

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature
21st Day

Friday, March 23, 1962.

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

On the Orders of the Day:

CORRECTION

Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to make a correction of some of my remarks yesterday and tender an apology to the house.

In the heat of the political debate, Mr. Speaker, I made some remarks about the press and I read the transcript this morning and I see that I so phrased my statements to include all members of the working press and this I certainly had not meant to do. My remarks rather had been intended to point out the relationship between the owners of newspapers and the well-established editorial points of view that are expressed by them, and with this correction, Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude this statement by apologizing to the house for expressing myself rather badly in this respect and certainly to withdraw any remarks that might reflect on the integrity of the press gallery.

QUESTION: RE OIL COMPANIES

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Mineral Resources, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Premier?

Is the Premier aware that two more oil companies, Sun Oil Company and Canadian Fina Limited this month discontinued their operations in Regina to move elsewhere? If so, will the government give immediate consideration to reviewing the regulations which apparently are discouraging oil exploration and development work in Saskatchewan?

March 23, 1962

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I have no information on this point, I add this as I did the other day that the government is always ready to review any regulations which may be discouraging development. To my knowledge, we do not have such regulations. To my knowledge, these regulations have not been responsible for the movement of oil companies elsewhere.

QUESTION: RE MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): —Mr. Speaker, may I direct a further question to the Premier, and I remind him that is the third oil company in two months that has moved.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! We cannot debate a question.

Mr. Thatcher: — I was going to direct this again to the Minister of Mineral Resources but he is not here, so I will direct it to the Premier.

Has the government called a meeting of representatives of the mining industry as requested by the Saskatchewan Chamber of Mines yesterday to discuss government restrictions which are causing some gold exploration companies to leave Saskatchewan?

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the member commented that this was the third oil company to leave Saskatchewan. It is true that because of centralization of certain business functions, some of the office procedures have been transferred from this province to other provinces as has happened in other parts of Canada.

Secondly, with regard to the gold mining industry, the Minister of Mineral Resources made what I felt was a very clear and complete statement on this last night in his speech and I say the minister is in Saskatoon today, and is in contact with certain representatives of this gold mining industry in order to remove any objections they may appear to have and which may be considered as valid and again to point out that the minister did yesterday, that the telegram of one day earlier this week was the first indication we had received that there was any problem whatsoever to the industry.

QUESTION: RE PRINCE ALBERT BY-ELECTION

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier.

Has the government yet given any consideration to setting a date for the Prince Albert by-election?

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I think nothing could speak more eloquently of the insensitivity of the Leader of the Opposition than the question which he has just asked. We had the funeral just the day before yesterday.

QUESTION: RE FREIGHT ASSISTANCE

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

I wonder in view of the fact that freight assistance is being provided to those who are bringing in hay from the United States up to the present time, I wonder if his department has given any consideration to also including corn on the feed and fodder free freight assistance policy?

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, there has been some corn moved in, we have been asked to give it consideration but in every case so far when we made enquiry, we found that there were sufficient stocks of feed oats and barley in local elevators.

QUESTIONS: RE FREIGHT ON SEED GRAIN

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Agriculture.

I wonder if he can give this house any indication

March 23, 1962

or any assurance of whether the freight and seed grain freight assistance policy will be extended or will it be closed off at April 1st.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — On seed grain and fodder the agreement with the federal government expires March 31st and the case of feed grain for which we have assumed complete financial responsibility for transportation assistance, the cut-off date is March 31st and for seed it will be extended to April 30th.

Mr. McFarlane: — Do I take it from you then that the assistance on fodder be cut-off March 31st?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That is right, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION: RE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Moved:

That this Assembly, gravely concerned with the growing threat of high and permanent unemployment, requests the Government of Saskatchewan:

- (1) to urge the Government of Canada to undertake immediate projects and economic planning to provide a condition of full employment in Canada; and
- (2) to co-operate as far as possible with the Government of Canada in any programs or plans which will bring about full employment.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this being my first opportunity, I wish to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this house. You and I Sir, have been members of this Assembly for many years and I can honestly say that you have given valiant service to the work of this house and fully warrant the position you now hold.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall about a year ago a very similar motion to the one that I am introducing today was debated by many members from both sides of the

house and some members went far afield on this question of unemployment and possibly I was as guilty as some of the other members. As mover of the motion today I do hope to put the case of unemployment before this house and to offer some solution or some remedy to bring about full employment.

