Liberal province, levies a four per cent provincial sales tax, plus a two per cent municipal sales tax — a total of six per cent, the highest in the Dominion of Canada without providing or contemplating to provide a medical scheme.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — The opposition, Mr. Speaker, does not admit that British Columbia levies a five per cent sales tax, has levied it for years and is not providing nor contemplating to provide in this year a medical scheme. We will take another province, Mr. Speaker, the province of Newfoundland, again a Liberal province, levies a five per cent sales tax and provides no comprehensive medical plan to the people of Newfoundland.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — You don't either.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, I have now covered the major direct taxes levied by this government namely, the education and health tax which is going to bring in \$35½ million; the gas vehicle fuel tax which will bring in \$25,400,000 and the vehicle licenses of \$8,100,000 or a total of \$68 million and have proven by substantiating my facts that Saskatchewan is one of the lowest taxed in the Dominion of Canada.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — May I point this out again, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan with a considerably lesser levy in these direct taxes provides services to our people that are not supplied by the heavier taxed provinces of Canada. I have proven beyond a doubt, by referring to recognized, established records in Canada, that our major provincial tax levies are lower than any of the three Liberal provinces of Canada, lower than some of the other provinces of Canada and these have absolutely pinned the unsubstantiated Liberal charge of highest provincial taxes in Saskatchewan as a deliberate fabricated falsehood or made due to their ignorance, in not studying statistics that are made available to them.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I wonder if I could direct a question to the hon. minister?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, no, not during the radio time. He will have his opportunity. Mr. Speaker, we have had the opposition try to convince themselves and convince the people of Saskatchewan that municipal and school taxes are exceptionally high in Saskatchewan. We don't levy a land

**March 22, 1962**

tax in Saskatchewan, but I do want to remind the house that there was a land tax in the province of Saskatchewan under the previous Liberal administration and it was wiped off by this government in 1952.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have over the past few minutes proven that provincial taxes of Saskatchewan are low, but down through the years they have been increasing as have other provincial taxes been increasing in every provincial government of the dominion of Canada. May I point out again that they have been increasing ever since 1946 when the federal Liberal government supported by the Conservatives lifted price controls, allowed costs and commodities of goods to skyrocket and it was only natural with the skyrocketing costs that municipalities and provincial government must levy more taxes in order to meet these increasing costs.

Now as I have proven with facts that our provincial taxes are low, I am now going to check the municipal taxes in the rural municipalities of Saskatchewan and Manitoba along the Saskatchewan-Manitoba boundary. I have brought the figures up to date and here is what you would find, if you people were only prepared to check the following information, the annual municipal reports of the province of Manitoba, of Saskatchewan and of Alberta. If we look along the boundaries of Manitoba and Saskatchewan we can compare the municipalities on one side of Saskatchewan with the municipalities on the other side in Manitoba. I have the figures for it. I will start with the northern area and take the rural municipality of Livingstone No. 331 in the Pelly constituency and compare it with the rural municipality of Swan River just across the boundary in Manitoba. I find that the Saskatchewan general municipal tax levy is 26 mills and in Manitoba it is 40.5 mills. The school mill levy in Saskatchewan is 28.7, in Manitoba it is 31.5. The total municipal and school levy in the Saskatchewan municipality is 54.7 mills. In Manitoba it is 72 or 17.3 mills higher in Manitoba than in Saskatchewan.

Let's go down further. Let's go down to the rural municipality of Calder. The hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) should be acquainted with it and the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker). Compare the R.M. of Calder and compare it with the R.M. of Shell River, Manitoba just across the boundary.

The total municipal and school tax in Calder is 57.1 mills. The total school and municipal levy in the R.M. of Shell River in Manitoba is 89.3 or 32.2 mills higher in Manitoba than in Saskatchewan.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Let's take another one. The rural municipality of Moosomin, surely the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) should be acquainted with this one, and compare that municipality to the one in Manitoba, the R.M. of Archie No. 2. The total levy in the R.M. of Moosomin in Saskatchewan is 61.7 mills, in Manitoba it is 68 mills — 6.3 mills higher in Manitoba than in Saskatchewan. Now if I take the statistics of all the municipalities — the average of all the municipalities in Saskatchewan along the border and compare it with the average in Manitoba, along the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border, I find out that the average federal, municipal and school taxes in Saskatchewan is 12.5 mills lower than in Manitoba.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McDonald:** — But the farmer only pays half the taxes.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Now let's go to the Alberta boundary and compare the taxes in Alberta to that of Saskatchewan along the boundary. Here I will compare and take the rural municipality of Brittania in northern Saskatchewan along the Alberta boundary, and compare it to the R.M. of Vermilion in Alberta. There the total school and municipal tax in Alberta is 64.2 mills in Saskatchewan it is 56.1 — 8.1 lower in Saskatchewan than Alberta.

I will take another municipality. The rural municipality of High Hill No. 382 in Saskatchewan and compare it to Provost No. 52 in Alberta. The total general and school levy in Saskatchewan is 59.3 mills, in Alberta 63.5 mills, again Saskatchewan is lower than Alberta by 14.2. Take the rural municipality of Mantario in Saskatchewan No. 262 and compare it with Arcadia No. 34 in Alberta and I see that the difference is 10 mills in favour of Alberta. Saskatchewan taxes here are higher than in Alberta. But if you take the average along the Alberta boundary I find that our taxes in Saskatchewan are 6.5 mills lower in Saskatchewan than in Alberta.

**March 22, 1962**

Let's take a look and see where the difference comes in, Mr. Speaker. The difference in Manitoba is that we in Saskatchewan contribute far more grants to rural municipalities. In Manitoba the rural municipal taxes are considerably higher than those in Saskatchewan and there is a good reason for it. In Alberta, if you check, you will find out that the school taxes in Alberta are somewhat higher than those in Saskatchewan and I am going to be honest about it, I believe that Alberta is building better educational plants than we are. The costs are higher yes, let's admit the truth instead of making wild inaccurate statements. These are facts taken from records not nonsense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to compare a few of the urban municipalities of Manitoba to that of Saskatchewan. I am going to compare Glenborough, Manitoba to that of Arcola, Saskatchewan. Glenborough assessment is \$786 thousand; Arcola's is \$704 thousand — very comparable. Population of the Manitoba town is 765, of Arcola is 610. If you compare the assessment in Glenborough, Manitoba, school and municipal levy is 79 mills, in Arcola it is 55.6 mills — 23.4 mills lower in Saskatchewan than it is in Manitoba. I will take another town.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Birtle, Manitoba and compare it to Sturgis, Saskatchewan — Sturgis is a town in my constituency. The assessment of Birtle, Manitoba is \$557 thousand, the assessment of Sturgis is \$650 thousand. The population of Birtle 806; the population of Sturgis is 807. The general school and municipal levy in Manitoba 73 mills; in Saskatchewan 71 mills — very little difference. I am going to take another town — Gladstone, Manitoba and compare it to Whitewood, Saskatchewan again in a Liberal seat in Saskatchewan. The assessment of Gladstone, Manitoba is \$969 thousand; the assessment of Whitewood, Saskatchewan is \$921 thousand, very similar. The population of Gladstone, Manitoba is 882, the population of Whitewood 789, very similar. But the municipal and school levy in Gladstone, Manitoba is 82 mills; in Whitewood it is 54.6 mills — 27.4 mills lower in Whitewood, Saskatchewan than Gladstone, Manitoba — 50 per cent higher.

I am going to take a larger town. Swan River, Manitoba and the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) knows



Swan River very well. I am going to compare it to a town within his constituency, Kamsack, Saskatchewan. Compare Swan River, Manitoba and Kamsack, Saskatchewan. The assessment of Swan River is \$2,441,000; the assessment of Kamsack is \$2,385,000 very similar. The population of Swan River 2,644; the population of Kamsack is 2,843. The municipal and school levy in Swan River is 88 mills; in Kamsack it is 78.87 mills a difference of almost 10 mills in favour of Kamsack. Mr. Speaker, when I took Kamsack, Kamsack has the second highest school tax in the province of Saskatchewan 49.8 mills. I took one of the worst towns for a tax levy. If I compare Swan River, Manitoba to Canora, Saskatchewan a town in my own constituency, Canora, Saskatchewan has an assessment of \$1,852,000. The population of Canora is 1,873. Per capita assessment is very close to that of Swan River. The municipal and school levy in Canora, Saskatchewan is 67.5 mills, in Swan River, Manitoba it is 88 — 20.5 mills higher in Swan River than Canora. Here again, Mr. Speaker, I am proving that again the statements that the Liberals have been trying to convey to the people of Saskatchewan that taxes in Saskatchewan are high and therefore higher than elsewhere is an absolute fabricated falsehood.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — May I again remind the opposition that they could get these figures as well as I could get them. All they have to do is check the annual reports of the province of Manitoba, Alberta and of Saskatchewan and get facts instead of peddling nonsense in the house and on the hustings.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that municipal and school taxes have gone up in Saskatchewan. They have gone up even more so in Manitoba and Alberta. All municipal land taxes have gone up because costs have gone up. Municipalities at one time were able to buy a caterpillar for \$5 thousand. Today they must pay \$20 thousand because the Liberals lifted price control in Ottawa and allowed prices to skyrocket.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Therefore commodities have gone up three and four times; taxes are bound to go up. But they have gone up the least in the province of Saskatchewan.

**March 22, 1962**

Now, Mr. Speaker, the financial critic made many ridiculous, unsubstantiated statements on the topic of taxation, but the most ridiculous was when he blamed the high cost of goods on high taxes. When anyone with any common sense at all knows that taxes were low and reasonable when costs were low and reasonable, but when costs started skyrocketing taxes have followed suit.

Now another foolish statement he made — taxes on drugs are 51 per cent and that is why they are high. Well, Mr. Speaker, the province doesn't levy any taxes on drugs. It must be the federal government and if it was the federal government, it was levied by a Liberal federal government and the Conservatives are carrying on.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to review my department. I want to emphasize that we in the Department of Natural Resources have always believed that the most valuable use of our renewable resources is the recreational and tourist industry. It is difficult to estimate but I am sure the revenues derived by our people of Saskatchewan catering to the recreational use of our renewable resources is by far greater than revenues derived from the other uses of our renewable resources namely exploitation of forests, commercial fisheries and even fur production. Our counters into the provincial parks and other recreational areas last year showed a further increase of 22 per cent in the use of our recreational facilities. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we in the department and the government foresaw this great increase in use of outdoor recreation some seven years ago. We then engaged a recreational consultant and planned rapid expansion of our provincial parks and recreational facilities. I am glad that some of the members of the opposition now appreciate that expansion, but I do want to remind the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and some of the other young lads on that side that some of their colleagues the older members were very critical of the planning particularly park planning. My friend the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) and I cannot forget the hon. ex-member for Saltcoats who made some of the recreational facilities an election issue at one time. They were very critical of modern facilities in heavily used recreational areas. We were then charged, Mr. Speaker, with inefficiency, with wasting public funds and of building comfort palaces. You know they believed in those square little houses with the two holes in them. These kind of improved facilities, Mr. Speaker, and even better ones are a must today if we are to reap the rewards of a tourist industry. Such facilities, we must

now provide in every major provincial park and our major camping sites on the Trans Canada. When the hon. member for Athabasca spoke the other day he talked of the importance of the tourist industry and it is important. He talked about the need of publicity — advertise our fine recreational areas and the opportunities that there are in this province. I am going to say this. He doesn't need to convince us, but he does need to rebrainwash some of his older colleagues. When we were in the past spending money on publicity to advertise our province his colleagues used to add these amounts up and they called it "political propaganda."

I was pleased to note the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) believes that even more funds should be provided for recreational areas. Mr. Speaker, in this budget we have over a million dollars that is going to be spent for recreational development and maintenance. We certainly could use more money for more developmental work as well as greater and improved maintenance. I believe that the time has come to consider levying a park entrance or park users fee to have some of the facilities provided paid at least partially by the people who use them. I am glad to hear that some of the members of the opposition agree.

When you travel in the United States you pay an entrance fee of as high as \$5 to drive through a state park. National parks have always had entrance fees for cars, even if you only drove through the park. The province of Ontario commenced last year an annual park entrance fee of \$3 for cars annually or 50¢ for each vehicle entering a provincial park, daily. Manitoba has provided for an entrance fee into certain designated parks. Quebec levies an entrance fee of \$1 per day for cars into certain designated parks. In Saskatchewan for example a number of private recreational areas levy entrance fees. Some of our newly-established regional parks are set-up to charge entrance fees. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every user of our provincial parks should contribute a small amount towards paying part of the cost of developing and maintaining such services. There is no reason why visitors from outside the province should not contribute to the costs of our provincial parks. When we leave the province and go into other provinces or the United States of America, we contribute to the development and maintenance of their parks. I therefore want to announce that as of the re-opening of our provincial parks in 1962 we will be charging an annual provincial park users entrance fee of \$3 per vehicle.

**March 22, 1962**

This will be in the form of a sticker and will entitle the vehicle with all its passengers to enter any provincial park in Saskatchewan for the whole of the fiscal year. Anyone else who doesn't want an annual fee will have the opportunity of paying a 50¢ fee for the privilege of using the park for that one day. These fees, Mr. Speaker, will be charged only in designated provincial parks that are in an advanced stage of development and maintenance.

For the year 1962 the following parks will be so designated: Cypress Provincial Park; Moose Mountain Provincial Park; the Duck Mountain Provincial Park; Pike Lake Provincial Park and the Green Water Lake Provincial Park.

Now I want to proceed on to give to the legislature our plan of recreational and park development program for the year 1962-63. In the Moose Mountain Provincial Park we expect to spend in the coming fiscal year \$15 thousand. Park entry fee collection facilities will be provided. The park office will be moved and located on the new entrance road. Power will be brought to the extension of the Sunnybank subdivision. Street lighting will be installed. Landscaping work will be carried out around the bath-house and the Fish Creek camp grounds will be enlarged.

In the Duck Mountain provincial park approximately \$51 thousand will be spent. Landscaping will be carried out around the Ministik Inn and an irrigation system will be installed. Work on a new water distribution system will be undertaken and the sewage disposal system will be enlarged and improved. Park entrance fee collection facilities will be constructed and road alterations will be made to accommodate them. Work will begin on the extension to the golf course at Madge Lake and will entail mainly fairway clearing. The parking lot at Ministik Beach will be re-gravelled.

In the Pike Lake provincial park we expect to spend \$20 thousand. Improvements will be carried out at the main core area of the park through landscaping, surfacing walk-ways and fencing. Park entrance fee collection facilities will be installed and the park office will be moved from its present location at the maintenance site to the park gate. A new road to give access to the site to the lake subdivision will be constructed as well as an access road to the institutional camp. Work will be carried out at the pumping site on the Saskatchewan River to insure the lake level to be maintained during the summer.

Cypress Hills provincial park we expect to spend approximately \$25 thousand. A new water distribution system will be installed in the park including a new reservoir. Park entrance fee collection facilities will be installed and the swimming pool will be renovated.

On the Buffalo Pound provincial park we will spend approximately \$25 thousand. Detailed plans for the development of this park are still being worked out. In general the work to be done this summer will include the construction of internal roads, a parking lot, beach improvements, the construction of camp grounds and the installation of improved comfort facilities.

In the Echo Valley provincial park we expect to spend approximately \$80 thousand. This park will not be fully completed in 1962-63, it is hoped that minimal facilities will be provided to allow for full use of the area. A water distribution and irrigation system will be installed and the main area will be landscaped. Walkways will be constructed. A bath change house and an administration building will be constructed together with permanent camp ground and picnic grounds.

In the Katepwa provincial park, one of our smallest in the province, approximately \$1,500 will be spent. Additional work will be carried out to improve grounds and walkways. At Valley Centre a water supply will be installed to the new golf clubhouse as a cost of \$4 thousand. In the Green Water Provincial Park we expect to spend \$13 thousand on the new water system, composed of a reservoir and a distribution system will be installed at the park. Facilities will be provided for the collection of park entrance fees.

In the Battleford provincial park we expect to spend approximately \$40 thousand. A substantial start will be made on the development of the park in 1962-63. Main work will concentrate on the installation of a water system together with a reservoir. The construction of internal roads and parking areas and landscaping. Power will be installed. Picnic sites and camp sites will be provided together with adequate comfort facilities. The work will also include construction of a boat launching ramp.

At Rowan's Ravine provincial park approximately \$1,500 will be spent on further tree planting programs.

**March 22, 1962**

In the Meadow Lake provincial park approximately \$2 thousand will be spent to provide further recreational facilities within the park at the south Saskatchewan picnic site areas \$3 thousand will be spent on both sides of the river on the west and on the east of the river to improve additional picnicking facilities.

On the Trans Canada camp sites on the No. 1 highway we will spend \$83 thousand. The McLean site will be completed and the main development will be undertaken at the Besant site. This will entail at each site the construction of an administration building complete with toilets, shower and laundry facilities and the installation of a water system. On the roadside picnic and historic sites we will be spending approximately \$38 thousand. Roadside picnic sites will be developed at Roche Percee, Borden Bridge on the North Saskatchewan River and Dana on No. 2 highway. A marker will be erected over Gabriel Dumont's grave at Batoche. A cairn will be erected at the site of Fort Carleton. We will also co-operate with the federal government in marking Steel's Narrow in the Makwa Lake area. It is hoped that a start will be made in marking the site of the Territorial Legislature in the city of Regina.

On the south Saskatchewan reservoir park site, \$10 thousand will be spent and this will mainly be a survey to carry out and locate adequate water supplies for the area. In the Squaw Rapids area a further \$100 thousand will be spent on the clearing and burning of debris and so on, left from this winters clearing operation in the Squaw Rapids reservoir.

In the northern areas recreational sites approximately \$3 thousand will be spent at Beaver Lake, La Ronge, Pelican Narrows. Five thousand dollars in the Prince Albert regional recreational site for the improvement of public camp grounds at Candle Lake, the beach and picnic areas at Murray Point subdivision.

Now I want to go on to our road program in the Department of Natural Resources. Under the northern resource road program, approximately \$800 thousand will be spent on the Hansen Lake and Otosquen road. This will complete the Otosquen road from Hudson Bay, Saskatchewan to the boundary of Manitoba some 80 odd miles. In 1962 we plan to complete approximately 25 miles of grading with some four bridges to complete the 226 miles of grading from Smeaton, Saskatchewan to Creighton, Saskatchewan at the Manitoba boundary at Flin Flon. The Hansen Lake road should be finished off and completely gravelled

in 1963-64. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that when the agreement on northern roads was signed back in 1958 it was agreed and understood by both parties that the Otosquen road and the Hansen Lake road were to have priority over the building of the La Ronge to Uranium City road. This is why this year we are pressing for the completion of these two roads. The Hansen Lake road when completed will open up new commercial timber area extraction, new tourist areas, engage in more economical transportation of the commercial fish to the markets of the world and of course complete and open the road from central Saskatchewan to Flin Flon.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that after these three roads are completed we will have approximately \$3 million left for the Uranium City road. I am hoping that by the end of this year we will be able to get some commitments from the federal government that they will be prepared to go along with this road to Uranium City and on a 50-50 basis with the provincial government. But I do want, just for the information of the members, to refer them to page 802 in the Canada Year Book — 1961. The Canada Year Book is issued by the federal government and I see they must have been doing some planning. I see there a map on the roads to resources program and territorial construction — they show that the road is going to go from Otter Rapids to the Southern Reindeer Lake, will proceed on to Wollaston, Stony Rapids and Uranium City.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Now the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) the other day was very concerned about the road and roads generally in the north. I would like to bring this to the attention of the house, that the provincial Liberal government in the past was never concerned about the north. There wasn't a decent mile of road in all of the northern region up until 1944. I would like to point out to the house that in 1957 prior to the general election, I placed before the federal Liberal government of that day a proposal, and I am going to say a vision to build roads in northern Saskatchewan; pointed out to them the need of opening the north, of giving access to the people of the north. I am going to say this; that the Liberal government at that time laughed at me; told me to go home; the Liberals were not interested in northern Saskatchewan.