Mr. Speaker, I have made the motion as simple as I can. I haven't cluttered it up with the different remedies and solutions. I think the federal government has been made well aware of what can be done and what should be done to bring about a state of full employment. I think I can truthfully say that all the members in this Assembly will agree with the first sentence of the motion, "That this Assembly is gravely concerned with the growing threat of high and permanent unemployment," and I think also, Mr. Speaker, that I can truthfully say that all members of this house will do all they can to bring about full employment in Canada today. I don't think that I can say that all members of the house will agree in the solution or remedy for bringing about of full employment, but to the person that is unemployed, any remedy at all will be acceptable to them to bring security and peace of mind of full employment.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment spells tragedy to wage earners and his family. It means physical and mental suffering. It means the loss of human dignity, the degradation of people. It means premature school drop-out and other social problems such as slum conditions, broken homes, juvenile delinquency and many other social problems. To the people of Canada, it means the loss of billions of dollars worth in goods and service. Now it is not good enough to say that unemployment is less now than it was last year, or that the labour force is higher this year than it was last. Unemployment which was bad during the last Liberal federal government has become progressively worse under the present government. It runs from a low peak of approximately 4% to a high peak in March of around 8-12 per cent. In fact the average for the last two years has been approximately 7 per cent of our labour force are unemployed. And it is pretty safe to say that 5 per cent of our labour force are permanently unemployed the year round.

What makes the unemployment situation so serious, the long run chronic unemployment, is a problem of growth.

From 1950-56 the gross national production showed an average real increase of 5.6 per cent per year.

March 23, 1962

Unemployment during that period averaged 3.5 per cent. Then we go to 1957-59 and the gross national production averaged a growth of 1.3 per cent per year while unemployment averaged 5.9 per cent per year. In other words, whereas the gross national production dropped 4.3 per cent unemployment increased 2.4 per cent. During these years, a growth of production did not keep pace with population. Between the end of 1956 and the end of 1959 population increased 8.2 per cent but the gross national expenditure in the same period rose only 4.1 per cent, so real gross national products per head has actually gone down.

What about the future, Mr. Speaker? The labour force has been gradually increasing because of the children born in post war years reaching the working age and coming into the market, and it is estimated that 2 million jobs must be found in Canada in the next ten years. In the absence of some spectacular change in the operation of our economy, the future really looks bleak to many workers. I say it is a disgrace that we have not today an overall national policy to deal with the unemployment situation. So far all we have done is to dip very deeply into the unemployment insurance fund and a winter works program which has taken care of about 1 per cent of our unemployed in Saskatchewan.

I will be very surprised of course if we don't hear from the opposition as to what this government has done about unemployment. I am sure they have got to have their little fun, even if it is at the expense of the unemployed.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that our record has been good considering that we had the worst crop conditions since 1937. We have maintained a vigorous program of public works, buildings, we have two dams going, we have a big program on highways, grid roads, our family farm improvement program, urban sewer and water, a very extensive program on power and gas and of course we have our crown corporations — God bless them! — who provide employment for some 5,600 men and women with a payroll of \$26.5 million. These people would not be employed if the present government were not here today.

On top of this, we have gone along with every approved project on the winter works program and contributed to the extent of over \$2 million in the last four years, and another \$660 thousand for a winter camp ground and picnic area on a 50-50 basis with the federal government.

If you look at our supplemental estimates, you will find that we had to spend an additional \$2.6 million because of our crop conditions, in feed and fodder and to help our farmers. Another item of \$1,750,000 for fighting the worst fire conditions in the north the last summer. And yet the opposition are appealing to us to curtail expenditures to do away with deficit budgeting and that means of course to put more people out of work. Surely no intelligent person will contend that any provincial government, rich or poor, can cope with the serious unemployment crisis and of course there are some very notable people who realize that this is a common problem to the whole of Canada and it is reasonable and proper that we should look to national action and national policies to cure the situation. I want to remind the members that not too many years ago the Rt. Hon. Mr. St. Laurent, who was then Prime Minister of Canada had this to say in Quebec City, and I quote:

“If I and my colleagues cannot so manage the economy of Canada, so that there will be jobs available for all, then you had better throw us out of office.”

Now we all know what happened to the Louis St. Laurent, but then we elected another Prime Minister the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker, who assured us, and I quote:

“No one will suffer from unemployment if you elect me and my Conservative party.”

Now these notable persons, Mr. Speaker, know this is a national problem, and they know also that the people know that it is a national problem, one that can only be dealt with adequately by the federal government who have the controls of the means to properly attack the unemployment situation and yet the present government in Ottawa has done very little more than their predecessor, they have sat there twiddling their thumbs, hoping that by some stroke of magic the free enterprise would come up with some solution to the unemployment situation. There has been absolutely no new policy to deal with the unemployment situation.

Somebody in this house was talking about the European countries and how there was full employment seemed to be more jobs than there were people, that is true because these people, because of survival alone, had to plan, they had to think of various means of providing employment, some of them were built in, some of them could be used and removed.

March 23, 1962

Sweden has a very interesting and a very happy situation where the industrialist, the worker, the farmer, co-operate with the government when a crisis arises. But in Canada our economy is controlled by those who own the means of production. These are the same people who refused to produce one item for war on a 5 per cent cost-plus basis for the McKenzie King government when we went to war in 1939. These are the people who were prepared to see our men and women go to war unprepared. It is logical now to expect these same people will have any more sympathy for the hundreds of thousands of people who are looking for jobs today. If there is any doubt in anybody's mind then I want you to consider the present campaign put on by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, "Operation Freedom" is a definite ultimatum that they will not stand for any government interference; that they will not budge one inch from the position they now hold on the economy of Canada.

History has proven that the only time that we do have full employment is when we have government intervention during war. Oh yes, there will be those who say, "What about the post war period?" That is true, we had full employment during the reconstruction period, but we also had a terrific amount of defence spending. In fact, I think we spent more on the cold war than we did on a hot war and if we took the defence spending today out of our economy, it would fall flat on its face. Canada is an industrial nation. It depends on its exports to get rid of its surplus. Markets are becoming scarcer and scarcer and there are more market blocks today in the world and the situation looks indeed grim as far as Canada is concerned. Unemployment helped to defeat the last Liberal federal government and it will defeat the present government in Ottawa and it will defeat any government that refuses to accept its responsibility for the unemployment situation.

Mr. Speaker, organized labour had no other choice but to go into politics. It had to challenge on behalf of all workers, it had to challenge the apathy of the two old parties in their approach to the problems of the workers and especially this problem of unemployment. It is interesting to me at least to notice the time, the energy and the money that is spent all across this nation to discredit the New Democratic Party. The party which some claim will not get off the ground. The people behind this propaganda of course are not spending the money for no reason at all, they know quite well that this is a real threat, a real challenge to the control which they now hold

on the Canadian economy. It recalls to me anyway, the early days of the CCF in this province, when the CCF were ridiculed, where is that motley bunch going to pick a cabinet? I think our cabinets compare very favourably with any previous cabinets, in fact I think some of them have been above many of the other cabinets that we have had in this province.

We were persecuted, run out of constituencies, halls refused to rent to our party, gangsters broke up our meetings. It happened in Saskatchewan under a Liberal government. The Liberal government who believes in democracy, great defenders of the freedom of the individual. Now, Mr. Speaker, the emphasis of our economy has been on private or personal goods and our public development has lagged far behind. We build nice homes, we landscape them, but we kind of complain if they hire a couple of garbage collectors to pick up the litter and garbage around, or we complain if they hire another policeman, or a fireman to protect our property. We don't seem to mind how much we spend on a luxury automobile, but we do complain if they spend too much on a good road on which to run this automobile. We spend a lot of money on liquor and tobacco, but we don't seem to spend enough on health and education. There must be a long term expansion of our social capital, of our public services. There is room for a big and sustaining increase in the expenditures in health, education, child welfare, low rental housing, slum clearances and urban development, parks and roads development and conservation of natural resources. Education alone provides an enormous field for expansion, the Canadian Conference of Education three years ago said that by 1965 total expenditures required on education would be 2 1/3 times, just to provide the extra enrolment resulting from extra population. This is without providing anything for better quality or better service.

We find today, Mr. Speaker, that our young workers are not properly equipped to go out into the market today and we are persuading many of them to return and get the necessary education. Now 2 1/3 times the amount that we are providing for education, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, is far more than a provincial or local authorities are able to take care of. There are suggestions that there could be changes in the mechanism of our unemployed insurance fund. Galbraith in his book, "The Affluent Society," suggested that during high peaks of unemployment the payments could be increased to approximately 75 per cent of the wage earned by the individual. This would give him purchasing power to start the wheels of industry

March 23, 1962

going and put him back to work and then during the low peaks payments could be reduced because there would be jobs available and the worker would only require a little to go from one job to another. The Canadian Congress of Labour has suggested to increase the payments according to the duration of the unemployment of the worker. Some say that this is going to require a strain on the treasury of the federal government but that does not necessarily need to be, because as you return workers to work they will be able to contribute and replenish the insurance fund.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada have got to ask themselves whether they are going to find the money or whether they are going to continue with a cancer of unemployment. When we consider the cost to bring about full employment, I would like to give you the opinion of one who has possibly had more to do with the economy of Canada than any man in the country today and I speak of Mr. Coyne, who as you all know has been the Governor of the Bank of Canada, or had been for quite a period of time and if I may be permitted, I would like to read a couple of sentences from a speech he made while he was the Governor of the Bank of Canada, and I quote:

“Whatever degree of assistance the people of Canada decide to provide to the unemployed even up to the point of guaranteeing them income equal to that which they had when they were employed, if that should be the decision of the community it can be provided without resort to large scale government deficits or monetary inflation. Similarly as regards to the problem of providing employment for the unemployed on direct government projects, there are no financial obstacles to government at all levels expanding their operations so as to provide useful and productive work for the entire number of the unemployed, including suitable work for the skilled as well as the unskilled, the clerical and the technological as well as the manual worker if and to the extent that it is found necessary or desirable to provide employment directly through government projects, whether national, provincial or municipal. Suitable financial methods can be found to meet the cost and share the burden without resort to large deficit financing or monetary inflation.”