**March 22, 1962**

In the meantime the federal Liberals were defeated. I returned back to Ottawa and I want to say that the new government was far more receptive and co-operative and we are now building northern roads.

I am going to go on with some of the other road programs carried out in northern Saskatchewan. We will in 1962 gravel the Jan's Lake road which was built last year, will be gravelled this year at a cost of \$10 thousand. The La Loche road from Buffalo Narrows — we have already done preliminary to mile 40 — work will be continued at a cost in the following year of \$45 thousand. The Dore Lake road — 21 miles of it was built in 1961. We are hoping to complete this road this year at a cost of \$100 thousand. The Candle Lake road — 20 miles is needed to be gravelled this year at a cost of \$15 thousand. The Whelan Bay road, one mile of construction and 3½ miles of gravelling will be done at a cost of \$5 thousand. In the Meadow Lake Provincial Park we intend to continue the building of the road from the east side to the west side through the park. A further ten miles will be constructed and gravelled at a cost of \$70 thousand. In the same provincial park the Lac des Isles road of 2½ miles will be constructed and gravelled at a cost of \$8 thousand. The Beauval residential road at Beauval will be constructed this year at a cost of \$50 thousand. This is a co-operative effort with the Department of Indian Affairs of the federal government and the Department of Natural Resources. It will cost us \$25 thousand. In the southern region Christopher Trail and division roads in the Moose Mountain Provincial Park will be built at a cost of \$25 thousand and in the Buffalo Pound Provincial Park a road will cost some \$12 thousand.

Mr. Speaker, may I proceed on to forest fire control. I want to say that I regret to report that 1961 will go down in provincial history as one of the worst forest fire seasons. At the height of the fire season in July, Mr. Speaker, we have 1,300 men, 12 winged aircraft and three helicopters on fire work. We took action on 507 fires and the cost soared to \$1,750,000. Some 30 million board feet of burned timber will be salvaged this winter. The hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) speaking the other day, mentioned the fires interfered with the commercial fishing season; that natives were forced to fight fires and lose other income. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I find this very disappointing, when hon. members criticize without checking



to see if their statements have any validity or truth. If the hon. member had checked to substantiate his completely inaccurate statement he would have gotten the following information.

During 1961 approximately 1,500 fishermen harvested a record 14½ million pounds of fish, the highest production in the history of the province.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Two million pounds more than the previous 1960. The value to the fishermen and the lakes was the highest in the history of the province, approximately \$1,367,000 or \$180 thousand higher than the previous high record of 1960.

I want to say something about the summer fishing operations. The 1961 summer of fishing season accounted for the heaviest harvest of summer operations in all the history of Saskatchewan — some 9½ million pounds. This is double the 1954 summer operations. Now I want to say this: I want to congratulate my staff of the fisheries branch, my fire suppression division, my conservation officers of the north, the management and staff of co-operative fisheries, the people of the north for the splendid work of co-ordination and co-operation to have so staggered commercial production of fish so that the people of the north were able to participate fully in fire fighting, yet produce more fish than ever before in the history of the province.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, this just proves what can be done when communities, industries and the government personnel work together for the good of all.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, I say it was in the best interests of the people of the north to have earned wages fighting fires, at the same time carrying out the largest commercial fish production and earning the largest amount of money in the history of the province. The statement of the opposition is again a complete falsehood, Mr. Speaker.

**March 22, 1962**

I am going to say that it is hard to understand why the members of the opposition do not have a little more regard for honesty and stop this untruthful, unsubstantiated, factless criticism. That's all it is. All he had to do is check the annual report and he would have got the information.

Since I am still on fire suppression, I want to inform the house that fire fighting wage increases, have been under consideration for some time. I was to have made an announcement in The Speech from the Throne, but due to some misunderstanding I was requested to give my place to the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). It now gives me great pleasure in announcing that the fire fighting wage rates will be increased for this season to \$5.50 per day — this is equal to Alberta's rate and 50¢ to \$1 higher than Manitoba.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — They can thank the member for Athabasca for that.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of reading a letter that I had received in the mail after the member for Athabasca did make a plea for higher wages in the north. I am going to read it:

“In listening to the member from Athabasca over the legislative broadcast today, I couldn't help but recall how I was called from farm work in the month of May to fight a fire for the sum of 10¢ an hour and it took me from my farm to Tuxford. (This is under a Liberal government.) Again, while the Liberals were still in power, three of my sons and myself fought fires in the municipality of Garden River for several days. I patrolled that fire which developed into a ground fire for three weeks, and none of us ever received a cent for it. Mr. George Williams took this case up on the floor of the legislature and found out that two Liberal heelers had received \$98. Now Mr. Guy deplores the fact that men are protecting their own interests and get \$4 a day.”

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Who wrote the letter?

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Do you want me to table it?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Yes table it.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — The name is George W. Buchanan of Weirdale, Saskatchewan. I herewith table the letter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to report that a new federal-provincial forestry agreement comes into effect on April 1, 1962. Under this agreement the federal government will assist the provinces in the cost of forest fire protection, forest access roads and air strips, inventory maintenance and forest management, forest stations and the establishment of new forest groups. Of a total of some \$7 million earmarked by Ottawa for the share program, Saskatchewan is eligible for approximately \$367,500.

Mr. Speaker, although I have touched a bit on the splendid work of our fisheries branch, I want to add something more. I want this legislature to be aware that in 1961 Saskatchewan became the top Canadian producer of whitefish and lake trout. We took the lead away from Manitoba on whitefish by 1½ million pounds and we took the lead away from Great Slave Lake by quarter of a million pounds of lake trout. I want to take this opportunity again in congratulating the fisheries branch and the industry on the excellent management of our commercial fisheries, which has shown a continuous, gradual increase in production over the past ten years. The fisheries branch will be examining some 70 lakes to determine again suitability to fish stocking and the following fish stocking program will be carried out in 1962. Rainbow trout 750,000 fingerlings; 160,000 lake trout fingerlings; 20 million pickerel will be stocked into some 30 lakes in the province. Two and a half million pike in the five lakes and approximately five thousand perch into two lakes.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that my time is going on, I now would like to report on the Northern Affairs Branch. I do want to point out that it is becoming increasingly evident to us that the primary resources of northern Saskatchewan are inadequate to provide an improved standard of living for the present producers and certainly insufficient to provide for the rapidly expanding population. I do want to run over some of the program that we have had in the north. In 1961 some 7 million board feet of spruce saw timber, almost a quarter million board feet of jack pine was produced on the already open Hansen Lake road. Cruising is being carried on in that area to determine further volumes for further production

**March 22, 1962**

in the coming years. New fish filleting plant was put up at Beaver Lake. In the northern region, particularly the eastern side we took action on some 309 fires, our fires suppression costs into the northern area amounted to half million dollars. I want to report that tourist business in the north did very well. Angling was excellent in most of the areas. A modern hotel was constructed at Cumberland House, catering to big game and moose hunters in the area. We carried out a course on guiding in the Cumberland House area and I want to report that considerable work was done on recreational sites in northern Saskatchewan and further work will be carried out in 1962.

Public assistance was granted in 1961 to the people of the northern area to the tune of \$170 thousand. And I want to say here that I associate myself with those who believe in a work and wages program for employable people of the north.

I want to remind the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) that the policy of the previous federal Liberal government had been to pay 50% of the social aid but when it came to a work and wages program there was no federal program and no federal contribution at that time, and the Conservative government of today is following that same plan. I want to assure all members that we will do everything possible to convince the federal government of the need for a work and wages program, especially in the north as joint federal-provincial program.

I want to report further that during the year that some 20 men and 10 young women of the north attended vocational training in Saskatoon, this will be repeated again in 1962.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since my time is limited I want to go on to a few other criticisms levelled from the opposition on to the government. Liberal speakers, Mr. Speaker, have used a considerable amount of their time trying to create and recreate certain fears about the re-organization of the CCF and the New Democratic Party. They are now trying to convey to the house and to the people of Saskatchewan the following: CCF was a mighty fine political movement but the New Democratic Party must be watched with suspicion and heed. They are out to build fears in the people of Saskatchewan about the New Democratic Party as they used to build them about the CCF in the past and I am going to remind the house of some of the fears of the past.

One, prior to 1944 they said, "If the CCF was

ever elected there will be no election after," fear number one turned to falsehood number one.

Fear number two was that they told the people of Saskatchewan, yes you people peddled this nonsense, "religious freedom will be curtailed, churches will be burned, preachers will be shot like in Russia," yes, that was their fear number two and this has now turned out to be a falsehood number two.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Would the hon. minister state what Liberal said that?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That's a fair question.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — All of them did, they did and now they are doing it. Sit down!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — But on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the minister said that some Liberal before the 1944 election made that statement, I would like to know which Liberal?

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — All Liberals.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Which one? Name one or withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! We cannot have an argument this way.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — But, Mr. Speaker, he is making some pretty broad charges, I would suggest he must withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** — He has not accused any member of this house specifically otherwise he would have to substantiate his statement.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — The Liberals said they would burn churches.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well say which one, which one said it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Will you sit down when the Speaker rises. The hon. member did not say that a specific person made these

**March 22, 1962**

statements but that they were made by the Liberal Party. If those statements are not correct then any of the opposition at a later date will have a right to refute them but we cannot have a challenge of every statement during the speech at any time.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, this is a very serious charge that this gentleman is making, and I think that every person in the province would want the minister to substantiate those charges or be gentleman enough to withdraw them. We demand a withdrawal or an apology from the minister, if he can't substantiate it. We must insist on it.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party stated that and the people of Saskatchewan know it to be true.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, that is no withdrawal and no apology, now I demand that the minister withdraw that or substantiate it and under the rules of the house I believe he must do one or the other. No Liberal has ever said that and the minister knows it full well.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You were a CCFer then you ought to know.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The rules of the house are that he must substantiate it or withdraw it but he has not submitted the name of any member of the house. He stated the Liberal Party in general. I cannot accept your point of order.

**Mr. Cameron:** — On a point of order, I would point out that the member from Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) the other day in reference to the government made slight reference to some under-the-table deal. The minister said this was casting a reflection on the government and the CCF and he had to withdraw it. The ruling was different then, Mr. Speaker, he was asked to withdraw the remarks, why is the ruling different now.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I would like to carry on . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No, Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared to let the minister proceed unless he withdraws or apologizes and we will not let him proceed.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Surely the Speaker is in charge of this house, not the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. This is a rule which we all observe.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We challenge your ruling and ask that the members be called in for a vote, because we are not prepared to let that go unchallenged.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — I suggest the vote be taken after 4 o'clock.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I do not agree to that, I ask that the vote be called right now, before the minister says another word, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Then, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw and continue.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — All right, thank you, that is all we asked.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, I have one other item that I do want to get over and that is the fears that they peddle throughout this country on freedom and democracy, now I am going to read a news report about Liberal deals exposed only lately, this reads like a deal that was very prevalent in the time of Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin and Al Capone of the American underworld. I am going to read or report from the Ottawa Journal dated March 15, 1962, headlined, 'Charge Liberal Deal.' I quote:

“Conservative M.P.s from Saskatchewan today were claiming that only two weeks before the recent defection of former CCF-NDP house leader Hazen Argue the Liberals were trying to cook up a deal with them to beat him in Assiniboia. This deal, which they contend was proposed by Saskatchewan Liberal Leader Ross Thatcher was in the form of a saw-off. The deal was this, if the Conservatives . . .”

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Sour grapes.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** —

“ . . . stayed out of Assiniboia then Liberals in a straight two-party fight, felt certain

**March 22, 1962**

they would knock off Mr. Argue. In return for this favour, the Liberals would remain out of Regina, so that in another straight two-party fight, conservative M.P. Kenneth Moore would have an excellent chance of clobbering CCF-NDP Party Leader T.C. "Tommy" Douglas, who is expected to seek the nomination in the Saskatchewan capital.

Mr. Thatcher was said to have approached two or three senior executives in western Conservative Party circles — and got no answer. Saskatchewan M.P.s insisted that Mr. Thatcher then dispatched at least two emissaries to Ottawa to try the "hard sell" on this saw-off at Conservative headquarters in Ottawa.

The go-between 'insisted' on an answer, but again there was no response, for, as it was explained in the Journal, in these kind of special circumstances you never reply, you just let the people who want to make a deal stew in their own uncertainties and difficulties.

Prairie Conservatives fully expected sharp denial from Mr. Thatcher, but he insisted that word of this proposed deal of his was never much of a secret even among the rank and file of the three parties in Saskatchewan much less their organizational brass.

They suggested that since negotiations for this unsuccessful saw-off was general knowledge it might explain in part the difficulties with which Mr. Argue is now meeting in Assiniboia."

**Opposition Member:** — What difficulty?

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that he did have extreme difficulty in Assiniboia. They had to send the Leader of the Opposition down to muzzle the young Liberals. Mr. Speaker, he returned to Regina and reported his problems to his caucus. They sent out the ex-leader of the opposition the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald).



He went down to muzzle the young Liberals, and he was more successful.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against the amendment and for the motion.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not want to interrupt the hon. member but I just wanted to tell the house that I never had a more enjoyable meeting in my life.

**Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education):** — This is the first time that I have had an opportunity of rising in this debate and I am looking forward to participating.

In watching the general line of debate, one is always impressed with the calibre of the speakers and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people on this side of the house listen most attentively when Mr. Cameron from Maple Creek speaks or when Mr. Barrie speaks or when the hon. member from Humboldt speaks. In this particular debate there has been a new face show up and this is the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) who we think has done a first class job, especially on the debate in respect to the veterinary college. We were much impressed by this particular debate. Here was a man who knew his agriculture, but sees dark and sinister plots in every move of the government. In terms of ability there was no question at all in our minds that he has effectively displaced the member for Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) as being their agricultural critic, and it is the type of debate we like and we would certainly like to hear more of them.

I would like to compliment you Sir, having achieved your present office, and I think by and large you have conducted yourself in an impartial manner despite some of the charges and shouts that you have just been listening to. By and large I also believe that most members of the legislature are well satisfied.

I would also like to compliment the member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) in achieving his seat. We were delighted when it finally became a two-party fight, Mr. Speaker, because this effectively shows that there really is no basic difference between the old line parties.

**March 22, 1962**

Now of course when you push this argument to the members of the opposition and to other members representing other parties, they claim that the reason that there was a two-party fight is because the other parties didn't have a chance, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that they haven't got a chance because there isn't sufficient difference to allow the electors to figure out which one to go for. I firmly believe that an arrangement has been entered into so that there would be no Conservative candidate show up in the Weyburn by-election and I will be most interested to notice whether a Conservative candidate will show up in Assiniboia.

Now in listening to the debate, the other thing that impressed me is that the opposition is particularly concerned with the trying to establish themselves as a private enterprise party. They claim that through private enterprise they can lead the way to a better type of economy. They claim it is the only way that freedom can be obtained and I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that they don't know what they stand for. As you listen to their debates you hear of varying number of points of view brought forward. I notice for instance that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has cautioned his members lest they should get too far to the left, and this is the time that they should not move in this direction.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken in this debate.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — I notice, Mr. Speaker, that other members are suggesting that the CCF and NDP people are only really Liberals in a hurry, and there is really no basic difference and this is an argument that is used over and over again. The latest statement I have here is from Walter Gordon who is certainly one of the their most able spokesmen, this appears in the Regina Leader-Post of March 20th. Mr. Gordon claims that they are neither left or right that they are somewhere in the middle. He claims they are looking for what he describes "forward-looking policies," whatever they are.

Now into this milieu you throw in Hazen Argue who as far as I know has never withdrawn his philosophy of socialism, at least I have never seen a statement of this. He claims only that the Liberals are a group into which he can fit. I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that these people representing the Liberal Party are a mixed bag without any real sound philosophy, and that they

are attempting to sell a bill of goods to the ordinary person in Saskatchewan, and I am going to demonstrate to you why first of all they represent neither private enterprise and freedom and secondly in their opposition to the budget how they demonstrate this point of view.

I myself am prepared to support the budget because this represents a positive involvement of government in economic questions. These gentlemen are obviously in favour of private enterprise and therefore should reject this type of participation of government. I will also support the budget and I will develop arguments on this line, that it is a positive budget in respect to education. It represents by far the best type of a budget that we could devise under the circumstances and provide the argument which will support the point of view that it is a projection into the future, and will demonstrate quite clearly, I think, that in future, governments must be involved farther in economic planning and in the regulation of our economy rather than to withdraw from it.

Before I leave this one particular subject I notice under March 17 of the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix on the editorial page a statement attributed to Mr. T.O. Peterson, chairman and president of Investors Syndicate of Canada, who claims that Canada has already moved one-third of the way towards socialism, and he claims, I quote:

“Nothing less than the entire fabric of the Canadian society is at stake in the drift toward socialism. The irony of this drift is that it is going ahead under a government dedicated to defend free enterprise and is almost unnoticed by the public.”

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that even though these gentlemen here try to maintain that they stand for private enterprise in the real truth private enterprise only exists in two areas, (a) the small business man, (b) the farmer; and the bulk of the control in our economy is no longer private nor is it in the field of private enterprise but within the hands of the modern corporation. I can also demonstrate that the real control of this political party, the Liberal Party, is in the hands of these corporations. One gentleman whom I am sure they will all know a Mr. D.K. McTavish, but perhaps some of the members opposite don't recall the name of Mr. D.K. McTavish.

**March 22, 1962**

He was the president of the national Liberal Party from 1958 to 1960 and I notice in an issue of McLeans . . .

**Opposition Member:** — Tory paper.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — That's a hilarious statement. . . . dated October 12, 1957, Mr. D.K. McTavish was listed as one of the hundred of Canada's richest men, and he served on the number of boards of directors who controlled a total volume of assets worth \$4,427,000,000. No man can convince me that when you have the president of The National Liberal Association involved in this kind of business structure that these people are really going to speak for the ordinary citizen. If you go to the person who is president of our organization, who do you find? You find an ordinary man in Saskatoon who is a small business man and in the real estate business and you go to our national president, who do you find? An ordinary citizen, associated with a university and as a teacher. There I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is one important difference between the orientation of the one party and the other.