I consider that that should be considered very thoroughly, Mr. Speaker.

There are many and varied means that could be employed to cure unemployment but it requires at Ottawa a government that has the courage to give the leadership, they have the control of the trades and markets, and have control of the monetary policies and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the words of the Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent to the effect that if the powers at Ottawa cannot so manage the economy of Canada so that there will be jobs available to all, are just as true today, Mr. Speaker, as the day that they were spoken.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move seconded by the member of Kindersley-Kerrobot the motion that stands on the order paper in my name.

Mr. E.A. Johnson (Kindersley-Kerrobot): — Mr. Speaker, this is a most important resolution. In fact, of all the problems that vex Canada in the present day is my own view that apart from the foreign affairs problem of peace, that the matter of unemployment and development takes priority as being the problem of greatest magnitude. I might add that this is a problem which the New Democratic Party believes it can solve. The New Democratic Party believes that excessive unemployment is an abomination and I might say that this group feels that it has a solution and this has caused the party to be formed.

The mover has most ably dealt with this matter in a very comprehensive way and I might add at this time that there are few people who are better qualified to speak on this topic. The member for Saskatoon (Mr. Stone) has been a working man, a machinist for some 46 years and those of us here know that he has been a member of this legislature for the past 18 years.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Johnson: — I do not presume, Mr. Speaker, in any way to be as competent to deal with this matter as the member that has moved this resolution and as a representative of a farming community, I believe that the people that I represent would wish me to speak on behalf of this resolution. Certainly farming

March 23, 1962

people recognize that unemployment causes a loss, a direct loss to the farm market and certainly farm people recognize that when there is excessive unemployment that there is a production of a potential that is not being used and of course farm people also recognize that there is a direct loss of economic strength in the nation of Canada when there is excessive unemployment as we have been experiencing over the past few years. I might add that in further reasons why the farmers find this resolution interesting and important is that there has been continual migration from the farm to the city and many farmers have found themselves in the labouring field and many of them have unfortunately found themselves in the ranks of the unemployed.

This is not a problem that is peculiar to this province, Mr. Speaker, in fact, if I may quote from the Monthly Review of the Bank of Nova Scotia, they indicated that for Canada for the 10 year period prior to 1956, that some 35 per cent of the farm labour force moved from the farm and into the city. This represents a number of people of some 400,000. If I may quote further from this, Mr. Speaker, the mover has already made reference to this but in anticipating the future it is expected that our labour force will be added to and that unless we find an adequate number of new jobs, that the ranks of the unemployed will be further added to. This is particularly unfortunate and this matter of unemployment falls particularly hard on certain groups of people. Among those more apt to suffer from unemployment as the mover indicated are the young people from the ages of 14-24, the unskilled and also those who are somewhat past their best working age. Also this brochure indicates that a rate of unemployment of some 3 to 4 per cent is generally considered acceptable and this is because there are always people changing jobs, people laid off, people on holidays and so on but the high level that the mover has indicated of 7, 8, 9, 10 — 12 per cent are certainly unacceptable and certainly we feel it is the responsibility of the government to alleviate this problem with as much as it is possible and certainly it would be wrong to deny that action has not already been taken by governments to mitigate the hardships of unemployment. If I may cite some of these that have a beneficial effect, we have things like Unemployment Insurance, Mothers' Allowance, Old Age Assistance and so on. I merely wish to point out that these are mainly government sponsored, government administered programs and that most of them receive tax support. This makes one point, that governments have been

involved in this matter of unemployment and have accepted some responsibility. I may also add that our provincial government has also accepted responsibility to mitigate the problems of unemployment.

The mover of the motion has indicated the public works program, he has indicated that the province has been willing to finance these programs, even at a deficit and this as I understand it is considered to be sound and acceptable economic method in times of recession.