If you want to go a little farther in this, Mr. Speaker, let us go directly to the people that are in politics, and the ones that have been in politics in the Liberal Party on the national level. I have here the directory of Directors of Canada, and any one of you gentlemen can read it. I notice Robert Henry Winters, who was formerly Minister of Mines, who at the time of his holding of that office as an elected representative of the common man, the ordinary citizen, that the Liberals are supposed to speak in favour of, served on 13 directorships, and these companies controlled \$4,167,000,000. Another gentleman who I knew, a man whose intellect and mind I respected, and a man with whom you tangled at your own risk, the late Hon. Clarence D. Howe, who members will remember very well served as Minister of Trade and Commerce, served on 16 corporations and the total assets controlled by these corporations amounted to \$6,394,000,000.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Don't you wish you could get some of these corporations in Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Now we start to prick the hide of the Leader of the Opposition and he starts to howl. Here you have the final proof, that

fundamentally the Liberal Party must in the final analysis reflect the opinions of the people that control them and in the final analysis they must stand up for policies that are favourable to those people and this only makes political common sense.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We would like some in Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — And in exactly the same sort of a way we stand up for and represent the ordinary people.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You kicked them out.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — We don't have hundreds of millions of dollars or billions of dollars behind the people that sit in these chairs. We don't have hundreds of millions of dollars behind the people that make up our organization, we have to finance our organization on the basis of ordinary memberships and through sweat and hard work.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Oh, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker!

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — And I suggest to you that in the final analysis the people of Canada will not be deceived.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — What about Mr. Fines?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Now then, let us go just a little bit farther in this question of economic control. If you go to the petroleum and the mining smelting refining industry in Canada and I have here a source from Brecker & Reisman, Canada and United States Economic Relations, page 110, you will find that the proportion of net value accounted for by the six largest firms read off as follows. In crude production you have 68%, in refining you have 93%, in the nickel and the mining-smelting refining area the nickel-copper you have the six largest firms accounting for 100%, in lead-zinc 86%, in iron-ore 100%, in aluminium 100% and there is only one corporation in that. What I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, is that due to the structure of the modern corporation you have here the real power in our Canadian nation.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Don't you want them in Saskatchewan?

**March 22, 1962**

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — And if you look toward the political parties that represents this real power you will not find people like ourselves, you will find the people that are sitting on your left.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Thanks for the compliment.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Now then, there are some organizations that are concerned with this and not all of them are political. This is a little brochure called the Co-op Concept, dated January-February 1962 and represents the co-op point of view. Here you see in all of Canada three firms produce 92% of all the breakfast food, three firms produce 80% of all the cars, three firms produce 90% of the soap, four firms process 75% of all the output of packing plants and I will return to packing plants later on. What I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, is the real power, the real control of our economy is not in the hands of the private enterprise, the real control lies in the hands of the people that control the destiny of these large corporations and everybody knows this to be true.

Over the long period of our history, since the time of the age of iron and steel there has been a slow evolution through merger, through elimination by competition, till one by one, the individual enterprises have dropped out or been absorbed. This is the only way it could be, Mr. Speaker, because if you have a group of individuals all operating as private enterprise and if they are in a certain economic area, by definition they can't all be winners. It is just the same, Mr. Speaker, lining up a group of people at a Sunday school picnic and having a race. This is private enterprise at its best; each man, depending on his own skill and ability, can run the race and in those terms, and how many winners will you have? Mr. Speaker, given enough time to run the race you will only have one or you may have two. By definition, Mr. Speaker, private enterprise does not regenerate itself in certain fields of activity. This can only lead finally to mergers between one and another and all you have to do is think back on the development in Canada and other parts of the world and you know this to be true.

Now then, these are the economic facts of life.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Ohhhh . . . Oh . . . Oh!

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — And this is the truth, that the major control of our economy is in the hands of these types of corporations, and into this, people like myself must fit. Now, Mr. Speaker, I represent a private enterprise type, because I am a farmer. I control my own farm the same as a small business man controls his enterprise, I have to borrow the capital to put into that enterprise, I have to supply whatever level of management I am capable of supplying. I have to hire the labour and put in and if there is any profit left over I can take it. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to look across the spectrum, across the economic horizon today and you will see the two groups that are in real difficulty are the small business man and the farmer, because working as individuals we simply cannot compete with an economic power that we are face to face with. One of the great things that has happened in Saskatchewan is that the farmers themselves finally realized it and set about to correct it by two methods.

They realized that as individuals that they are helpless in front of this type of economic power and so they have systemically over the years attempted to build larger and stronger co-operatives. The other thing that they have attempted to do is build the type of political party that will give them the necessary legislation that they will have to have in order to make these co-operatives work.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That's the Liberal Party is it?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Ah! I have something to say about this, yes let's take a look at marketing boards. This party stands firm on the principle that bargaining and bargaining powers must be finally put in the hands of these farmers and there are two ways it can be done, in which the producer retains control.

One is through the co-operatives; the other is through a producer's marketing board. We stand firm on the policy that we will do all that we can to provide the legislation required so that the producers can go together and effect bargaining powers so that they can bargain for better price in the market.

Before I go farther in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the members of the press. I think they have a particularly difficult job to do because they have to listen day after day to the speeches

**March 22, 1962**

that are uttered in this house, whether they are good or not good — they have no choice. They have the difficult job of making all the speeches we make sound to be redundant, ridiculous, naive and they have the more difficult job of making all the speeches from the left sound as if they were pearls of wisdom. I sympathize with the members of the press.

Now some of the speeches that are made by members opposite are excellent, in my opinion, but not all of them. I just mention this and my sympathies go with the members of the press. The members of the press are employed by the press. Everybody knows that the press has a point of view and if you pick up the Leader-Post you certainly expect to have a particular point of view. It certainly won't be the point of view of the 'Commonwealth' will it? The people who control the press will determine the point of view of the press and the reporters, the people who work for the press, have no choice but to write in the way in which the people who control the press find it favourable. I can demonstrate to you.

**Mrs. Batten (Humboldt):** — May I ask the hon. member a question? Is he saying that the members of the press have no personal integrity?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — I said nothing of the kind.

**Mrs. Batten:** — You are leaving that impression.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — I did not leave that impression. I said that the members of the press are working for a paper which has a point of view and if they wish to continue to work for that paper they have to reflect that point of view.

**Mrs. Batten:** — That is not true.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — And I can demonstrate. Let us take the case of Hazen Argue. For 16 years the members of the press, representing a particular point of view that wasn't favourable to Hazen Argue, had to attack him vigorously and belligerently. Now over night he has become one of the members of the Liberal Party. Now these members of the press have no other recourse but to write articles that are favourable to Hazen Argue, regardless of how they feel individually.

Now, there may be some members of the press that



feel perfectly in accord with the point of view expressed by that particular paper, in fact I would be surprised if they did other than that. But there may be other people who find their articles blue-pencilled by editors and I don't think there is any argument about this whatsoever. The only way a press man can be really free is that he must become a free lancer and take his own chances.

Over the long period of time in Saskatchewan the continuous attacks of the press that are not favourable to the point of view expressed by this government, the continuous type of advice they give, has forced us as a party to go back to the country and make sure we get our point our view across to the individual voter face to face. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the press maintains its position and continues its attacks because it is a good thing for us. It makes us make sure that we are on the right track in terms of developing policies. It makes us stay close to the ordinary citizen. I hope sincerely, and I see no reason why this shouldn't continue, that we simply are pushed into the position where we are not able to rely on anybody else but ourselves. It is only in this way, by working closely with private citizens in the country, that we can develop the type of party and the type of a philosophy that is required.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question. As Minister of Education are these ideas being taught to our children in our schools in Saskatchewan today?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — The Minister of Education has no jurisdiction over what the teachers are teaching in respect to the functionings of these particular people. It is up to the teacher himself. I have expressed here a personal opinion and in my conversation with members of the press I find that substantially the things that I have said are borne out.

Now let's take another paper. Here we have The Western Producer. This is a co-operative type of paper, this reflects the co-operative point of view, you wouldn't dream of having a person on this press writing glowing editorials for Canada Packers would you? And this is essentially my point, the people that work here are going to reflect this point of view. Here you have the co-op concept and the people here are going to work closely to a co-operative point of view.

Here you have something a little different;

**March 22, 1962**

this is The Financial Post, you don't see the same sort of thing here. Here you see an article about "What they do about taxing the big co-operatives," and the person that wrote this naturally reflected the point of view of that paper, and when you read this you find that organizations such as the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool are held out to be a threat to private enterprise, that these co-operatives are taking unfair advantage of tax laws; this is the way this article was written. It is written around a particular point of view and the co-operatives of course through their press will attempt their point of view. As a consequence we must present our point of view in a clear, able manner a face to face manner with the ordinary member in the country and here is where our real strength lies and it is here I hope we stay.

I have just one more thing to say about the concentration of economic power and the association with the Liberal Party. I have here the annual report that just came across my desk and I am sure that the hon. members have received it — Annual Report 1961, Dominion Tar and Chemical, I notice that this particular year there has been another merger and Dominion Tar and Chemical have merged with Howard Smith Paper Mills and Lawrence Corporation Limited. I mention this to show that there is no stopping merging under our present type of economy. There is some concern with it, but the same evolution toward more and more economic power in the hands of fewer and fewer people continues. The merger took place between three corporations the final assets were \$385 million. If you review the operations you can understand why this had happened and you will also see that they made a profit last year of \$55 million, or 17.5% of the sales.

**Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — After taxes.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — No, no this is before taxes, and if you take their operation after all taxes have been paid in terms of the profit to the shareholder, you find that you end up with \$187,799,000. Yes, but when you find out these people have gone together to make a larger corporation to control the market somewhat more in their favour and when you break down this figure of \$18 million the important question is who gets it? If this was a co-operative this \$18 million would have gone to the people who had helped build this organization. But of course these people pay the profits to

the people that invest in shares. I find that the shares are valued at about \$8 a piece. If you break this down you find that it is \$1.29 per common share on a value of \$8 per share with a profit of around 12½%, which isn't too bad.

The real bonanza is in Canada Packers once again. Once against this corporation has returned its profit of \$4.4 million against an authorized capital of \$1.4 million. One point two million shares valued at about \$1 a piece. If you go through this, this gives any person that still retains the shares that they may have bought at that value, a return of 400%.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You know better than that.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — No, this is true.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Oh no, this is true, it is right here and if the hon. members will take this they can find it out for themselves.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — What are the total assets of that institution?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Ah! But the profits, Mr. Speaker, you don't return profits on the basis of total assets, these profits are returned to the people that own the shares. Now then, just let me finish this argument.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Childish!

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — I checked with the stock and bond companies today to see how many shares are being handled and how many are being sold and it is true that some of them are being traded at \$55. Last year there was a dividend of \$1.87 and on that basis, I would get a very small return, but how many shares were traded? That is the point. And we find here during January . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Did you ever hear anything so childish in your life?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — . . . 596 shares have traded of A and 3,800 B and the total number of shares is 1.2 million. Any of those people who were able to buy those shares at the initial price and still retain them, and you know that this

**March 22, 1962**

becomes assets within families, can pass them one to another. This becomes this “blue chip stock” that we hear about. It is these people that have made their 400%. Now I hear these members scoffing, Mr. Speaker, but if it is so rosy as these people would have us believe, why then was Canada Packers up before the courts. Let’s hear about that one.

**Mrs. Batten:** — You tell us.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — And here we have . . . I certainly shall tell you, the excerpts from restrictive trade practices of the commission report.

**Mrs. Batten:** — It’s bad enough when he reads it correctly, but when he reads excerpts its worse.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Any member can get this if he wishes, and all he has to do is read it, and you will see here not only did the courts decide that Canada Packers was getting too powerful, which as I have described is a natural tendency under existing economic policies, but the courts also decided that they should be broken up. Some of the evidence is particularly interesting, and I mention this to show how an ordinary private enterpriser like myself when I go to sell my hogs or sell my beef, why I haven’t got a chance and anybody that stands up in the face of economic reality and tries to tell me that I as an individual can sell by myself to my best advantage is just imply whistling through their teeth.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — What about your co-op marketing?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — I have here some of the evidence that was tabled before this hearing, on page 189 the importance of Canada Packers attached to the maintenance of list price, prices of shortening, June 25, 1917, this is a letter that was tabled between Mr. McLean and Mr. Lazby, whoever Mr. Lazby is. This is the correspondence:

“Recently one of our plants decided that as a result of a special local situation to lower the price of “Snowflake” without first clearing with Toronto. For a few days it looked as though it might lead to a general

reduction of shortening prices right across the country, fortunately it didn't happen. To avoid such risks in the future it has decided that no plant may lower or raise shortening or margarine prices without first clearing through me.”

This is the letter by Mr. McLean.

Now what this demonstrates quite clearly is that an ordinary housewife has literally no bargaining power at all and the person that is going to determine whether prices of shortening go up or down will be the people who are in the manufacturing of shortening and this is a very few companies.

Let's go to the hog side of the picture. Here we have January 13, 1953, Mr. S.F. McDougall one of the plant managers to Mr. S.J. McLean, and this is a quotation from a letter that was tabled before the courts:

“We are buying our truck hogs at \$20.75 basis A Grade but this is only a small percentage of total receipts. Our country connections are based on Calgary and Edmonton markets. Due to extremely cold weather, 25 below today, receipts are light both in Edmonton and Calgary, hogs sold at \$23.75 yesterday. We are working with competitors to divert some of our regular connections to the stockyards to try to get Calgary and Edmonton markets down to the floor.”

If you really believe in a private enterprise economy, then you would say that this is exactly the sort of thing that you should oppose, but I have never heard one word from these people opposite. Instead of allowing the individual farmer to get the breaks in this and take advantage of the cold weather, to allow the prices to rise so they could get a little better price, these gentlemen sit quietly by and watch the manipulations of this market — Canada Packers in this case — allowing shipments of hogs to come in to drive the price down to the floor.

Following that January 14th, this is the following letter, January 14th, 1953:

“As practically all our hogs . . .

**March 22, 1962**

Well don't blame me, Mr. Speaker, this is the evidence that was tabled before the courts, I am just simply quoting the evidence that was given before the courts, as they took their action to break out Willsil out of the Canada Packers combine, the Liberals were in power at that time. Our country hogs were killed in Alberta, in the Calgary and Edmonton yards.

“We have decided to divert approximately 500 expensive hogs to the stockyards which in turn have been sold to small packers.”

They didn't dare put them on the market on their own.

“This lowers temporarily the killing percentage which should help take the fire out of the market.”

The fire out of the market for whom? Well obviously not in favour of the man who is trying to sell hogs. Then the letter concludes,

“Do you agree with our action?”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to continue on that because what I have demonstrated first of all that when you talk of private enterprise in the Canadian economy there is very little of it left. Even their own people don't know where they are going. Some of them are saying that we are too far to the right. Others say that they are too far to the left, Walter Gordon says no neither, right down the middle. An individual has also said that in the last 25-30 years Canada has become one-third socialist. This is a hilarious spectacle from the people standing up claiming that they are private enterprise. In actual facts, because I have demonstrated that people who have been elected and have held the offices of federal cabinet ministers, have also held the seats on a number of giant corporations, and their own president was one of the 100 richest men in Canada.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Wouldn't you like some of those companies over here?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Not under that basis.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You wouldn't like them.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Not any company that will take unfair advantage to manipulate a market such as I just demonstrated Canada Packers can do to the detriment of the ordinary farmer. No Sir, I will tell you the kind of a company that I would like to bargain for the farmer, and that is just the co-operatives and the other one that I would like to have is the type of marketing board that is coming in spite of the delaying dragging tactics of the opposition and the giant corporations.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Even if the farmers don't want them?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — The farmers want them.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — They voted it out. They vote it out every chance they get.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — All you have to do is to take a look in Ontario right now, Mr. Speaker, and you will see that the fire is glowing in the right way.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — How about your egg marketing here and the honey marketing?

**Mr. Snedker:** — That is joust one of the socialist monopolies.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Now then, Mr. Speaker, I support this budget on the first point, representing an active projection of government in regulating and balancing the economy.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It didn't balance but it regulated.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, because these people, by their own political connections and by their own admissions and their failure to take action, have demonstrated they are opposed to the budget and I suggest to you that they are fundamentally opposed to the last two private enterprise groups that exist, the small farmer, the ordinary farmer and the small business man, and they are more in favour of corporation such as Canada Packers — I have just read you the evidence — they are more in favour of the giant corporation who can manipulate markets. The member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) said they are in favour of planning and the planning is for the corporations,

**March 22, 1962**

that can control the economy. There is only one other point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen have been talking about private enterprise, and during their long political career in Canada, they have also developed a number of federal crown corporations. These crown corporations, some of them, have been excellent and they should be complimented for it. The CBC is one of them, the TCA is a better one. In some areas, Mr. Speaker, there is only room for one corporation and the evolution toward monopoly in some cases is inevitable.

**Mr. Snedker:** — You think there is only one party.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You're destroying the party.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Oh no, I am not. I am not. If the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) will just listen. There are advantages, Mr. Speaker, economic advantages by having more economic power and because these are advantages to monopolies, I am suggesting to you that these ought not to be left in private hands and where monopolies emerge, they should be in the control of the public.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — And if you want to check back, Mr. Speaker, you will find that in Canada as of 1960, we had federal crown corporations with total assets of \$10,579,000,000 with a monthly payroll of \$49 million.

**Mr. Snedker:** — They didn't go broke like the shoe factory.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Ah yes, now here we have a gentleman eating his words, private enterprise on the one hand and in favour of crown corporations on the other. This is the same old pattern, Mr. Speaker. "I am for the right, I am for the left, I am down the middle; we are for forward looking policies and all the time we're looking back."

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Where do you stand?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!



**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Forward looking, backward looking party, this is it. I have one thing here, this is the last thing that I have from the Liberal press. “The Liberals have the answer,” it is called, perhaps some of you gentlemen opposite haven’t seen it. This is one on Canadian unity and this is a lulu. How are you going to further the cause of Canadian unity? Well I will tell you how they are going to do it, by reading this to you. This author, whoever he is, says,

“A new Liberal government will, if the provinces wish, withdraw from programs that are firmly established through the country. What do you think of that?”

They will withdraw from programs that are firmly established. In withdrawing, Ottawa will compensate the provinces of its share of the costs by lowering its own direct taxes and increasing equalization payments.”

This is in contradiction, Mr. Speaker, to many of the opposition members who now hold office, who I have heard time after time stand up and say that they are not in favour of withdrawing from programs, they want a stronger type of federal government. A type of government that can make up for area differences and I agree with them.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That’s exactly what I said.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — But this is not what this says. No, no, they are going to withdraw, they are not going to stay involved in federal policies. Mr. Speaker, they don’t even know their own literature.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You can’t understand it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — You can’t understand what you read.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — This is some more of this forward, backward, rightward, leftward type of co-operation. I would advise some of the members opposite to get this brochure and read it because this does nothing towards establishing a stronger Canada.

**March 22, 1962**

What this finally does is Balkanize Canada — it breaks it up into provincial areas so that the ones that have the largest population and the greatest amount of economic advantages will finally emerge as the strongest. This does not build greater Canadian unity; this is the same forward-backward looking policy that they are so famous for.

**Mr. Coderre:** — What are you talking about? Just what are you hoping?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — No, I am reading their own document, Mr. Speaker, it isn't mine.

Now the second point upon which I would like to support the budget is because of the type of support it gives the education system as a whole, and I would like to deal with the question of teacher supply. During the war years as members will well remember there was a time when there was a great shortage of teachers in this province. The same as other provinces, we had to make special concessions in order that the children would have a teacher provided, which may not have been the best in all cases, but we provided teachers to all schools so that no child would be deprived of education.