I think that we could also add that the provincial government has done a great deal in establishing the educational opportunities for our young people. Previously the ranks of the unemployed unfortunately had many in them of those who are unskilled, and untrained, and the provincial government through an extensive educational program in the schools, technical schools, universities and so on has certainly helped immensely in this way and we would also add that the provincial government has co-operated with the federal government in its program. This resolution of course calls for some further action by the provincial government, it also calls for further action by the federal government. This brings us to this point, if we accept that unemployment or excessive amounts of unemployment is undesirable and if we accept it as a problem that it won't solve itself and if we accept that it is a problem beyond the scope of the provincial government and if we believe that there is some action that a federal government can take, then we must feel absolutely justified in supporting this resolution.

I don't wish to make these as simple assertions I think in this legislature that with the exception possibly of the lady member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) and possibly the member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) that all of us recollect some experience of the depression of the thirties and this is my own viewpoint, was caused not so much by Liberals or Conservatives as such, but it was caused laissez faire attitudes of the government of the day. I also believe, and I intend to give further evidence to this respect that other countries have seemingly found a solution to the unemployment problem, because I would like to deal with this matter further, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: RE RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT

Mr. C.B. Peterson (Kelvington): — Moved:

That this Assembly is of the opinion that any policy of the federal government respecting the abandonment or relocation of railway lines should take into account necessity of retaining sufficient lines to serve agriculture and industry of western Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think this motion dealing with rail line abandonment is perhaps a matter that is much more far reaching than is generally realized. I would say that the subject matter of this resolution is without doubt a matter of great concern for a large segment of people of this province. I am particularly concerned about the affect it will have on the people of my constituency, people who live in the vicinity of Hazel Dell, Okla, Lintlaw, Nut Mountain, Kelvington and in the southern part of the constituency, people who live in and around Bankend, Westbend and Edmore. These people will be seriously affected if the branch lines serving these areas are abandoned. People who have for the most part depended on rail service as an indispensable part of their farming or business operations and as a part of their way of life. These people have helped to build up their respective communities and services such as are common to any town or village many of these people would not have settled in these areas had it not been for the railways in the first place. The very fact that these people are here have made other demands for public services, such as roads, schools, more power lines, telephones and I could go on and on, but in addition to these services which have been brought about at public expense of building new and modern homes. Many of these homes may become vacant, if the rail line is abandoned. In addition to these are the business men who have invested their life savings in various businesses and enterprises which have served a useful purpose, making a way of life possible for the community as a whole. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, what is going to become of these people if the rails are lifted? It would appear that their investment will be undoubtedly depreciated completely. They will no doubt be left with nothing to do and perhaps nowhere to go and their property will have little or no value.

Another aspect of hardship that will inevitably

accrue if the business services of these small communities is forced to withdraw is that the remaining population will not only be required to travel greater distance to market with their products but of necessity will have to travel greater distance to obtain their supplies. These people for the most part have borne an undue share of the national freight burden.

It was said during the 1959 farm delegation to Ottawa, that and I quote:

“More than two-thirds of the wheat grown in western Canada is sold abroad. This fact is important because it puts the wheat producer in a class apart from most other Canadians. The conditions of these markets are dictated not by the prosperity of the demands of his fellow Canadians but by the terms of trade on the world market.”

To quote further:

“Where other Canadian groups are often able to pass on to others the steadily increasing costs, Canadian producers are totally unable to do so. All of their wheat, even that part used in Canada is priced on the basis of world competition. Therefore any increase in Canadian costs is borne by the farmer in order to keep the price of his product in line with the price prevailing in the world market. The general rise in freight charges also fell more heavily on the people of the west. In the last ten years accumulated increase in railway general freight charges totalled about 142 per cent after allowing for the \$20 million federal government freight rate subsidy for the year ending July 31, 1960. The domestic price of bread kept pace with the general rise in prices of nearly everything the farmer buys as a consumer and a producer. Rising to a price of 19¢ a loaf for an average 12¢ ten years ago. But the farmers share of the increase has actually declined. He still receives about 3¢ for the wheat going to one loaf of bread indicating a relative decline in his share. On the market the farm price to the grain grower for a bushel of wheat has fallen from the average of \$1.59 during the peak year period 1945-53 to \$1.37 in 1955-56 and \$1.34 in 1956-57 and \$1.29 in 1957-58.”

March 23, 1962

A decline then of 30¢ per bushel in those ten years and since that time, since this was written in 1959, bread has increased another 3¢ but the wheat hasn't increased so we see the distance is still even further.

Not only are the people of Saskatchewan paying more and more for the things that they buy but they are getting less and less for the wheat that they sell.

Now then, part of this is due to the high freight cost. This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the most important facts that the government of Canada must recognize in dealing with the railways of western Canada. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to deal at any length with the MacPherson Report on the Royal Commission on Transportation but I would like to point out that the commission recognizes the inequities of freight rate structure as that being borne by shippers of non-competitive traffic. It is also recognized that the railways have until very recently enjoyed a virtual monopoly on shipping in western Canada and because of this shippers have been at the mercy of the railways.