Over the time that has elapsed since the war, both by co-operation with boards of trustees and with the teachers, we have effectively built up the number of people that are becoming teachers, and at present we have 650 students enrolled in Teachers College in Saskatoon, I am sorry we have 1,181 at the Teachers Colleges in Regina and Saskatoon, and we have 968 attending the College of Education, for a total of 2,149 in training. This represents an increase of 121 per cent in 6 years, and I think the trustees and the universities and the Teachers College should be complimented in the excellent work in which they are doing.

I think it reflects a number of facts. One is that there is a greater degree of security in the teaching profession. There is a growing awareness in society generally, that we must increase the standing of teachers and I am sure all members here regardless of which side of the house they sit, would agree that this level must be further increased. This of course will also call for better salaries. In order that this can be met both in terms of facilities and levels of salaries, the first thing

that had to be done was to establish a better base and this has proven to be the school unit.

For awhile we had a considerable block of teachers that were teaching on Letters of Authority, and members will recall here, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, what this is. Over a period of years since the war we have steadily reduced the amount of teachers that are on Letters of Authority. We now have in 1961, 52 per cent of our teachers that have two years training or more beyond Grade XII, and this is a record of which Saskatchewan can be justifiably proud, because we have a greater percentage of our teachers in classrooms now with Grade XII or two more years of training, than any other province in the Dominion of Canada.

Further to this, in the whole question of teacher training, we are going to attempt this next fall, a minimum period of two years of training. This means we have to enter into negotiations with the university, and Teachers College. If we can we will start this program at one centre, and it will be developed between university and Teachers College in a close relationship rather than being the relationship that we have had in the past. We still have, of course, a scarcity of teachers. We have not the supply we should have.

The other thing that disturbs me, and I am sure it disturbs all other members of the house, is the rate of growth of our school system. Part of this has been reflected in the numbers of children that were born following the war years. This is sometimes referred to as the "baby boom" after the war. This puts tremendous stress on elementary schools. This wave of students is now moving through the latter part of the high school stages and into the universities. This is why the university now is in the position of, having completed their fine development at Saskatoon, looking forward to developing new facilities here on the Regina campus.

There were some statements made about levels of high school salaries of teachers, and there were some statements made in respect to the number of teachers leaving the province and those returning to the province. The answers to the latter I tabled during the Public Accounts Committee and I won't repeat it here. However, I have some information here, that our average high school salary during 1960-61 was \$5,687 or the third highest in Canada, and I think this is rather a terrific record.

**March 22, 1962**

Now one program that I have not discussed at all at this point in connection with developing better teachers and allowing more people to enroll at Teachers College is the policy of student loans, and I am only going to refer to the aid provided by the Student Loan Fund toward those who are going to take education. Incidentally if you take the whole block of money that has been loaned, and members will recall that this program has been in existence for 13 years, Mr. Speaker, we had 10 thousand students at the end of March 1962, who have been assisted by loans totalling approximately \$3 million. This is the type of a program, Mr. Speaker, in which the government should be involved. I firmly do believe there should be more of this type of program. A thing that has always disturbed me is when it comes to taking military training, and those on both sides of the house that took it, will recall, I am sure, that there is never any lack of money for this type of an operation. If we can train our young people and give them not only training in military arms, commando training the same as I have had and some of you have had, if you can also give them training in the sciences and physics and chemistry, and not only provide them with the training, but pay them while they are going there, and give them living allowances, then I think this is the direction in which the nation as a whole should think of moving if we are going to resolve the problem of growing numbers of people who are not able to find the type employment in future.

Part of this is in the technological displacement. I discussed at some length, Mr. Speaker, the question of centralization, and in financial terms, and while this has been going on, another thing has been introduced that is not shown by reading financial reports, and that is the effects of automation, but maybe some of you are not quite so familiar with the effect it has on the number of people a given industry employees. I read the other day that President Kennedy expects one million young people in that great country, between the ages of 16 and 26, who will never have been gainfully employed for any permanent length of time, and inside of 10 years they estimate this block of people will be up to 7.5 million.

We are in a similar position in Canada, and I believe that it is going to require all the energy both senior governments, both federal and provincial governments, can muster in order that our people can be well trained and established in society rather than be rejected by it. The Student Loan Fund that we have is a small beginning in this direction. It is not large enough, it simply starts

to nibble at the problem. At one time, Mr. Speaker, we thought that education was like a railroad train and that everybody went in the same direction. You started in a primary grade and you ran as far down the track as you could go, and depending on your own ability you got to the end or you did not; you fell off. Statistics now show that for every 100 students who are enrolled in Grade II, 94 of them have stopped going to school by the time Grade XII is finished. Of the 6 that start university only 1 graduates, and of the 1 that graduates, only .15 per cent take further work. This ably demonstrates, Mr. Speaker, first of all, that not all of our young people are getting the type of education that they are particularly interested in by moving toward the matriculation courses. But more than that the people that drop out are not particularly well trained to fit into the modern industrial complex, some of which is changing so quickly that we don't really know what it will be by the time these people graduate. I firmly believe we need a new approach in education to satisfy the needs of the industrial side of our economy in terms of training and mobilizing manpower and fitting people into our society, into a trade for which they have chosen and for which they are best suited.

I have something here in school grants, Mr. Speaker, that may be of interest to the house, and these break down into two main areas. I have them broken down into terms of the percentage in education of the total provincial budget, and the percentage of grants in education. Let me put this in a different way — take the provincial budget — I have it broken down to show the percentage for education in the total budget, and then of the amount budgeted for education, I break it down again so that we have the percentage that goes to grants, in other words the part that goes back to the school units, and districts.

Members will recall of course that we have \$45.4 million for education, of which \$34.4 is allocated to grants, and this does not include university grants which represents \$4.1 million for operation of the university and \$1.5 in capital. It also does not include, Mr. Speaker, the grant towards vocational training that has been entered into under the federal-provincial agreement.

We have on the drafting board at this time the vocational schools which are going to be built in Prince Alberta and in Saskatoon, and the addition in Moose Jaw

**March 22, 1962**

which will total fairly close to \$6 million. Members will recall, of course, that this is shared 25-75 between the provincial and federal governments, and this means an additional \$1.9 million should be added into the total amount of money spent on education. But leaving that amount out I find that the percentage in education in the provincial budget in Saskatchewan is 26 per cent, in Manitoba it is 30 per cent, in Alberta it is 28 per cent and in British Columbia it is 28 per cent. Here we compare unfavourably in that the total budget is not as high as other provinces. British Columbia includes the home-owner's grant in education and I found it very difficult to break this down, because members will recall that in British Columbia every person who owns a home and pays taxes on it, gets a \$50 refund on taxes, and that amount of money is lumped in the figure I have, so it is difficult to break it out.

If you compare, Mr. Speaker, the amount of money that goes back to the unit, and this is the important thing, much more important than a home-owner's grant, I suggest, then we find that in Saskatchewan 87 per cent of our total budget goes back to those who are responsible for administering schools, and this includes separate schools, school districts and this type of thing, collegiates and so forth. In Manitoba this is 91 per cent, and in Alberta it is 82 per cent, so here we are right about the middle. Alberta 82, Manitoba 91 and ourselves with 87, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we compare favourably. If you spell this out in terms of the school unit, the independent cities and towns and districts with 20 or more rooms in operation, and the independent districts in the northern areas, you will find this: 56 units get an increase this year of 6 per cent, the independent towns and cities get an increase of 18.6 per cent, the independent districts with 20 rooms or less, 5 per cent and northern areas 14 per cent, with a total increase of 8.9 per cent.

Some members who are interested in rural areas may question the percentage increase in independent towns and cities as compared with the units. I think this is only fair. The amount of money that goes into the independent towns and cities and the collegiate areas in the cities, are areas that are being stressed very, very sharply, the load is heavy and I think here, because our formula is balanced a little more favourable towards the rural areas, that in this particular instance it is only fair that we allow them a certain larger

percentage increase to urban areas.

Now I don't have any individual responsibility in determining how the grant operates after the formula is established, the formula has resulted this year in amounts so that the independent towns and cities actually are in the position to show a larger percentage gain than the rural areas. The amount of money is \$1.3 million for the unit and \$1.4 million for the cities and towns of 20 rooms or more, \$100,000 for the independent district and \$66 thousand for the northern areas, for a total of \$2.8 million, which is the amount that is discussed from time to time.

Now while we are discussing grants I would like to just mention one other thing. Members will recall, I am sure, that this government was instrumental in devising equalization grant structure. This essentially means, Mr. Speaker, that those areas which have a high assessment and a low population are not in the position to gather as much money in terms of grants than an area that has a low assessment of low earning capacity, and a higher population. The effect of this is if you select an area, a school unit that has land of low population and break it out to find what their grant is in terms of mill rate, because this is what is going to interest our farming people, you find that the one school unit earns a grant equivalent to 8.6 mills, and if you go to the other end of this spectrum you will find a unit that has the lowest assessment per teacher, per teacher equivalent, has a grant equivalent to 83 mills, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, this is in keeping with our philosophy, that areas that are better off and can afford more, can equalize and share to assist those areas that are, through no fault of their own, in an area where their school costs are high and their assessment is low.

I have two cities here. We have one city with the highest assessment per teacher, and it has a grant equivalent in mills of 15.3, and we have another city here, with the lowest assessment per teacher, and the grant is equivalent to 43.6 mills, I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that all members, would be interested in supporting this budget, due to the nature of the equalization formula and the amount of relief that we can affect the tax payers. This is a sound policy and leads to a good solid educational budget.

Some members, Mr. Speaker, may be interested in what is happening in terms of increasing mill rates, and

**March 22, 1962**

where if they are occurring. I don't have the latest up-to-date information but I do have a table dated May 26, 1961. I recognize that this is for last year and there will be new mill rates imposed for this year. Of this particular year, and this is only applicable to the units, I don't have it for the independent towns and cities; in this one, I find there is some increase in the average, of 2 mills, with a high of 35 in total, as I read it, at this particular period of time, and they were increasing by 2 which would make 37, and there are 18 units that represent some increase of one or two mills on an average. One unit went down by one mill and 34 remained the same. Three are not listed.

In spite of the very difficult times our farming people are undergoing, it does not reflect an impossibly structure of taxes in terms of schools and if you check this with the rate at which taxes are being collected, you will be agreeably surprised to learn that tax collections this year are up slightly from what they were last year. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised. I would not have been surprised if they were down slightly from last year, because we know the type of stress our agricultural people are in.

I have some other item here that I would like to mention. Two other items. One has to do with the cost of education in the future, the other has to do with whether or not education should continue as a public enterprise, or whether private enterprise should share some of the responsibilities. At present members are well aware of the fact that corporations do share in educational costs, generally in foundations, or as Imperial Oil has just done, in awards to students who are graduating from Grade XII with a 70 per cent or beyond average, providing of course they are employees of Imperial Oil. I think members would be interested in noticing that in the total educational costs, private capital contributes 12 per cent across the nation, mostly in the form of building capital.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Don't they pay taxes?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — No this is not taxes.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Private enterprise pays taxes, don't they?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — I am not talking about taxes, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about



a direct contribution towards the cost of education in the forms of grants towards building buildings, in terms of scholarships, or this sort of thing.

I do believe that the time is coming, Mr. Speaker, when educational process is going to have move a little closer towards industry, and the opinions of industry are going to have to be listened to in terms of education. I am not suggesting this will be done in terms of matriculation courses and university courses. I think by and large universities must be kept entirely free of and independent of any type of pressures or coercion, and any monies that are offered towards a university whether they come from private citizens or corporations or governments, must be offered in that spirit, because the university in the final analysis is a collection of ideas and is a fragile thing and can only exist on these terms.

But when it comes to the question of training this 96 per cent of the people that never gets to the university, I suggest to you it is time for us to take a new look at how we are training these people, what lines of endeavour they should be trained in, and whether or not we might have industry enter into a new relationship in sharing costs in terms of in-service training or training for a specific job and fitting the student into a particular line of employment. This is being done in other parts of the world. Sweden, I think, has done a tremendous job in this. Japan has done a tremendous job in this. Europe generally has done this, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, there are some pretty thorny questions involved in this and it will take a good deal of common sense on the part of all of us to feel our way through it. Not only are there questions involved in terms of minority groups, and religious questions, but there are also questions of provincial right, and these questions, which are traditional ones with us, are going to have to be thought through carefully in terms of the whole question of mobilizing and training manpower.

I know that by and large we have thought of education as a public enterprise, it should be maintained by and large as a public enterprise, but a new relationship with industry in terms of training manpower, locating manpower, from a national point of view, I think could be developed, I would like to see a further projection of the relationship that has been developed on the federal-provincial agreement, where the federal government has

**March 22, 1962**

recognized 75 per cent of the cost of the plant, and is spending something as I recall of around \$180 million. Instead of terminating this agreement, and in fact I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that they can't be terminated at March 31, 1963, because after the plant is build, then there is going to be the question of what you are going to do with it. How are they going to be trained, and where are they going to find employment in the nation, I suggest to you that this question of training is going to have to be put in the whole scope of being in the national interest, the same as it is in Europe, in the Scandinavian countries, in Britain and in Japan.

The kind of a thing that we don't want, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of thing that is demonstrated here by "the education of industry" as it is called. This is the "A.B.C." of industry as some people have referred to. While it looks like the inoffensive type of thing, you who have seen it may have been somewhat startled to notice that B instead of standing for ball, stands for bank, and it reads like this, "B is for bank, you will find as you grow, your neighborhood banker is a good man to know." Well, I have always found my banker is a good man to know. In terms of the capital for my farm, I am no different from the average individual here I suspect, I have to go to my banker and arrange for my short term credit, and argue about the notes, the same as the rest of you do. I question very much however whether it is good education policy to put this in this form. We also see C is for crush — this is Orange Crush. "C is for Crush so full of zest, it is refreshing, delicious and by far the best, you will know how good a soft drink can be, when your friends will say, have a Crush on me." And so on, Mr. Speaker, and here, "G is for General Motors, who by near and far, built for all Canadians the Valiant car."

**Mr. Klein:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Is that pamphlet you are referring to sent to all the schools? If so under whose authority?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Any educational material, and this, classed as educational material, can be sent to schools, and it is not released or censured or passed on by the department. It is sent directly to schools, and it is the responsibility of teachers, and this is generally done by the principal, to determine whether or not he would wish to use this material.

Let me explain, Mr. Speaker, a group of people came to me wanting to sell a fire-proof medallion upon which the name and the identification of the child could be printed, and this would be hung around the child's neck so that in the event of an atom bomb attack and the school obliterated this medallion would withstand the severe temperature. You would know where the child had once been presumably. They wanted authority from me to release this to all the schools, and I had to tell these people that I had no jurisdiction in this whatsoever. It is up to individual school boards as to whether or not they want to have this type of thing released in their schools, and this is in exactly the same category, Mr. Speaker, I deplore these tactics. I would urge the teachers to use their good common sense on these matters and I use it as a demonstration of the type of thing you would have to guard against by getting private groups involved in the educational business.

The thing that interested me in this in particular, Mr. Speaker, was an article by J.W. Sheriden. Mr. Sheriden apparently is or was assistant general manager to the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. This is called "Free enterprise is our greatest heritage" and "It all depends on you." Well this is all very well, I suppose he is entitled to his opinion. I question very much if he should have the right to foist it on the school children. Here you have the concluding paragraph which says:

"This ends the story of freedom in enterprise."

This after he had gone through the process of how we built this great nation on individual enterprise where the young boy who gets up early in the morning, gets on the paper route, peddles the bike, demonstrates great energy, is the man who is going to succeed. The Horatio Alger type of a myth. It no longer applies to modern society. The real control and development of society is not in the hands of such individuals.

**Mrs. Batten:** — . . . man . . . social welfare?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — No, oh no, Mr. Speaker, the man who is ambitious and energetic may rise in a corporation, but he will not develop as an individual — it will be the corporation that will determine the how and when, and when it will move the terms of economic policy.

**March 22, 1962**

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Put him on social aid.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Mr. Speaker, this is a plain and simple fact. I can remember, Mr. Speaker, when I was serving — I see members shaking their heads. I have been in situations, Mr. Speaker, when I served on the farmers' union when I was arguing with both the Liberal and Tory governments, to try and get a better deal for the farmer in terms of pricing, and do you know who laid down the policy for prices, Mr. Speaker? It wasn't the farmers, no it was the trade, Mr. Speaker, that determined what the level for prices and the level for support, and I know what I am talking about because I was there.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Garden . . .

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Not at all, I can demonstrate again, Mr. Speaker, I can remember being in a discussion with the former Prime Minister of Canada, Hon. Louis St. Laurent, and we talked about the Hudson Bay Railroad, and all members here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, know what the benefits are to Saskatchewan people to increase the use of the Hudson Bay Railroad and to increase the port. Do you know how the argument finally was settled, Mr. Speaker? Mr. St. Laurent stood up and he said, "Mr. Turnbull, I want you to know that the transportation of this nation is based on an east-west haul and I am not going to do a damn thing about it to change it." That is what he said.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Prove it.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — That is true. These men can't stand the truth, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Get to the point.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — The point that I was making here is that I question very much whether this type of thing should be launched and foisted on school children. He talks about how those who have worked the hardest and made the most extensive use of their abilities have received their reward. "Under some kind of economic systems this kind of progress simply could not happen," and so on and so on and he outlined the dangers of socialism. Well this is all very well, I don't

object to this, but the point of view he presents is that everything that points to the view of democratic socialism or socialism or communism is all in the same bag and evil.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — I will have more to say to this gentleman. That everything that points to private enterprise is good. Now then, you and I know, Mr. Speaker, that this is simply not a fact of life. There is never any situation that contains all the virtue and another situation that contains all the vice. Everybody knows there are dangers in communism and Marxism which we all deplore, but there are also dangers to be found in the use of democratic government, there are dangers to be found in the use of industry and education, and if you look at the private enterprise system you will find there are dangers here, and let us take a look at this. I see my friend Mr. Klein shaking his head.

**Mr. Klein:** — I guess . . . you won't fool around with the curriculum . . .

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Mr. Speaker, this gentleman operates under a curriculum set by the department.

**Mr. Klein:** — I don't want you to fool around with it either.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — If the curriculum is going to be changed at all, it will be changed to strengthen the hands of the teacher, to provide for more freedom of the teacher, to use the full intelligence of the teacher, and to get away from the bigotry and the narrowness that some people display in this house.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — No, let me read this. By way of demonstrating, Mr. Speaker, I am not presenting only my own views. No, I have here a book, Mr. Speaker, called "Man's Disorder and God's Design" and this book is a summary of . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — . . . religion . . .

**March 22, 1962**

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — . . . the minutes taken at the Amsterdam Council of Churches, and if the members are interested you can turn here to page 194 and read this:

“The church should make it clear that there is a conflict between Christianity and capitalism. The development of capitalism varies from country to country and often exploitation of workers that was characteristic in early capitalism has been corrected, in a considerable measure by the influence of trade unions.”

Capitalism tends to subordinate what should be the primary task of any economy, that is meeting human needs, to the economic advantages of those who hold the most power over its institutions. Now let me see these members shake their heads over this one, Mr. Speaker. These are not my words. I am simply reading from the records.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Karl Marx could . . .

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — No this is not Karl Marx. This is an insult, Mr. Speaker. This is the World Council of Churches, and all they have said here is that this should be considered. I should also make this perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that this type of thing is not policy for the Protestant churches that were there. This was the considered opinion of a committee and this type of an opinion was referred to churches for study, and let us also be fair. In conclusion they say capitalism puts emphasis upon freedom, and promises that a justice will follow as a by-product of free enterprise. That too was an ideology which had been proven as false. If you want to make a note of it, it is page 195. It is the responsibility of Christians to seek new creative solutions which never allow justice or freedom to destroy each other.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that these people were trying to push me into a corner as they thought, and trying to make the point that I am expressing my own ideas, let me make this abundantly clear. I am not expressing only my own ideas, I am trying to let the people of Saskatchewan know and I will do it everywhere I go, that the type of consideration that must be given to the problems that we have at hand, are not to be found all in one direction or all in another. Everybody knows that the great desire towards greater stability and greater economic

justice has to be found in a mixed type of economy where you have some private enterprise working, where you have some crown corporations working, and where the final control of the whole situation must be held within the hands of the electorate themselves, and they should be free to use any method they choose.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — And it is not a question of black and white. It is a question of shading of greys, and in order to make sure that I not only had the view of the Protestant churches in this question, I have here the English translation from the Vatican press of the Papal Encyclical.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Another convert.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — And I see the member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) shaking her head. I don't see why she should. I think this is one of the most remarkable documents that I have ever seen.

**Mrs. Batten:** — It seems to agree with you.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Now if members want to read this document, and I trust that those people that follow this particular faith have, you will find here exactly the same type of view that was expressed in the other, and I have here a section that is entitled "Socialism — the origin and scope of the phenomena" and I am not, Mr. Speaker, don't misunderstand me, I am not claiming that Pope John 23rd is a socialist, I don't mean that for a minute, and far be it for me to impune any intentions other than those that are stated right here very clearly in this particular release. I would like to read to you what it says:

"Socialism is at one and the same time an effect and a cause of the growing intervention of public authorities in the most crucial matters, such as those concerning the care of the health, instruction and education of the younger generation, the controlling of professional careers and methods of care and rehabilitation, but it is also the fruit and expression of a natural tendency almost irresistible in human beings, the tendency to join

**March 22, 1962**

together to obtain objectives which are beyond the capacity and means at the disposal of single individuals.

A tendency of this source has given light especially in these last decades to a wide range of group movements, associations and institutions in the economic cultural social, etc. and on the national and international level.”

This is a part two . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — . . . church always . . .

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — Mr. Speaker, this is an insult, I am not in any way suggesting this is part of any other document but that which it is. I am simply suggesting to the members opposite, if they would only listen, that great lot of people in the world are taking a look at the whole question of economic development of our nation and realize it is not a question of just private enterprise versus socialism, that it is a question of developing our resources in such a way using all the different types of government that we can, to get the best degree of social justice and the greatest amount of economic equality, the last sentence that I would like to read here is:

“Ought it to be concluded then that socialization, growing in extent and depth necessarily reduces men to automation? The question is one which must be answered negatively.”

Now then this document also goes on and points out the fallacy and the dangers in Marxist-Leninism, and we all recognize this. I only have the one point to make that this tendency toward using governments whether they be provincial, or federal or local governments, is a natural and growing tendency, point two, the nations of the world, and the people of the world, are going to move forward and demand these services, and no group such as the Liberal party opposite, dragging its feet claiming to be a forward looking group, are gong to be able to stop it any more than we can stop it.

This is going to happen, Mr. Speaker. The last point that I make is in relation to the development that we must take in terms of our education process, which must



take cognizance of all these things, and take a look at what our needs are, and enter into the common sense type of relationship by which the dignity of man can be raised, and our levels of living and security can be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, for these three points I support the budget.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like at first to take a few moments to deal with some of the statements made particularly by the Minister of Education. He was appointed not too long ago to that department, and I was most interested in hearing the background of his viewpoints, not only in the field of education but in the field of economics and the field of politics because I think that has an important bearing on his viewpoint in the field of education. I was rather shocked to learn of some of the views which he holds. I was shocked to learn, Mr. Speaker, that he believes that anyone who works for salary has lost his individual freedom, and that in all his endeavours he must be careful at all times to express the viewpoints of his employer. Thus he said that a pressman working for a Conservative paper, must subdue his individual interest and his own viewpoints, and he must in all his writings do all he can to promote the Conservative point of view, and he said if it happens to be a Liberal paper he must, in order to preserve his salary, do likewise for that paper. Then he said that a person who is working for a large corporation is in identically the same position, that he can't have individual viewpoints, he can't be objective in his thinking, because he must reflect the viewpoints of the boss who pays his salary. I was rather amazed at that, because we have in this legislature a man reporting the sessions each day on the air, and is noted across Canada as one of the greatest objective reporters that we have, that man works for the Saskatchewan corporation. Do you mean to tell me that in his reportings on these radio broadcasts that he must reflect only the viewpoints of these Saskatchewan enterprises?

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — . . . not talk about that . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — I think that is exactly what the Minister of Education was inferring. That man is denied the right to use an objective reporting method. That is most interesting,

**March 22, 1962**

because that gentleman is noted for his great objectiveness and his fairness in the reporting of the proceedings of this legislature.

**Government Member:** — Masterpiece of distortion . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — He says it is a masterpiece of distortion, what I said about this gentleman being so unbiased and so objective in his reporting. He said this, for instance, those reporters who are reporting for the Leader-Post, you can't read anything there but what it reflects the Liberal viewpoint. He said, look at this screaming headline about Hazen Argue. All the great interest is created in the movement of Hazen Argue today, because that is the Liberal point of view, and those reporters are compelled to write according to the viewpoint of the owner of that paper. Then he held up The Western Producer, and he said The Western Producer is a co-operative paper, therefore the reporting in the Western Producer will be in line with and will project the viewpoints of the co-operative movement. Let me read you some of the screaming headlines in The Western Producer:

“Argue a Liberal — glad to have him there.”

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Here is another one — the co-operative viewpoint — Hazen Argue quits the NDP and in glaring headlines declares the party has become the tool of a small labour clique. That there is the view of the co-operative of this province, if I follow the logic of the Minister of Education.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — You are all mixed up.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That is all I want to say on that.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Another step in our way.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Then he goes on to give you his viewpoints on marketing boards — justice to the farmers, and he said he is convinced in his mind that only legislation that will step up producer marketing boards will give the producer a fair and equitable share. He said that the time is coming when we must by legislation establish this in spite of the opposition. Mr. Speaker, my ranchers and cattlemen will be most interested in that statement . . .

**Mr. McFarlane:** — The iron heel again.

**Mr. Cameron:** — You will recall a few years ago when this government wanted to do that very thing. The farmers and cattlemen all over this province had to organize themselves and at great expense in the dead of winter had to go around from place to place across the province holding meetings, in order to show their protests to that particular legislation which would have been brought in at that time. As a result of that protest the legislation was not brought in. They will be interested to know that the responsible minister of the crown has announced today that this legislation is forthcoming in spite of the objection.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear

**Premier Lloyd:** — May I ask a question to clarify a point?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Sure.

**Premier Lloyd:** — What legislation is that member referring to that wasn't brought in because of protests at that time? Do you mean marketing plans?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Marketing boards.

**Premier Lloyd:** — This was not legislation.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Then too, he singled out Canada Packers for criticism — what an evil concern it was. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that just three weeks ago Canada Packers laid off half their staff in Moose Jaw, and cut their budget in half. This sort of thing not only affects Canada Packers, but every firm that is established in this province and those who are in hope of coming into the province in the future.

He went on in the same strain and he said he was down to see the Liberal government in Ottawa, something about a railroad problem. He said Prime Minister St. Laurent said he didn't give a damn and he wouldn't do anything about it. Well that may be true, but if it is true, he is not the only responsible minister of the crown that has taken that attitude. I can recall a few years back when the present Minister of Education, then the vice-president of the farmers' union, together with a

**March 22, 1962**

delegation came in to see the Leader of the Opposition, and the members of the opposition, and very eloquently put forth a plea that we should support a motion asking that the farmers have purple gas in their trucks. Then when we in all good conscience brought the resolution into the house asking for this very thing, he in the meantime had become a responsible minister of the crown and while he didn't say so in actual words, he said I don't intend to do a damn thing about it, because he stood up and voted against it.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — These are some of the statements that I find rather dull. There is one other matter that I want to take just a few moments to deal with. I was surprised and disappointed that the Minister of Agriculture didn't see fit during this session, and particularly during the debate, to inform the legislature on one of the most critical problems that the farmers and cattlemen are facing today. If it wasn't for the University of Saskatchewan who made the first announcement that the loss of cattle, particularly calves, is a tremendous threat to the cattlemen of Saskatchewan, most of the people would never have learned of it. We stood up in the legislature, and asked the Minister of Agriculture to comment on this situation, and he said, "As far as I can gain from the knowledge and information brought to me by my officials, I don't think it is too serious."

Now then we had two conflicting points of view. Knowing of those conflicts of view, when I went home last weekend, having been gone a month, I thought I had better ask a few questions, and I went to the merchants in town and asked if they had heard of any farmers losing cattle, and everyone of them said, yes, we have. I asked them to tell the farmers who came to town that I was in town and would like to see them. As a result of that I had an opportunity to discuss this whole matter with a great number of farmers. Every farmer who came to see me, or with whom I discussed this matter said they had lost one, two, three, four, five, to twenty head of cattle. If he hadn't lost any himself he knew a neighbour who had. When I talked to one farmer I said now I am interested in this because the threat is particularly dangerous to the coming calf crop. This farmer said, well I have 42 head of cattle that I use as my breeding stock. He said of those 42 cows with calves, nine have delivered their calf. Well, I said, how did you come along? He said, three of them were born dead. One was born without hair —

one living was born blind, and later on it had to be destroyed because one of its eyes dropped out. On that basis of four dead calves from nine cows, I estimate that I will lose 50 per cent of my calf crop.

I was rather alarmed, because that is a most alarming situation. When I came back to Regina I wanted to get their viewpoint of how general this may be throughout the province. I didn't know whether it was confined to the southwest area of the province, or whether it was fairly general, so I took the initiative in telephoning a few of the vets across the province and to my amazement, these vets had the same experience. They told me in different sections across government that farmers had lost five, six and seven head of cattle, and they said we have saved a good many, but that my estimate of the 50 per cent loss of the calf crop was probably a good estimate, and if anything it may be a bit on the conservative side.

This is a crisis that is facing the cattlemen of this province, and I am amazed that the Minister of Agriculture with his veterinarians and his field staff having the information coming into his office, did not see fit to bestir himself and to look into this matter. I hope he will do so now. It is too late to do much to save the calf crop, because as I get the information these cattle are suffering because they have been on dry grass all summer, because they are on dry food, and because they are lacking vitamins and minerals and certain other substances vital to the health of the animal. They are not starving from lack of food, they are starving from malnutrition, lack of vital substances in the food.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . warned all last fall.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Now he says we warned them all.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Every ag. rep. that is out in the field.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Every ag. rep. that is out — I like to hear that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Cameron:** — I can recall last fall there were screaming headlines. The Minister of Agriculture was on the radio and T.V. He said we are facing a terrible drought threat. He said the farmers should muster all their resources.

**March 22, 1962**

We are going to use all the resources available to us in order to assist the farmers in this time of need. He alarmed a goodly number of people as a result of those statements. Fortunately the drought was not as bad as the Minister of Agriculture had thought it would be at that time.

He said of this crisis, I don't believe it is very serious. Well I say to the Minister of Agriculture, it is time you got your staff and the veterinarians of this province, to make a complete survey of the situation and it is time you took to your publicity media, and informed every man who owns cattle of the dangers he faces.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That is already done. It has been done all winter.

**Mr. Cameron:** — We have done it all winter he says, then secondly after that it should be your responsibility to see what supplemental food is available for these cattle, and if necessary ship it in to have it available for the farmer at his local point.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You are telling me . . . dollars.

**Mr. Cameron:** — You are telling me, I am going to tell you, Mr. Minister and Mr. Attorney General, I have found people in my constituency that have no vet at all near them. I asked if the ag. rep. had been out to check on them, and they said we haven't seen an ag. rep. since last summer. They didn't know what was wrong with their cattle, and you tell me that you informed them all and they knew all about it. You can't wash your responsibility in that way. The responsibility is heavy and I am not here to bring recriminations against the ministers, I am here to plead with you to get off your seats and get out and do something.

**Government Member:** — We have.

**Mr. Cameron:** — You have, what have you done?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Will the Minister of Agriculture kindly refrain from interrupting the Speaker.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, being near 5:30 I have much more to say that I would like to save as dessert until we reconvene.

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

The Assembly resumed at 7:30 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, when I called it 5:30 I was dealing with some of the remarks of the Minister of Education who had spoken just prior to me rising. I may go on to say that I was somewhat disappointed that he didn't have a bit more to say about some of the current problems facing education today.

The tax problem, net cost of education, relationship between the teachers and the trustees and other such problems that we find in education, were skirted around by mentioning that the time must come when governments and industries must play a bigger role in financing education. I will recall to you, Mr. Speaker, that some two years ago I moved a motion in this legislature which was unanimously accepted. At that time I had confidence that something would be done about it. Nothing has been done to this date, and we are still facing the problems that we faced then, only they have become more acute.

I mentioned at that time that I thought one of the essential things to be done in the whole field of education was first to try and find some method to put taxes on an equitable basis, and get an equality of opportunity for each and every child in the province in education today, we haven't accomplished either. There is no equality in taxation. I pointed out that some school districts were giving a program of education that took \$320 for a year for each little child at his desk, others were limited to a program of expenditure of only \$150 a year, therefore there was not equal educational opportunities. I think I pointed out at that time that it was my thinking at least, that education is a social responsibility, it is not the responsibility of the local districts. These students are trained and educated at the local taxpayers' expense and then they leave the local district to make their endeavour in life and their contribution in the field of industry in provincial and national governments and so forth. Therefore we should look at education as a social responsibility, a responsibility in which everyone should make their rightful contribution. I propose such a system would be the foundation program that included these principles that I have enunciated. Nothing has been done about it. I notice last year that the Social Credit government of Alberta had more faith in the principles of the foundation program than did the Socialist government of Saskatchewan.

**March 22, 1962**

They instituted the foundation program, practically on the basis which I outlined it in this legislature. Today they have the foundation program incorporating those identical principles that I have been stressing here. At the recent municipal convention in Alberta, municipal men went on record as favouring and endorsing the extension of the foundation program in Alberta. There are things to be ironed out, but they are in the process of doing this and they are well on their way to removing both inequality in taxation and giving better equality in educational opportunities for their children.

Another thing today that we must look at, and we can't afford to dilly-dally any longer is the frightening fact, the chronic unemployed group is the group 20 years of age and younger, and that seventy per cent of the unemployed in this age are unemployed because they have a standard of education of Grade VIII or less. Surely we cannot be satisfied, when we turn out our young boys and girls from school unequipped to take their place in life, and as I said at one time, defeated in life before they have a chance to begin. These are serious problems facing us in Saskatchewan, and I was most disappointed that the Minister of Education didn't see fit to deal with the problems of his department, rather than the type of speech which he delivered.

I want to say something about the Minister of Natural Resources. He was on at air time. It seems to me that there was strategy in giving the air time to the Minister of Natural Resources, although it was the end of the debate. It seems to me that he was the man who was going to slay the dragon. He was going to kill these Liberals once and for all. Yes, he was going to slay the dragon. You know, Mr. Speaker, just when he was ready to make the kill and his sword was drawn and the blade was held high, he withdrew. Then he said, "Well if I can't kill them perhaps I can injure them," so he pulled out his little pen knife and came up with another attack, he said, "I am going to reveal, Mr. Speaker, a dark secret under-the-table deal." Then he proceeded to quote a Conservative paper, what the Conservative paper had to say about a Conservative M.P. and what the Conservative M.P. had to say about Hazen Argue in the province of Saskatchewan.

This is the great under-the-table deal.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — You are double dealing.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I heard a remark a moment ago that these people believe in



democracy and wouldn't indulge in tactics such as that.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Shame Alex.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That was his under-the-table deal. You know, Mr. Speaker, in this debate reference has been made quite frequently to under-the-table deals. I think it started off with the member from Estevan when he innocently enough and truthfully enough made reference to some under-the-table deals he had heard about ten or twelve years ago. The Minister of Mineral Resources knowing that the member from Estevan was comparatively new in coming to the legislature, knowing that he wouldn't have perhaps complete and full knowledge of it, put on an air of indignation, and he rose in a state of wrath and demanded that the member from Estevan withdraw the accusation, or prove his charges. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was amazed the Minister of Mineral Resources should have seen fit to stand up in this house and open up the matter of under-the-table deals. I thought he would have kept the closet door closed, but since he opened it up and he invited us to do so, I relish the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of bringing the skeleton out of the closet.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — I think it is a good thing to bring these family skeletons out of the closet once in a while, perhaps every ten years is a good opportunity to freshen them up, to preserve them a bit longer, and that is what I am going to do tonight. The minister says, the same old story.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — . . . mouldy . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mouldy it is . . .

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — . . . not as old . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — But the minister asked me to bring out these mouldy skeletons from the closet and here they are. The Minister of Natural Resources — this under-the-table deal of the Liberals which arranged some deal with the Conservatives, a Conservative paper quoted a Conservative M.P. and had him say, "A scandalous situation," implied the minister.

Well, Mr. Speaker, every time I drive in to the city of Regina, I am reminded just west of the city, of another little under-the-table deal. I want to refresh

**March 22, 1962**

the minister's memory. This I recall was a beautiful friendship. It was a friendship that developed and blossomed with romance and then it withered away. Let me tell you the story of how this beautiful romance began and then something of the charge against it. This romance began on May 1, 1950, when a gentleman came up from Weyburn to see the Government Insurance Office, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Bodnoff. He rapped on the door of the Government Insurance Office, and said he would like to receive a loan of \$75 thousand. He want to give as security his three theatres in Weyburn. The officials told him, under the regulations of the act, we can't take as security a mortgage on business enterprises already established, so he couldn't get the loan. But they said being a good friend we can accommodate you, particularly a friend who would returned the favour. The records show that within a couple of days the cabinet met and conveniently announced the regulations were changed to accommodate this good friend, and he got his \$75 thousand. He had formed a company, I think it was called "Theatre Under the Stars" beautiful name, romantic name. He was going to proceed to build a drive-in theatre called the "Sunset Drive-In." A few days after the officials of the company met in the city of Regina. When the meeting was all over they announced to the press that the shareholders had appointed the Premier and Provincial Treasurer Fines to the board of directors.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That is togetherness.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Twelve days after that they began to arrange for a mortgage which was taken out and duly registered in the office here a \$60,750 on this "Theatre Under the Stars," drive-in theatre. Mr. Speaker, who held the mortgage? Mr. Bodnoff, the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer. Coincidence that he took out a \$75 thousand loan from the Government Insurance Office, and shortly after \$60,750 turns up as a mortgage in the name of these three people. The opposition now got a little concerned and in the Crown Corporation Committee — after all the Saskatchewan Government Insurance is a crown corporation, and this was public funds, we asked where this \$75 thousand of public funds had gone, we suggested they bring the manager of this enterprise before the Crown Corporation Committee, and have him explain to the committee to what purpose this was put.