In concluding my remarks I maintain that it is hoped that because the railways have been given tremendous direct subsidies that the railways should realize that they have a direct obligation to the public. They should also realize that the railways have determined to a large extent where towns and villages were to be built in the first place, rather than the towns and villages determining where their railways were to be built. I will however concede that eventually it may become necessary to abandon certain sections of our railway system because the demands of service may diminish to a point where losses would occur beyond the point where the losses could be recovered to the use of more profitable sections.

It must be remembered however, that the C.P.R. had a net profit of \$33 million last year. This should be reason enough to believe that there will be no immediate need for railway abandonment because of economic conditions at least for a number of years hence. Another well-known fact, every shipping point has certain installations established by others apart from railways. Some installations being comparatively new such as grain elevators and petroleum marketing facilities and so on. These must also be considered in view to orderly advancement. Only after adequate notice and by saying that I mean 5, 10 or 15 years, has been given to permit the necessary

depreciation and relocation of these installations to avoid serious loss to the owners.

In other words the whole matter must be considered as a unit as it affects all concerned so that if any such move becomes necessary that ample notice will be given to allow these facilities to relocate and that sufficient consideration be given to the need for alternate rural roads required to accommodate an adjustment of this magnitude. The construction of alternate rural roads will certainly require a new concept in financing circles. The financial burden already borne by the rural municipalities must not be allowed to be aggravated further by the additional cost of these alternate roads. It is to be hoped then that the Government of Canada will provide financial assistance for such roads that no rail line abandonment will be permitted until the services that are now available will be replaced by a suitable substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by Mr. Broten this motion.

Mr. H.A. Broten (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a very important resolution. It could affect a very large section of our population. Rail line abandonment means curtailment of existing service and convenience. Also it will add a certain cost to production, because the farmer having to haul his grain further to market and also his service centre will disappear in many instances and thus he will be forced to drive further for his supplies. When forty thousand farmers have already been forced off the farms by the cost-price squeeze I maintain Sir, that further added cost should not be contemplated until the farmer gets more money from his produce in order to meet his higher costs. Further I submit Sir, that this abandonment should not take place under present conditions, especially when purchasing power of the bushel of wheat is at an all-time low.

A pamphlet which the wheat pool put out in 1957 when they were distributing information to the public regarding the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat tells quite a story. It shows that in the years between 1914-57 the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat has been lower in only four years than it was in 1957. Those years being 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933. The reason for this can be seen very clearly if one looks at the price index given by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. With the

March 23, 1962

figures between 1935-39 based on 100 regarding farm costs, we would get the following information.

Cost index, inclusive of living costs, has gone up from 123.6 in 1945 to 256.3 in August 1960. That is the cost of production has gone up 132.7 or 9.1 points more than double what it was in 1945. So you can see that line abandonment with these things in mind would cause tremendous dislocation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say more on this subject but at this time I feel as time is up I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: RE LONG DISTANCE TOLL SERVICE

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Moved:

That this Legislature urges the Government to maintain the long distance toll service in the city of Melville in order to provide comparable facilities with other cities in the province.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the motion that stands in my name on the order paper, I might say that I think it fits in well with the order of business to date in the legislature this afternoon. The first resolution related to unemployment and of course the action that is contemplated in this resolution could affect the question of employment, at least in one centre in the province of Saskatchewan.

The other resolution has to do with the cutting of services in the various fields in the province of Saskatchewan. Of course the motion I have the privilege to move this afternoon has to do with both questions because it relates to the question of employment in the main centre in the constituency in which I represent, as well it relates to the cutting of necessary services to that community and to the area in which the city of Melville is located.

I therefore deem it a privilege today to take this opportunity although it may be confined to one section of this province, to speak on behalf of the people of the city of Melville, and to ask the support of all members in this house for the resolution that I am going

to move, not so that any service can be taken from any other part of the province of Saskatchewan, but that the city of Melville, the only city which under the orders and decisions of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones, will be without long distance toll service, after the actions of that corporation is taken, to see to it that those services are retained in the city of Melville.

I think one of the major reasons why the people of Melville have a right to make this request of the government, is the fact that of the 11 cities in the province of Saskatchewan, they will be the only city left without direct long distance toll service, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if that alone was the only argument in their favour, that they would have a right to ask the members of this legislature and this government to give consideration to their plea and their request to have this service retained in the city of Melville.