The committee refused to do that. Mr. Douglas said he didn't know where the \$60 thousand came from, but he had put in \$500. Later on he said it was a bit

more than \$500, but he didn't know how much. Provincial Treasurer Fines said, this is none of your business, this is a private deal. He said perhaps we got the money from a rich uncle, and they never did reveal the source. I noticed there were a considerable number of rich uncles around in those days.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — You are coming to your final one now . . . Today, Mr. Speaker, everybody in the province is concerned about the lack of redevelopment in oil, gas and minerals in the province. We see headlines like we saw the other morning, a mining firm pulling out because they said the regulations were too distasteful to them. We have read out names of other firms that have left the province, now today we see very little oil activity in the province. Why? Why isn't this province today, after the start it got in 1949-50, not having any exploration for gas and oil. Well here again, Mr. Speaker, I want to give you the background, because it has a direct bearing on the condition Saskatchewan finds itself today. You will recall when this government came to power in 1945, there were two major firms doing exploration work in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Willis:** — How many oil wells Alex?

**Mr. Cameron:** — There was the Imperial Oil Company which had a contract. They were induced to come into the province to explore for gas and oil, and when this government came to power, the contract was about to expire. When it expired the CCF said to them; this is the type of contract you are going to work under if you are going to work in this province. The Imperial Oil said, no dice gentlemen — not under those conditions, so they moved to Leduc in Alberta, and everybody knows the story of Leduc. That is how Alberta got its start in oil.

A second major firm that was in here working diligently to develop the resources of the province was Bata Petroleums. Bata Petroleums is an organization composed of 24 thousand Saskatchewan farmers and shareholders. The Bata Petroleums had quite a record in the province of Saskatchewan. It had drilled over 30 wells, it had discovered gas and it had brought gas to the town of Unity. Bata discovered a salt mine that was in production, and Bata had discovered the first potash findings in Saskatchewan. Quite a record I would think for this company

**March 22, 1962**

with all these farm shareholders. What happened to Bata? Well, like the Minister of Natural Resources, they said, there is something strange going on there. There is something that smells to high heaven; we don't know what it is; we don't like it, so the government moved in. They confiscated their books, locked the doors and they laid a criminal charge against the company.

Now when the smoke had cleared away the company was exonerated of all charges, but for punishment they found the government had taken away from them one million acres of their holdings, and they had relegated this company to the position where they were unable to obtain financial assistance and almost bankrupted them. Why? Because the former minister, the first Minister of Natural Resources, being a true socialist that he was, said that the resources of the province would be developed in the interest of the people by the people and for the people. He said we are waiting our time, and when the time is ripe we will move. They moved — they moved on to Bata, they moved on to the Imperial Oil and then from 1945 we had no exploration at all in the province. When they came to the election of 1948, the government came within a hair of being defeated, so they thought this one through. Premier took to the air waves and to the press, and in great oratorical form and announced to the oil companies and to the other people that may be interested in coming into the province his pledge. He said, "I give you a pledge that those who come into the province of Saskatchewan in good faith, will be accepted in good faith and their confidence in this province and its people will never be betrayed." That was a great statement.

These companies had renewed faith that the Premier after all had got control of his cabinet, and that they would be safe in coming into Saskatchewan. To further show their good faith the government made an announcement, and declared it was releasing 36 million acres of crown lands for exploration, and it invited these companies to put in bids. After this firms again began to come into the province of Saskatchewan. I remember in the legislature here during that time the Minister of Mineral Resources announced in May, 1949, to the press, and it was in screaming headlines in the Leader-Post, this biased paper, "Minister of Mineral Resources announced that permits were coming into his department faster than the department could handle them." We were away to a grand start. These releases created a great deal of interest. They created interest not only

in Saskatchewan but in all parts of Canada and even in the United States. Shortly after these press releases, a gentleman from eastern Canada arrived on the scene. He came into the department, met with the government and here they found another friend. This man, in the name of Gulf Securities, a man by the name of Mr. Rhubra came into the province and said to these boys, if you want to do development I am just the man to do it for you; in return I will get development started in the province. The government announced by way of the minister and himself, that by way of permit and of lease rental Mr. Rhubra obtained control of 14 million acres of our crown and oil reserve. He obtained control of 40 per cent of all the crown reserve in the province, of the 36 million. What did he pay for it? One-tenth of a cent an acre. Mr. Rhubra was granted 14 million acres of our choicest mineral rights in the province for one-tenth of a cent an acre, while at the same time the farmers were compelled to pay a ransom to this government of three cents an acre, each year, to prevent the government from confiscating the mineral rights which they owned.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Shame on the socialists.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Shortly after, what did he find? Mr. Rhubra was now in business. He was in the driver's seat and he said to the oil companies, "If you want any acreage in Saskatchewan you must now deal with me." The firms had to go to Mr. Rhubra, not to the Department of Mineral Resources, not the Premier of this province, but to Mr. Rhubra, and Mr. Rhubra demanded his pound of flesh from every legitimate oil firm of this province, he extracted not only a cash consideration, but a two and one-half per cent over-riding royalty on every dollar's worth of oil you find in this acreage. Having no alternative some of the companies accepted, and they got their permit. That didn't take him very long, he brought no money into the province, he was not an oil operator himself and he had no drilling rigs. His intention was not to explore in the province, but to set up as the middle man in order that he could rake his pound of flesh off these other people when they came in to develop the province.

I asked in 1950 when I talked about this; I asked why did you bring this man into the province and give to him this huge acreage at one-tenth of a cent an acre, for if oil is discovered on this land, this man will stand to make millions.

The Minister of Mineral Resources at that time

**March 22, 1962**

said, how do you know Mr. Rhubra will make millions? He said, you know, if no oil is discovered he won't make anything. That was the attitude of the minister, and I said in 1950, that this friend of the government was bought here, obtained control of 40 per cent of our gas and oil reserves, and would stand to make a million dollars. That is what I predicted in 1950, Mr. Speaker, how accurate was I in my predictions?

Well, I think it is only fair that I should tell you. I have here, Mr. Speaker, the annual report of a company called Canada Oil Lands. This is one of Mr. Rhubra's companies. Mr. Rhubra after leaving Saskatchewan formed three holding companies, one was called Canada Oil Lands, which I have the report here, and Calta Petroleum Limited and Phillips Oil Limited. That is not even a second cousin to Phillips Gas that you know of. These were three little companies that he formed, which he of course had the controlling interest.

I want to read to you the report that I picked up the other day in the city of Regina, from the Canadian Oil Lands Limited, the annual report for the year 1959. It has given the financial statement for the year, and I want to read what it says here, and I will follow it here because it is outlined closer:

“In 1959 the annual report”

It goes on and it says this:

“Additional oil discoveries were made on Saskatchewan leases which the company has an over-riding royalty, a total of 24 new wells were completed under these leases.”

The report goes on to say under the heading Saskatchewan Royalties:

“Royalties income in 1959 increased from \$153,680 as compared with \$114,876 in 1958. These leases are located in two or more areas in southeastern and southwestern regions of the province.”

It says further:

“Production on this area is from 120 wells located principally in the Dollard, Instow, Parkman and Wapella fields.”

The 1960 annual report which I have here says:

“Further development drilling continued on these holdings, leases on which the company has an over-riding royalty, a total of 28 wells were completed during the year.”

Then in this report in 1960 under the heading Royalties Reports from Saskatchewan, it is reporting on its earnings of two and one-half per cent in over-riding royalties. It says:

“Income from this royalty is \$165,932 in 1960 as compared with \$153,680 in 1959.”

And it further quotes:

“Tidewater Oil Company and its farm have completed some 184 wells of which 28 were drilled and completed in 1960.”

I would point out this is one of his companies, and only one of them. He divided the royalties between the three of them, and the latest information which I obtained the other day, and I have every reason to believe it is accurate, Mr. Rhubra estimates that from his royalties of this two and one-half per cent over-riding royalty, will net him this year in 1962, \$400,000.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Where is Olie?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Under-the-table deals! Here is a man brought in, given this huge acreage and today estimates his revenue in each year alone from here on in will be \$400,000 a year. In 1950 I said this man stood to make millions — today I can substantiate that statement with the annual reports from the gentleman himself. Is that an under-the-table deal? There were others, Mr. Speaker, who got in on the gravy train during this rush for development in Saskatchewan. I want to refer to some of them.

There was another firm that was incorporated, legal incorporated, called Freeholders Oil Company, it was incorporated in 1950. The object of this company was to acquire lands and mineral rights from the freeholders and to pool the same. Now freeholders are those people, mostly farmers, who own their own mineral rights, other than those in the crown, so he was going to deal not with crown reserves but with the minerals owned by

**March 22, 1962**

the farmers. Who originated and conceived the idea of taking and inducing the farmers to put their mineral rights into this company? Who originated the idea?

The minister said Henry Mang. According to the evidence given in the law case in the city of Regina, it said according to Mr. Broughton, the president, according to the Leader-Post of October 11, 1957, giving evidence under oath, one of the promoters, a Mr. B. Havard learned about oil leases while working for the government. Mr. Broughton said, when Mr. Havard was looking about for a president for his company, he chose him. Mr. Broughton said, according to his evidence and I was surprised to learn, that he had been told by a farmer friend, Mr. Cliff Thurston, that Mr. Havard would like to see him. Now who was Mr. Broughton? Well, he was a prominent farmer in the Weyburn country. In his report he stated among other things not in this trial, that he was a personal friend of the Premier.

**Premier Lloyd:** — The hon. member . . . used to work . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Sit down.

**Premier Lloyd:** — I will sit down when it is proper to do so, but not at the order of the hon. member.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I said not at this trial.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Cameron:** — I said not at this trial. I was quoting other evidence from the trial of Meyers vs. Freeholders in the evidence brought out at the trial.

**Premier Lloyd:** — The reference was to trial . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — As evidence and statements not pertaining to the trial, I made that distinction. Mr. Broughton said that he was a friend of the Premier. We know he was the Premier's personal organizer in the constituency of Weyburn, in fact he was his choreboy looking after his interests in the constituency of Weyburn. Now we have established who Mr. Broughton is and who Mr. Harvard is.



Then this company said, well if we are going to go out and induce the farmers to sign leases of mineral rights, we will have to have salesmen to go out and do it. So they were going to get a host of salesmen to obtain these mineral leases from the farmers. Mr. Havard had worked for the Department of Natural Resources and he had learned about oil. Mr. Broughton, a valuable friend of the Premier spoke to Mr. Young, the registrar of the Securities Commission. Mr. Young said, well, I think it would be perfectly okay. Let your salesmen go out; don't register under the Securities Commission of this province. So the salesmen of Freeholders were exempted from having to register under the Securities Commission of this province.

**Hon. Member:** — Who was the minister?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Thus they could not be held responsible for any misdeeds they may have committed. This was nice little family compact. However, this family compact dealings of the farmers were not quite so nice according to the testimony of 2,500 farmers in Saskatchewan. I can't speak about that because the Attorney General knows those farmers have court case at this date in the courts. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the evidence brought out in this court trial proved most interesting, but it didn't prove the farmers' case; it proved my case, but it went to the Supreme Court in the process.

I want to give you a run down of the board of directors. This proves rather interesting. Who were the board of directors of this Freeholders Oil Company, who find themselves in such difficulty today? President, Mr. Broughton of Weyburn, vice-president, Mr. Cliff Thurston of Lumsden, Mr. Hoxley, a former CCF candidate in Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and the manger of the company Mr. Havard, a former employee of the Department of Natural Resources. Now the board met and after a first meeting the board went over and assessed the situation and the board did not think they were capable of managing the company, so they decided they would engage a company to manage the company, Freeholders, for them. They agreed to do that, so they approached the firm that was set up in terms of management company. They made a deal with this managing company to manage their company for them. They obtained the services of a managing company called Western Royalties Limited and who turned up as president and manager of Western Royalties, Mr. Broughton and Mr. Havard.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**March 22, 1962**

**Mr. Cameron:** — They became the Western Royalties to manage Freeholders.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Another salary too.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Broughton and Mr. Havard of Western Freeholders said to Mr. Broughton and Mr. Havard, and Mr. Hoxley and Mr. Thurston, we will manage your company for you. But, they said, for a slight consideration. After all we can't be too charitable. They said you give us a slight consideration; they said you give us 30 per cent interest in all the mineral leases you obtain from the farmers and 30 per cent of the revenue from all the production on the Freehold acreage and we will manage your company for you. Quite a small consideration. He said you give to Western Royalties, whose manager and president are the same gentlemen who are president and manager of the Freeholders, you give us 30 per cent interest in all rights that you get from the farmers and a 30 per cent interest in all the production you may obtain there from by drilling. So the deal was made. The contract was witnessed on behalf of Western Royalties by Mr. Broughton and Mr. Havard on behalf of Freeholders by Mr. Thurston. This slight consideration of 30 per cent interest didn't seem too much out of line.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No, humanity first.

**Mr. Cameron:** — According to the same evidence that came out in the trial of Meyers vs. Freeholders, Mr. Broughton said that he sold this slight consideration for \$1 million cold cash. That was how they managed the company.

Evidence in a court of law. Mr. Speaker, the actions of Bata in forming the Unity Gas Company was as sweet as a baby's breath by comparison to this scandalous situation that we find here. What effect did these under-the-table deals, Mr. Speaker, have on our oil industry in the province? We need but look about us today. The major oil companies hamstrung by government bureaucracy, loaded with excessive taxation and having to carry these leeches on their back, have thrown in the sponge. The Minister of Mineral Resources knows, because he distinctly made a statement the other day, I think it was in Calgary, he said, the craving need of Saskatchewan today is to find a new oil discovery.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is what Premier Manning said.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Exploration for gas and oil reserves in this province has ground to a virtual halt. There have been but two new gas wells brought into production in Saskatchewan in the past four years. Reports tabled in the legislature of the Department of Mineral Resources point out — this lack of exploration has compelled the government to spend millions of the taxpayers' dollars to step across into Alberta and to purchase gas fields there in order to supply their own empty pipelines. Mr. Speaker, to the chagrin of the CCF and the NDP, if it were not for the gas obtained from C.D. Howe's Trans Canada Pipelines, Saskatchewan would be sitting high and dry. Oh, the cry went up and what a saviour that has been to Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the only drilling going on today is the drilling on proven reserves, reserves where there are oil wells already there. Today we have drilling rigs in the province that you could count on the fingers of your hand. That is all that is left, the rest have pulled out, and that is why you have 148 wells on this small acreage belonging to Mr. Rhubra, because they are adding more wells to it.

How serious has this become? How alarmed are the oil companies about the treatment in Saskatchewan? I think this has been pointed out when the oil companies gave a press release about a month ago. They said the oil companies of Canada had allotted a budget of \$126 million for exploration and development of oil and gas in the three western provinces, and of that \$126 million budgeted for 1962, Saskatchewan was assigned \$50 million. The same press report went on to say that British Columbia which began exploration in 1957 this year will replace Saskatchewan as second to Alberta in expenditures on development and exploration. That is where we have dropped, and British Columbia who began in 1957 today replaces Saskatchewan as second to Alberta in the amount of money being spent there for exploration and development for mineral resources.

Why, income from oil is up, naturally it should be up, because that is the only oil we produce. The minister knows very well that the oil we have in Saskatchewan is a very heavy crude, and there is no great market for heavy crude, and so our wells are working at half the capacity because there isn't a market for this oil. The crying need as the minister said is for Saskatchewan to

**March 22, 1962**

find a new kind of oil, to get into the light medium oil. To do this they will have to do deeper into the bowels of the earth. When I talk to oil companies they are not too interested in this type of venture, not because they don't think the oil is there, but because at the present time the contracts they have with this government limits them to a certain depth. Below that depth they are tagging on an extra tax to go down below there to find it.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Socialist planning.

**Mr. Cameron:** — You will recall a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, when the minister brought a new bill in this house, he said we must get after these oil companies because we need more revenue for the province. He said, we can't prove that any oil comes from under the road allowance but if it comes from the field next to it, surely some of it must come from under the road allowance. He said we are going to place a tax of \$1½ million on the company for oil we think may have come from the road allowance. That was another tax they put on the oil companies.

**Hon. Member:** — Did you dream that one up?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Is it any wonder today, hamstrung as they are by regulations and restrictions, overloaded with excessive taxation, having to pay ransom to men like Rhubra, on every dollar's worth of oil they produce, they are not interested in coming into Saskatchewan. That is the situation that was created by this government, and that is the situation this government will have to be asked to account for.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, and talk at great lengths about the oil in Saskatchewan, and the lack of activity that is experienced today, when we need these revenues so greatly, to meet the commitments we have in the province. However, I want to take time to complete my story of all the under-the-table deals which I set out to relate, in order to show completely the devastating results these have had on the province of Saskatchewan.

Well, they were in their heyday, they struck oil — here was a bonanza — and they gathered in their friends to put them on the gravy train. Well the wheel of fortune spun again — this time in the uranium area in northern Saskatchewan.

Northern Saskatchewan became a second Klondike, and the history of oil in the south became the history of uranium in northern Saskatchewan, and history repeated itself to a remarkable degree. During 1951 I stood up in the legislature and I outlined to the house what was happening in the uranium area. Here again as in oil we found government employees organizing promotion companies, securing from the Department of Mineral Resources, rich concessions in the uranium areas, some of the choicest uranium areas in the northern part and I quoted the history of one company as just one instance. I outlined how other people with no relation to these, and in no sense connected with them, had come in from eastern Canada and the United States, and had moved into the north. I told the story of Canadian Uranium Company who were granted 143 square miles in the uranium area in northern Saskatchewan, and how after having set up this company, got 83 per cent of the shares for \$90 thousand, went down into the State of New York to sell the remaining 17 per cent for \$1,750,000. At the same time the headlines in our papers were screaming about Saskatchewan's people being rooked by speculators. It became so rampant that the Attorney General of the state of New York said if Saskatchewan cannot control the problem, then in the interests of my people I am going to take action myself, and they had the company investigated. He says I have no control about what they do in Saskatchewan, but I have a big control of what they are going to do in the state of New York. They formed a company not to develop uranium resources, but as a shady promotional company to fleece the people, and they fleeced them by the hundreds.

Mr. Speaker, when I exposed these under-the-table deals in 1951 here in this legislature, I was branded both here in the airways and out in the hustings. I was branded as a witch-hunter; I was called a McCarthyist; I was called a fascist; and I was called many choice names, Mr. Speaker, which I would not want to repeat in this Assembly.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I could tell you some better ones.

**Mr. Cameron:** — At the time when I revealed these under-the-table deals I could not conceive in my mind how long it might take to establish beyond doubt the accuracy of this accusation I made at that time. Mr. Speaker, it took seven years, it took a case that went through the courts of Canada, to the Supreme Court of Canada.

**March 22, 1962**

It is from the evidence taken under oath in those cases that my case was proved. Today I can stand in this legislature completely vindicated, that what I said in 1951, every statement that I made has been proven in the courts of this land to be accurate and correct.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — I said in 1951 that these people had come in with no thought in mind of developing our resources. They were aided and abetted by many of the officials of this government and brought no good for the people of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Member:** — What is he talking about?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Today the records bear it out. I want to read some of the evidence of the trial as reported in the Leader-Post, and if the Minister of Education doesn't wish to read the Leader-Post because it expresses the viewpoint as he thinks, of the Liberal Party, then I can bring him four big volumes of the evidence taken in this trial. That evidence as reported in the Leader-Post of October 22, 1957, I quote:

“A witness admitted today in Queen's Bench Court he had helped promote oil and mineral companies while employed by the Saskatchewan government.”

That is what I said in 1951, the Premier said I didn't have the intestinal fortitude to repeat those statements outside of this house. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, how I went to the airways and I told my story, and in fact I had it printed in a pamphlet, distributed by the tens of thousands, which told the story of the oil and uranium scandal in the province of Saskatchewan. There were no prosecutions as a result of it. Mr. Speaker, there will be none today.

I said in 1951, and here I am going on with the evidence:

“A witness admitted in Queen's Bench Court, on Monday, that he had helped promote an oil and mineral company while employed in Saskatchewan government. He said a co-promoter of the company was Ronald Havard, an employee of the Department of Mineral Resources.”

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — May I ask the hon. member who the witness is?

**Mr. Cameron:** — My good friend if you will just sit quiet I am coming to it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member doesn't need to get so ratty about it. It is just polite to tell who the witness is when he begins to quote him.

**Hon. Member:** — Sit down.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think the minister has a correct point when he asks the member speaking to give him a name. The member speaking says he is going to give that at the right time, but other members have no right to say "sit down" and I would ask the member to refrain from those interjections.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I will have to start from the beginning so that the minister will be able to follow me this time. If he would just be patient:

“A witness admitted in Queen's Bench Court Monday that he had helped promote an oil and mineral company while employed by the Saskatchewan government.”

He said:

“A co-promoter of the company was Ronald Havard, an employee of the Department of Natural Resources.”

The witness was Dr. M.C. Shumiatcher of Regina, Saskatchewan.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — I would like to ask the Minister of Mineral Resources if he thinks I am muck racking now? As he said in 1951?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes I do.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Dr. Shumiatcher, admitted he and Ronald Havard had

**March 22, 1962**

organized and promoted search corporations. Dr. Shumiatcher says this was done by himself and a Calgary law firm before he left the government employ. He said he and Mr. Havard were also business associates before they left the provincial government.

What about it? What about this? Well, Mr. Speaker, might I point out. The actions of these employees were not illegal. They committed no offence; there is nothing wrong in what they did. I am going to tell you why. They broke no law, because this government brought in an act amending The Legislative Assembly Act, which would protect their own members if they were mixed up in this same scandalous situation.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — That amendment was brought into the Legislative Assembly in 1952, and when you exempt the boss you exempt the employee.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, will the hon. member make more clear this accusation?

**Mr. Cameron:** — It is not an accusation. I stated that The Legislative Assembly Act had been amended for that purpose.

**Premier Lloyd:** — I want to know the amendment to which the hon. member is referring?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Why was it amended Mr. Premier?

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is, what is the amendment to which the hon. member is referring?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I couldn't hear . . .

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is, what is the amendment to which the hon. member is referring, and accusing the government of having brought in for this nefarious purpose?

**Mr. Cameron:** — If it wasn't brought in for this purpose I would



ask the Premier what purpose was it brought in for?

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Sit down, up that that time you asked me to answer you and I am going to answer you. Up to that time under The Legislative Assembly Act, it was wrong for any member of the legislature to have a controlling interest in the resources that were being handled by the government, the same as it is to be the head of a business firm doing business with the government. That is the right law, because it prevents members from using their influence. Why was the amendment brought in? The amendment was brought in and exempted the members of the legislature from this law. It was exempted for one year and the following year an amendment was brought in and took the original amendment out, and in the meantime many of the members over there had time to dispose of their holdings.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — That is why I say these employees of the government did no wrong.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member had made the charge that this amendment was brought in and later changed in order to give the members of the government time to unload certain of their holdings. On behalf of the government I want to deny there is any truth whatsoever in that statement.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, I thought this was so evident that the amendment was brought in, the Premier was a member of the cabinet a the time. If I had the item and the file with me I could read the discussion in the house. I took it to be so factual that everybody would accept it. I could bring the file of maps showing the permits issued in the name of some good friends and prove to this legislature.

**Hon. R.A. Walker:** — That is not true.

**Mr. Cameron:** — After the amendment was brought in they disappeared from the map. Why did the government see fit to bring in an amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act

**March 22, 1962**

exempting the members from this act for one year? Why? I don't have to make any accusations.

**Government Member:** — Well don't.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I have to ask you why? And I point out that the reason for this is that these men as employees of the government did no wrong because they were exempted by an amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act. The day will arrive, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Willis:** — On a point of privilege, I was a member of this legislature in 1952 and I want to emphatically deny that I ever had any holdings in any area of the country.

**Opposition Member:** — You have a guilt complex.

**Mr. Cameron:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I know that the minister didn't . . .

**Mr. Snedker:** — What is his point of order, Mr. Speaker,.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Will the hon. member for Saltcoats please leave it to the Chair to discipline members.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Just maintain it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well I shall have to maintain if you do not be quiet. If any member rises on a point of privilege or point of order I must hear their point of privilege or point of order. I cannot rule on a point of privilege or a point of order until I hear it, and I cannot hear it if interrupted. The Attorney General rose on a point of privilege and I must hear it.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — The hon. member has said that during the years that the amendment was on the statue books, members of the government got rid of their holdings.

**Mrs. Batten:** — He did not.

**Opposition Member:** — No he didn't.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Oh yes, he did.

**Opposition Member:** — No, he didn't. Quote it again.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to categorically deny on my behalf that I had any holdings at any time.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, is this going to go on all evening, let's have them all up, I have lots of time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — He referred to members on this side of the house and during a certain year referred to certain holdings they had. I deny that on my own behalf, Mr. Speaker, and I say that if the hon. member has any guts he will name the members on this side of the house.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — That's jumping off the ship. I am surprised the Minister of Agriculture isn't up to give his testimony. Don't you want to rise?

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — On a point of privilege, I was going to rise to my feet and make the same denial, but it is not necessary — it is stupid.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Are you next Alex? Come on!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Premier Lloyd:** — On a point of privilege, I would say this, that if he hon. member has any decency, then he will name those persons to whom he is referring.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Name them or withdraw.

**March 22, 1962**

**Premier Lloyd:** — If he has any decency, and I sometimes think he has.

**Mr. Guy:** — Have you any more to say?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Are you ready to listen now? Have you any more to say over there. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment exempted all members of the legislature on that side of the house and on this side of the house equally. If any members on this side of the house had such arrangements they could unload them too. If it wasn't brought in the amendment gave permission . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Sit down will you, Mr. Speaker, I can't have this tall giraffe up here butting in all the time.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I rose a moment ago on a point of privilege to insist that the hon. member withdraw the allegation which he made with reference to members of this side of the house and which included me. I was here at that time. If the hon. member does not withdraw the allegation, I suggest that he either withdraw it or substantiate it and if he can't do either one he can apologize.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the point of privilege is well taken.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, how can I withdraw the statement? This is the statement that was made, that if The Legislative Assembly Act was amended to permit members to have these associations and if they had had them they could dispose of them within a year's time, when the act came back in. Now how can I withdraw that? How can I withdraw it?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member was quite explicit and he said that during that year several members on the other side of the house had time to dispose of their holdings.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Certainly they had. Exactly!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, that is an insinuation which the hon. member should withdraw.

**Opposition Member:** — It is a guilty conscience.

**Premier Lloyd:** — On the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, he went further, of course, and he suggested that this was a part of a deliberate purpose on the part of the government, to arrange it this way in order to give certain members an opportunity to unload. It is a pretty serious charge and I say again that if the hon. member does have decency that I have usually thought he had he would withdraw that kind of statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on a point of order.

**Mr. Cameron:** — If we were guilty we could unload as well. There has been no inference there.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) has risen on a point of order.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on a point of order, I can't see the question of personal privilege on which the members speak, and certainly on that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I object to anybody on that side of the house saying that this isn't decent or someone has to be decent in order to follow their dictate; surely any member of this house can get up and say that the intention of certain legislation is this and that, without having to prove that it was written or said to any particular person.

**Mr. Speaker:** — In Beuchesne, Citation 111, a number of statements are given which constitute breach of privilege. Statements which charge members of corruption in their exercise of duty seem to constitute a breach of privilege. If the imputation is made that members of the legislature

**March 22, 1962**

are charged with corruption in their duties, according to Beauchesne, this must be either substantiated or withdrawn. The point of privilege is well taken.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, no one has made that charge.

**Hon. A.G. Kuziak:** — Sit down a minute and catch up. Shut up and sit down.

**Mr. McDonald:** — The hon. member for Canora had his day this afternoon, and I know he bored the house including himself but I wish he would sit down now and shut up, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Sit down and shut up.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — If the charge that you referred to had been made then there would be something to withdraw, but, Mr. Speaker, certainly amendments were made and the hon. member has suggested that there may have been or there may not have been reason to make them. Here is the point, Mr. Speaker, that I want to make. If the cap fits over there, then let them wear it.

**Premier Lloyd:** — On a point of privilege, I think with the latest remarks of the member for Moosomin, there probably is a point of privilege, but let me point out this, following the member for Maple Creek's meaning, if there was any unloading, this would imply that members on this side had illegally obtained these rights, had improperly obtained these rights, this is a point of privilege which must be accepted.

**Mrs. Batten:** — On a point of order, this is exactly opposite to what the member said. He said that this amendment was brought in and therefore it was legal for that period of time for all the members, to hold this and they had one year in which they could dispose of this holding and the next year the amendment was taken off the books. This is exactly the point. There could be nothing corrupt during the period of time when that amendment was in effect; it couldn't be because it was legal to do it.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may rise on the point of order? The member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) put it well. She suggested that the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) had said that during this interval it would be legal for members to dispose of their holdings.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Or to hold them.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes, to hold them or dispose of them, she used the word “disposed” the member for Maple Creek used “unload.” Neither used the word “acquire” and mind, you can’t unload something unless you have acquired it, and if . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . and if it was acquired prior to that amendment it was in violation of The Legislative Assembly Act and this is the clear imputation of what the member for Maple Creek said.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Why was the act amended?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I don’t know why the act was amended. I will make my point Sir. The point is this; that if the member had said during that interval it was legal for members to acquire mineral interests, he would have been perfectly proper, but he said to unload them and of course it was legal for them to unload them but they could only unload what they had previously acquired and had they acquired them prior it would have been wrong, and this is the straight and clear imputation which he made.

**Mrs. Batten:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, just to answer that, as I understand that amendment it was a retroactive amendment

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! We are not debating on a point of privilege.

**Mrs. Batten:** — It made it legal even in the past.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I have been sitting in

**March 22, 1962**

this house for a long time and I know what happened. There is no use quarrelling among ourselves here tonight. You have to refer to the statutes of this province, the amendment is there and the repeal of the amendment is there.

**Mr. Speaker:** — We are not speaking about an amendment or its repeal. We are speaking on a point of privilege.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Why was it put on?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Sit down please. We are not debating at this time the amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act that the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) referred to. The point which has risen is that on a point of privilege he was asked either to substantiate the statement which certain members thought was an imputation — either substantiate or, on a point of privilege, withdraw it, and that is the point we shall raise at this time. We are not debating the pros and cons of the act or why it was amended. If the member who has the floor is speaking, and he wishes to say in his opinion why it was amended, he has the floor. At this time it is a procedural point that is being debated.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, I am glad of that ruling, it is my opinion that I have been expressing. It is my opinion and while this Legislative Assembly Act was amended, if I question the purpose of why it was amended how am I imputing anything to the government?

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — It is of the opinion that you should withdraw.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Sit down. It exempted the members of the opposition equally with the government. If I had had any such arrangements I could have unloaded mine. The gentleman is right. All I asked is why was this amendment brought into this legislature for one year only, and then taken out again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may proceed . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can't go on without withdrawing.



**Mr. Thatcher:** — It is all true and he knows it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — My ruling is according to Citation 111, Beauchesne, that imputations against members of corruption in exercise of their duties, are improper and constitute a breach of privilege, and must be withdrawn.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Or prove it.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, if it offends the sensitive feelings of the government, if it is going to offend your sensitive feelings, and I know you are more sensitive than ever, but let me tell you this.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Come on, come on.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, will you have that renegade keep quiet so I can at least say something.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must insist on order here.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member still has not withdrawn and he must withdraw . . .

**Opposition Member:** — Withdraw what?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, if I might proceed again . . . They are trying to confuse me, and I don't know what it is all about here. Well I am sure they are not going to do it. I was going to point out that there were members in this house in those days that are not here now on both sides of the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think that the hon. member realizes that this statement, unless he is prepared to document some evidence, he must withdraw.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, would you give me the statement, will you quote what I said? Give me the statement that you are disputing, Mr. Speaker.

**March 22, 1962**

**Mr. Speaker:** — As I heard it and when the point was raised, a statement was made to the effect that the records will show, if you want to check later, that certain maps had certain names on and a year later certain names were removed and would give the government members time or any member, to unload. That was the statement which members rose and asked that it be withdrawn. I think that unless some evidence can be substantiated, it should be withdrawn. Withdrawal is not supposed to be a qualified withdrawal.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw if I have offended someone who didn't have any dealings, of course. If they are sensitive, I will withdraw it. I will withdraw it, under this one condition, a brief point.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I don't think we can allow conditions.

**Mr. Cameron:** — All right, I will withdraw it and make this explanation.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — The Legislative Assembly Act was amended for one year exempting the members of the legislature from their responsibilities under the act.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — That is right.

**Mr. Cameron:** — As yet no one on the government side has been able to tell me why?

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — What I set out to do at the beginning was to accept the challenge of the Minister of Mineral Resources, that if there were any under-the-table deals, that we had to be prepared to substantiate them. Mr. Speaker, I accepted that challenge. I came into the house tonight, I quoted not only newspaper clippings, but I quoted evidence given in the trial which revealed the information in documental form under the oath that

I repeated here tonight. I think that the statements I have made from here on in must be taken as accurate, if not they will dispute the records of the courts of this province.

I don't want to prolong this issue, because I understand that the Minister of Public Works would like to speak and no doubt the Minister of Mineral Resources.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — We want to vote.

**Mr. Cameron:** — All I would say is this — that these actions of these firms in the oil industry and the uranium industry must be laid squarely on the doorstep of this government, Mr. Speaker, I predict that the day will arrive when these people and others who have given testimony will believe that the greatest error they ever committed was when they became friends of this government.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — When the history of oil and the history of minerals is recorded in this province, it will give testimony, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this legislature, should the day arrive when I discover any under-the-table deals arranged by the Liberal Party either in power or out of power, on that day the Liberal Party and I part company.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, oh, hold the horse.

**An Hon. Member:** — Where is the Minister of Public Works?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, a very interesting news item in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of March 21, 1962. It is headed:

“Saskatchewan Economy Progressive, Stable,” says visiting bank head. Saskatchewan's economy was considered a progressive and stable one by the financiers in eastern Canada on Wall Street in New York

**March 22, 1962**

according to A.E. Hall, general manager, of the Toronto-Dominion Bank, Toronto.”

**Mr. Thatcher:** — He must be new to his job.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** —

“Investors have shown no hesitancy in moving into Saskatchewan and industry has moved in from other provinces and the United States have good results. Unemployment was a smaller percentage here than elsewhere. This was due largely to the secondary industries that were developing in Saskatchewan.”

I just thought, Mr. Speaker, that might be of a little bit of interest to this legislature after what we have listened to for the last hour or two. I am not going to take time or waste time to answer remarks of the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). He has made those before on many occasions; he has made imputations; he has talked about scandals; these are old, he made no charges, and I am not going to bother with them. He talks about under-the-table deals, and, Mr. Speaker, if there were any under-the-table deals, and he had any evidence at all, he could take me into the courts and take care of that, if I have been taking bribes for any deal or any other member of this government but he hasn't got the intestinal fortitude nor the proof or anything else. I have never heard or seen a better illustration of a frustrated politician on a very poor much-raking expedition than I saw tonight.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — That's exactly your temp Brock.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Answer the charges.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . he quoted me, he quoted the Premier, he quoted the former Premier, he quoted other people, he quoted oil companies and in all of them he was wrong in some detail. He put words into the mouths of these people that were not there, thinking that after seven or ten years people would forget them, but people will not believe

it any more than they did in 1952, and I just hope that this is a good omen and that he will have the same results in the election of 1964 that we had in 1952, after they made all the fuss about these things. The nerve of these people. He wants to know why The Legislative Assembly Act was amended, and I can tell him, because we wanted people in the north who make their living in mining and prospecting not to be shut out of the legislature, not to allow members of the legislature to go into the business.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — For one year?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You must remember . . . see my hon. friends, Mr. Speaker, are like a bunch of crows, caw, caw, caw, they go. Just like when you throw a stone at them. You'll hoot yet too.

Now many of the people in the north make a good deal of their living prospecting, by staking claims, by selling those claims to mining companies. Our Legislative Assembly Act prevents any of those people from being a member of the legislature, but it allows the person to sit on the Liberal side of the house, who gets his pay directly from the government of this province of Saskatchewan, next door to a civil servant, sitting right behind the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) and I watched him, he didn't blush a bit when the member for Maple Creek was talking about this.

**Mr. Guy:** — You know you are wrong.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I don't think we should have laws that should prevent these people from sitting in the legislature, but in that one year that this was in effect my hon. friend, and I say hon. with discretion, my hon. friend went about the province of Saskatchewan telling the people of Saskatchewan that the act had been amended so that the Minister of Mineral Resources and other members on this side of the house could get mining claims and get into the business in the north of the province. This is what they told and this was the reason it was repealed a year later, because we were not going to allow these people to go about with that kind of much-raking business. That's why it was done like this and the year the member for Maple Creek referred to — see what he tries to do with it today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal for a few minutes with a question that was raised on Tuesday in

**March 22, 1962**

this house, about mining companies leaving the province and I was very sorry that I was away on Tuesday but I was attending the annual meeting of the Canadian Petroleum Association in Calgary on their invitation, excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I got my notes mixed up here, but we'll make it.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — You've got more than notes.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — First of all I want to deal with these regulations that have been mentioned, and it is obvious that the people that were mentioning them on the other side of the house don't know much about them. These regulations came into effect on April 1st, 1961, almost a year ago. We had been working on these regulations for over a year; we had made several drafts, studied them and redrafted, we had sent out a draft to the mining industry across Canada and then we called the representatives of the mining industry to a meeting, this is a practice which we commonly follow.