I would like to say here that I appreciate very much, as well, the fact that my friend the member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) (I might say that Yorkton and Melville have quite often been competing for things in the past) but I appreciate the fact that my friend, the member for Yorkton, has agreed to second this motion, not in order to take anything from the city of Yorkton, but to have retained in the city of Melville the services they have had to date.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been an argument going on between the people of the city of Melville and the Minister of Telephones and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones, as to whether or not long distance toll service should be retained in the city of Melville.

I am going to take a few moments this afternoon to read into the records of this house some of the correspondence that has taken place between the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Melville, and the Minister of Commerce of the city of Melville, and the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Telephones, the senior member for the city of Regina (Mr. Williams). I am not going to attempt to read all the correspondence because time would not permit me to do so, but I think in order to answer some of the arguments that have been made by the Saskatchewan Government Telephones through the Minister of Telephones, I should read at least one of the letters in its entirety that was received by the Chamber of Commerce at Melville, from the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Telephones.

March 23, 1962

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Telephones): — May I have the date of the letter?

Mr. Gardiner: — The date of the letter was November 24, 1961. It is written to Mr. Harry Swartz, vice president of the Melville and District Chamber of Commerce, Melville, Saskatchewan, and the letter reads as follows:

“Dear Sir: This will acknowledge receipt of your recent letter in which it is suggested the closing of the Melville office be postponed until such time as all other changes have been completed. The fact that Canora and Melville are an equal distance from Yorkton really has nothing to do with the situation. As was explained to your group a few weeks ago by far the greater number of lines from the west and southwest run into Yorkton, and it is only logical to include the city of Melville with these. The town of Canora will be a toll centre for the northwestern part of the province. As you know the community dial office program will not be completed for approximately ten years. I have the impression when your committee met with us about six weeks ago,”

I think he had a mistaken impression, Mr. Speaker,

“that you were in agreement with what we were doing.”

Now when he said it would be in agreement with the action that was being taken would be very foolish in the extreme and I don't think the people of Melville have ever agreed to this change.

“Following are the main reasons we wish to proceed sometime in the spring of next year.

1. There will be an annual saving of approximately \$19 thousand on conversion of Melville to a community dial office.”

And I want to say here, in between the arguments that are presented by the minister in his letter, I want to place before this house arguments to prove that the

suggestions that are made by the minister as to the saving to taxpayers of this province, are possibly not true but even if they were, they are so slight in their savings to the taxpayers of this province when one city and an area of this province is being denied services that are being granted to every other city in this province, that they are very slight, with regard to the services that are going to be curtailed to the people of the city of Melville. The minister states that the extra cost to the corporation will be approximately \$19 thousand. Well I am quite certain I am not going to bring politics into these particular matter, but I want to say to the minister that this is the first time I have ever heard any minister trying to use economy as a reason for taking an action of this type, as long as the present government has been in office, because the members on this side from time to time, Mr. Speaker, have urged upon this government economies in many fields, where it would not require the curtailing of services to the people of this province, and time after time this government has refused to accept those suggestions. Now the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Telephones tells the people of the city of Melville, that in order to save the Saskatchewan Government Telephones \$19 thousand they are going to have their long distance toll service taken away from the city of Melville.

Now the second reason given by the minister in his letter to the Chamber of Commerce.

“The firm would require an estimated \$30 thousand for building extension which will not be necessary if we continue with our present plan.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't begrudge any of the points in this province's increases in services or building increase, but during the past year in the period of time that the government was contemplating the action that I am speaking about this afternoon during the same period, four central offices in the same area of the province, have been increased and have had expenditures made on them during that period of time much larger than the \$30 thousand that he speaks of saving, by removing the long distance toll service from the city of Melville.

Indian Head which is in the same approximate area of the province had an addition made to their building costing \$29,300. Moosomin had an addition to the central

March 23, 1962

office of \$101,500 and the city of Yorkton, I suppose partly because of the extension from Melville, I am not certain whether this is the reason or not, but \$60 thousand was spent on enlarging the telephone exchange in that city.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to any of these particular expenditures that have been made at these various points in the approximate regions of the city of Melville, but when the minister used as a reason for taking the long distance toll service out of the city of Melville, the fact that it will cost his branch \$30 thousand or cost the Saskatchewan Government Telephones \$30 thousand on improvements to the building an excuse for curtailing services to the people of the city of Melville, then, Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept that as a valid argument on behalf of the corporation.

Then the third point was the switchboard equipment. I am going to give it all, Mr. Minister, you don't have to worry about it.

“Switchboard equipment valued at \$28 thousand is required to other areas, and a deferment would necessitate additional capital expenditure along this particular line.”

Then he goes on to say number four:

“If Melville is not included in the initial plans for customer distance dialling, an additional cost penalty will be incurred to make this service available in the future to our subscribers at that point.”