At that meeting we went over these regulations section by section, now it is obvious that a meeting like this there will not be on all points, agreement. I pointed out, as I have often pointed out, that on questions like rent and royalties and fees that it is very unlikely that any government and the industry will ever agree. I think if hon. members were in the mining industry, they would be in favour of no royalties at all or a very low one, so we don't expect to have agreement on that point. In regard to this question of royalty I want to point out that for over 14 years we have had a 12½ per cent royalty on hard rock mining, 12½ per cent of net profit for mining. That is not new, it has been in effect for quite a long time. There was this difference up until a year ago, there was a choice, the company could take either 12½ per cent of net profit as the royalty or 5 per cent of the value of the mineral in the ore produced, which ever was the lesser, now the result of this was that when times were good, and profits were high mining companies choose to stay on the 5 per cent of the value of the mineral in the ore and when profits were low they would go back to 12½ per cent of net profit. It was, as far as the government was concerned, heads you win, tails I lose, because they were able to make this choice and when profits are high, is the time when no company can make very great complaint about the royalty. When we changed this royalty to remove that choice and make it 12½ per cent of profits from mining we also provided

for some new deductions, for example a mining company paying royalties can deduct from their net profit, all of the money that they spend on exploration within the province. That is a very important feature to have in. Another important feature is that there is a three year royalty free period for new mines.

Any new mine starting up gets three years free of royalty with only one limitation and that is if they make \$2 million in profits before the end of that three years then they start paying royalties. But that does mean that they would have to be a pretty good mine to do that. It certainly would be no small mine. This rate is the highest rate in Canada — the 12½ per cent is not the whole measure. It is these other things which can be deducted and the method in which this profit is calculated. Though some other provinces have a lower rate, they have differences in the methods of calculating the royalty. But when the profits are low, either because times are bad or because it is a very marginal mine, they will pay little or no royalty. But when they have it good then we will have it good in revenue too. Now that is the question with regard to royalty and I want to tell you about some of the other things that were put into these new regulations.

The limitation on the number of claims staked has been removed. There used to be a limitation on how many claims a prospector could stake in a year in a mining district. The rental on leases has been dropped. There is only a work commitment and no rental on leases. The first year of a claim or claim block is free of assessment work. All of these things are new and were put into the regulations a year ago. Credit for transportation costs will be allowed against assessment work where an owner of a claim or claims had to hire an airplane at Lac La Ronge and fly out to the bush, the cost of that flight and transporting his materials and equipment can be counted as a part of the assessment work. With only one limitation that it must be limited to 20 per cent of the total assessment work done.

I just mentioned the three year royalty-free period and of course more roads are now built into the Pre-Cambrian area — these will be further extended. This is a further advantage to the prospector and to the miner if a mine develops. Flying services and radio communications are made available and our geological and geophysical surveys are also services given to the mining fraternity by the Department of Mineral Resources.

**March 22, 1962**

Now, as I said we discussed these regulations and there was no serious disagreement unless it was on the question of royalty where there will always be disagreement on any of the procedures. I was very much surprised to hear the story that was quoted in the house on Tuesday that mining companies were pulling out because the regulations were supposed to be unworkable; they just couldn't live with them. The objection which I heard was in regard to supplying the evidence to show us that the assessment work had been done on claims. Now there was one more change in the regulations which I should explain to the house. Previously the assessment work which was valued at \$100 a year on each claim, was set out in the regulations as so much trenching, so much blasting or so much diamond drilling — in measures like that. This was not a fair measure and one of the purposes of changing our regulations was to get good useful work done and the mining industry wants to see that done. So we provided for \$100 of assessment work each year but not translated into so many feet of diamond drilling or so many cubic feet of trenching. So they have to keep that account and I think most people know what they spend. They report the amount of work they have done and the money they spent on it. The regulations say that this has to be shown to the satisfaction of the minister. A circular was sent out describing the kinds of work and the kind of information that could be sent in and there may be some things in this circular that are unnecessary. I don't know but we're going to have a look at it. But it pointed out that the actual money spent could either be — the evidence could be the certificate of a chartered accountant or a certified public accountant and then listen to this or an affidavit of any person who had knowledge of the facts. The prospector — the man who was doing the work — or any person who had knowledge of the facts could complete an affidavit and provide the evidence. I think everybody will realize that when you say there is to be \$100 worth of work done on each claim during each year after the first year, we want to see that it is done and it shouldn't be too much trouble to show that the work is done. But there has been no change in the regulations since last March 1st. That is one thing I want to get across.

I have been following up this question and I certainly intend to follow it up because the last thing I want to see is any of the companies which are doing some prospecting work pull out of the province of Saskatchewan. I am certainly willing to talk to them and if there is anything wrong with the way these things are set



out — okay — we can discuss them and we can get them fixed up. But I was very surprised and somewhat disappointed when without being notified that there was any objection at all to any of these things that the Leader of the Opposition knew about it even before I did. I was sorry that was the way the business is done. This is going to be followed up, Mr. Speaker. I hope it is a tempest in a tea pot. I am rather inclined to think it is but one can never tell. So that I think is all I have to say about that particular question at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about some of the things that were said during the last few days during this debate. Particularly I want to say a word or two about the amendment which was moved by hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall). I can't help but wonder if he didn't move this amendment just for a joke. Mr. Speaker, read the amendment and just let the members take a look at it. I would like my hon. friends opposite to see what he doesn't want. He doesn't want a budgetary deficit. He doesn't want a big public debt, he wants that reduced. He wants the interest payments reduced. He wants excessive administration costs reduced and he wants taxes reduced and he wants roads built and he wants gas in his town and he wants and he wants and he wants. So I have come to the conclusion that he just did it for a joke — introducing this amendment.

I think all the other members over there look at it exactly the same way because every one of them in speaking to this amendment urged the government to spend more money rather than less. Everyone of them has been urging that more money be spent. The member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) wants work and wages for all the people in his constituency. What would that do to the deficit. He wants houses and roads and air fields and they are all good ideas. He wants a road to Uranium City, but he doesn't want high taxes. He doesn't want a big debt, he doesn't want deficits. Now I am not sure how he is going to vote when it comes to voting on this amendment. I want to take that back, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, because these are the people who can ride two horses expertly. They can get up and they can vote against the budget and against having a deficit budget. They can vote against taxes and they can vote against borrowing money to build power lines and gas lines and then they can get up and want more money spent in their constituency. The member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) wants more highways.

**March 22, 1962**

The member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) wants gas. Somebody will give it to him some day. The mover of the amendment wants a park down at Boundary Dam and they all of course want more school grants, municipal grants, hospitals and land titles offices, court houses and all kinds of things and telephone offices and so on. After I listened to them talk, Mr. Speaker, they persuaded me that I should vote against the amendment, because I want to see these things done in Saskatchewan too. I know that if that amendment should carry we couldn't do these things without taxation and without borrowing money and without a deficit budget on a year like this.

The member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) complains about unemployment. His seat-mate the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) doesn't like us building the head office of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, even though it gives employment to a lot of people. They should speak to each other some time, Mr. Speaker, and find out where they really stand. If we took the advice of the members in the opposition, of course, we would have a deficit ten times as big as it is now and if they ever keep their promises, if they ever keep one-quarter of their promises they could do nothing else but increase the public debt.

Mr. Speaker, there is no smoking allowed in the legislature. There is a stranger smoking in the door back there. I am afraid he is going to blow up.

Mr. Speaker, they should also pay some attention or at least know what their national leader Mr. L.B. Pearson thinks and on January 31, 1961 he said: "We don't argue that you can cut taxes, spend more money and not have a deficit." That is what Pearson says, but this is what these people want us to do. The member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) is out of his seat just now but he is against the town of Abbey getting gas because he doesn't believe they should have gas and he is going to vote for this amendment. But we are going to see they get gas whether he wants it or not. The member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) is voting for this amendment which is against natural gas for Abernethy, Lemberg and Neudorf in his constituency.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — . . . took away the telephone exchange.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The man that rides two horses . . .

**Mr. McFarlane:** — . . . gave you \$140 thousand.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . and in Humboldt, the member is going to vote for the amendment, vote against Carmel getting gas, just because the big town of Humboldt has got gas you shouldn't be so mean with the little places like Carmel — let them have gas. The member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) is going to vote against Scott getting natural gas and the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) is going to vote against Mikado getting natural gas. Do these people really believe, Mr. Speaker, that you can put in natural gas without getting money to do it?

Then when it comes to highways they are all in it. The member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) — he is going to vote against oiling about 25 miles of highway in his constituency. In Humboldt the member is going to vote against 58 miles of blacktop through her constituency, both ways. I want to remind you that these are the things you are doing. Then when we come to Yorkton, the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) is against 40 miles of oil treatment in his constituency and 29 miles of grading and gravelling. He is also against the new hospital in Yorkton. I would say to the Minister of Highways, we didn't put these highways in the right place. We should have put them some place where they will be appreciated instead of here where these people will vote against them. In Rosthern, the member there doesn't want a road to the new bridge he got, so he is going to vote against the budget hoping that he doesn't get that new road.

Mr. Speaker, if I can get your consent I am going to get this speech of mine printed and send it out to the constituencies represented by the hon. members opposite.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I can think of a good use for them.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — How can they vote against these valuable improvements in their own constituencies I don't know, but I have to vote against the amendment and there is one thing I would like to talk about, but I am not going to take the time tonight and that is the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and the provincial debt. But I will leave that till next year because I know that will come up next year just the same as it came up this year,

**March 22, 1962**

and it will be just as good a subject to talk on. So I am not going to bother about it except to say this. In the balance sheet in the public accounts of 1943-44 they have an item on the asset side of the balance sheet, public improvements — it includes these buildings and the highways and everything else — \$56 million. The balance sheet that you find in the public accounts now — the public improvements are put in a nominal sum \$1.00.

**An Opposition Member:** — So what!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well you stuffed the account by putting in this asset back in 1943-44 just to make it look good. I want to go back for a minute to mineral resources because my hon. friend the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) according to him, we shouldn't have had any development in minerals at all. So I just want to point out to him that from 1946 to 1960 in Canada, the total value of mineral production went up from \$502 million to \$2,480 million. In Saskatchewan it went up from \$24.6 million to \$202.7 million. In Canada in that 14 years the percentage increasing the value of production of minerals was 493 per cent. That is a tremendous increase isn't it? Four hundred and ninety three per cent in Canada. In Saskatchewan 824 per cent.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — This is the answer to the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) and all the stuff that he tried to rake up tonight. Mr. Speaker, I won't support the amendment but I will support the motion.

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I didn't expect to participate in this debate, but there were statements made by hon. members opposite that need replying to. I was denied an answer to a question when the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) was speaking. Again extreme statements when he suggested, Mr. Speaker, that the government and I assume it was the provincial government should have frozen supplies of oats in elevators last July. As a matter of fact he ought to know that oats in elevators come under the jurisdiction of the wheat board. I informed him in my letter of reply in June that negotiations had taken place with the wheat board to . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — What date?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — June 23rd to retain supplies in elevators. I also told him that the policies that we have been following ever since had been already finalized at that time. He would like to get on the band wagon, Mr. Speaker, and suggest that he had to urge the government to do those things. For his own information, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform him that as a result of the freezing of oats in elevators in Saskatchewan we shared storage costs with municipalities on 445 thousand bushels of oats. Under the transportation assistance program we moved over 1,400,000 bushels of oats and barley which farmers acquired in farm to farm transactions. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, there are still over a million bushels of oats in elevators in Saskatchewan at this time. We have made arrangements for two hundred thousand bushels of seed oats in the province of Alberta. Apparently farmers have moved feed grain so freely under our transportation policy that when I was talking to the manager of the seed co-op in Moose Jaw he told me they haven't had many orders for seed oats. This may materialize but I would attribute it to the fact that farmers moved so much under the transportation policy.

The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) in his usual disregard for facts — he woke up, he went home and he discovered at this late date that some farmers were losing some calves. We knew, Mr. Speaker, that this probably would occur early last summer and he ought to know if he didn't have his ears plugged that we have been pounding away at this program of proper rations for livestock for supplementing feed with vitamin A particularly ever since last August. I have in my hand here, Mr. Speaker, a pamphlet that was issued jointly by the federal government and the three prairie provinces that urged farmers and told farmers what a balanced ration should be and we would have a testing of wheat . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — What was the name of it?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Take this over to the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) I don't know if it will do him any good. Subsequent to that, Mr. Speaker, we have put out pamphlets from our own department too in conjunction with the University of Saskatchewan. We have had T.V. programs, radio programs, until I was told we were placing too much emphasis on warnings that farmers ought to be very careful in the matter of supplementing their rations this year.

**March 22, 1962**

The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) seems to think that I should run around with a hypodermic needle, I suppose, and inject the cow expecting that by some miracle the calf is going to be born in the normal manner. I want to tell him that you have to start this kind of a program at least 7 or 8 months in advance.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes, and why didn't you do it.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, we have done this and will continue to do so. I need no advice from the hon. member for Maple Creek who suddenly wakes up and finds that there is a bit of a problem. We have been working on this problem since last summer under a variety of programs made available to livestock producers — some 14 emergency assistance programs in the department. They say nothing, Mr. Speaker, of the amount of feed and fodder that has already been moved to the amount of about 200 thousand tons. Doesn't the hon. member think that this did some good in terms of proper rations and proper nourishment. He ignored all this and he was just as wrong, Mr. Speaker, when speaking this evening as he was prior to the . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Questions should be asked before he takes his seat.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Did you not tell me right in this house two weeks ago when I raised the point that this was no problem that you have it under control?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I said to the hon. member that these are things you should expect under the circumstances. I suggested the problems right along. And the reason, Mr. Speaker, that it is brought to the forefront is because we now have 39 veterinarians and 39 veterinary service districts with veterinarians in the province and they are making people aware of this and bringing it to the public attention.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — There is nothing new about it, that is what I said.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. minister a question?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member over here is on his feet.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I notice Mr. Minister that you said we are having a bit of a problem. Do you still consider it just a bit of a problem?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I have never left the impression anywhere that this was just a bit of a problem. We were anticipating this problem and made preparations for it as long ago as last summer. This is what I said and I didn't say as the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) said that this wasn't a serious problem. It is a serious problem and we were aware of it. No more questions.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I believe I had the floor, Mr. Speaker, did I not?

**Mr. Speaker:** — You arose to ask a question.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — But I am rising now. I haven't spoken in this debate.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — You haven't spoken in the debate. I didn't know whether you had rose to speak in the debate or what you were doing.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, The Premier had the floor before . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — The Premier was on his feet when I had another question.

**March 22, 1962**

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out in connection with this cattle disease that when I arose and asked the question, the Minister of Agriculture said it was under control. The fact that he has since given lack of vitamin A as the cause as was pointed out at that time, that this thing is quite serious and the most serious part of it is that the vets don't know what vitamin they are short of.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Vitamin A.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — They are not short of vitamin A because there are all kinds of herds that have been fed vitamin A and the disease is still there. What I asked you to do was to find out if you could through your veterinary service what was causing this. It isn't vitamin A. You are wrong on that. There are all kinds of herds that have been fed their quota of vitamin A but the disease is still there. Your own vet, no I guess it was the dominion vet . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Dr. Bell is at the university . . . it is not only vitamin A but general nutritional deficiency.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — But Dr. Bell said that he didn't know, that he didn't know which vitamin it was. He admitted that he didn't think it was vitamin A shortage altogether. He knew there were cattle being fed vitamin A and the disease was still there. So I say again, that two weeks ago if the Minister of Agriculture hadn't been so sure and so cocky about, why we might have had some information for our local vets. Our local vet is convinced that it isn't a shortage of vitamin A that there is something else wrong and yet there we are going along and nothing is being done. All I ask the minister to do is to investigate and see if he could find out what other vitamins are short that was causing these deaths.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, unlike the Minister of Agriculture I did rather expect to speak in this debate, but I didn't really expect to start five minutes before the vote was to be taken. I rise with that amount of time, but it is time to make one or two remarks.



May I first of all, Mr. Speaker, express as many other members have done, congratulations to the Provincial Treasurer on the first class budget address which he gave to this house a few days ago.

I was the resident of that particular office for a very short period of time, and for that perhaps the opposition don't seem to be nearly as thankful as they ought to be. Having been there for a short period of time I know something of the difficulties and complexities involved, and I know I can say on behalf of myself and the government and the people of the province, that they will be heartened and gratified on the way in which the Provincial Treasurer presented the budget, in which he and his staff and the government have prepared.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to say with regard to the remarks of the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) earlier this evening, that this kind of address seems to me falls into the category of one which should not be made. A few nights ago I went back and I reread the same address, with very few differences at least, that the same hon. member made in this legislature in 1950 or 1951. The point that he emphasized as he finished, and emphasized over and over again was that, "I make no charges here." Over and over again he said I make no charges. Reread the records.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I said I do make charges.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, reread the records.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Premier Lloyd:** — He told us he made no charges, on one occasion when it appeared that he had made a charge and when he was challenged on it, he withdrew it and distorted the words which he had previously said.

**Mr. Cameron:** — No, no.

**Premier Lloyd:** — The significant point is that there was no clear cut statement, but a statement that was full of innuendo and of inference. But at no point did he say that wrong had been done by members of the government or that there had been action which was illegal taken by members of the government. He makes this kind of slinking reference that somebody who is supposed to be friends of the government

**March 22, 1962**

that somebody is getting good deals somehow or other, but he made no charges, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that he will in fact make no charges because charges of that kind cannot be sustained by evidence of any degree of fact.

**Mr. Cameron:** — It has been proven now.

**Premier Lloyd:** — I want to turn from that and say a very few words about some of the other statements that were made earlier. When the financial critic was speaking, he pointed out, with regard to the deficit, that other provinces do not find themselves in this position. I don't know where he gets his information. I rather think the answer is probably that he doesn't get information, I happen to have in my hand at the moment a summary compiled by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, of provincial surpluses or deficits in all the provinces of Canada for the last three years. Those provinces which have surpluses have been entered for that particular year in black. For those three years for those ten provinces, Mr. Speaker, there are only one, two, three, four, five black figures, and two of those are in the province of Saskatchewan. In other words in all the provinces in Canada, the province of Saskatchewan has had more regularly surpluses than any other province in the Dominion of Canada, over the last three years. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if the financial critic watched this last year, to take a look at the Liberal province of New Brunswick with a population more than ours, and a production less than ours, he will find a much bigger deficit than ours.

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . figures it produced.

**Premier Lloyd:** — If you want to take a look at the province of Manitoba. We find the deficit, if their records were compiled on our basis, to the extent of some 10 or 15 millions of dollars. May I just say a word in the thirty seconds that are left in regard to the matter of provincial debt.

Here again there is what can be considered a pretty gross misrepresentation of the facts. They take the gross debt ignoring the fact that Saskatchewan is the only province in Canada, which has under a public program, all of the utilities of power, of gas, and of

telephones. They ignore at the other end that in some other provinces such as Manitoba, Ontario, the debts of the power corporation is guaranteed by the province, it is the same kind of responsibility for the province, and is not in their total debt.

Again if you look at the total responsibilities of provincial governments, of net debts plus contingent liabilities and guarantees you find Saskatchewan has the lowest of these in the entire Dominion of Canada.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Highest in Canada — hon. member . . .

**Premier Lloyd:** — The hon. members refuse to face the facts . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not support the amendment, I will support the motion.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Highest in Canada.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — . . . juggling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

Amendment (Mr. MacDougall) negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 19**

**Messieurs**

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

NAYS — 31

Messieurs

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

Motion (Hon. Mr. Blakeney) agreed to on the above division reversed.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:49 o'clock p.m.