Then he goes on in his next one:

“During the last few months conversion to C.D.O. has taken place at Biggar, Wilkie, Unity, Battleford and Maple Creek.”

None of those of course being a city.

“The 1962 program which will convert 23 exchanges to C.D.O. will be announced in a few days.”

As he related at the meeting that was held at Melville to discuss this very thing, most of those 23 centres are very much smaller than the city of Melville. There is not one city included in the group, and so I think that

particular argument is also not valid in the case of the city of Melville. and then of course he states lastly:

“That any deferment in the plans developed will slow down our mechanization program, which we obviously do not wish to do. It is expected conversion of the Melville office to a C.D.O. will take place during the first part of August next year.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, in relation to one or two of the arguments that were used by the minister in the letter that he has presented to you there, I might just turn for a moment to arguments that were used at the meeting when he appeared at the public meeting in Melville. On this occasion the figures were fairly close to being the same, but this is the statement that was made at that meeting: It was explained that to put automatic dialling equipment to bring Melville up to the equivalent of the other cities of the province, it would cost an additional \$30 thousand. In addition the present board would represent a further saving of \$30 thousand.

These are the figures that were related at the meeting in Melville, and there is not too great a difference, and I am not going to argue with the minister over the fact that possibly he could make some saving, and so could Saskatchewan Government Telephones by curtailing the services.

I have heard the minister and other members of this government get up time after time and state that they would sooner have a government deficit, they would sooner spend money, than curtail necessary services to the people of our province. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a necessary service. This is a service which, if it is curtailed, will mean a great deal to the people of the city of Melville, not only in the loss of the employees that are now working in the telephone office, they have 12 employees at the present time, but the possibility of 12 families living there because of the fact that members of those families have jobs in the telephone exchange in the city of Melville.

Not only because of that fact will it mean a disadvantage to the people of the city of Melville, but I know everyone here realizes that there are many facilities which a community has that has a long distance toll service in that centre itself, and of course with a city or a

March 23, 1962

community the size of Melville, the loss of this service could mean the loss of many other facilities that are provided indirectly, due to the fact that they have their own telephone switchboard in that particular centre. So I say there that I feel quite sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that this is going to involve the curtailment of necessary services to the people of the city of Melville.

It is only two years ago that the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Telephones came to the city of Melville to help them celebrate their becoming a city in this province, where he wished them well, and stated, and I remember it, that they could count at all times, on the encouragement and support of the government of this province to maintain themselves to help them grow as a city in the province of Saskatchewan.

I am going to say here that these encouraging words that were presented that night are not being borne out by the government that sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, when only two years after Melville took the steps to become our 11th city in this province, the government is going to work to curtail necessary services in that centre.

One other argument that I would like to place before you this afternoon has to do with the revenues that are being received at the various centres of Saskatchewan Government Telephones which they intend to retain as long distance toll services in the province of Saskatchewan, and these figures are taken from the year 1961, being practically as up to date as you can get. Now let us read the revenues of the different points that the Saskatchewan Government Telephones intends to retain as long distance toll centres. First the town of Assiniboia, the total revenues, and I am going to give it in round figures, \$92 thousand in 1961, this includes long distance and exchange rentals and rural connections at these various points. The town of Canora \$67 thousand revenue, I am going to leave out the other cities, I am going to include all those that have a lower revenue than the city of Melville. Humboldt the revenue is \$105 thousand. Kindersley \$127 thousand, Meadow Lake \$74 thousand, Moosomin \$66 thousand, Outlook \$58 thousand, Rosetown \$103 thousand, Shaunavon \$67 thousand and Wadena \$52 thousand.

Now the point that is going to have a long distance toll service taken away from them, we come to the city of Melville where the revenues received were \$140 thousand in the year 1961. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the city of Melville provides greater revenues to the Saskatchewan

Government Telephones today than 11 of the centres that are going to be included as long distance toll centres in this province, and of course the city of Melville is intended to be the only city without this particular service.

As I said in my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention I don't think of either the people or the residents of the city of Melville, or myself, to make a political issue out of the question of retaining service to the people of the city of Melville, but I am requesting the members of this house to give serious consideration to their decision in this regard, and to accept the resolution that is being presented to you.

The city of Melville has not given up itself, I understood they are seeking an appointment at the present time with the Premier of this province, to again present their case, and of course if they come before the Premier and this government with the support of the members of this legislature, and I am quite certain they can expect consideration of their case as far as retaining long distance toll service in the city of Melville.

I am therefore requesting the support of every member of this house whether he sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, or whether he sits in the opposition. I have not individually sought out any member in this house and asked for his support, but I think the petition of the city of Melville is a reasonable one. I think the arguments that I have presented to you will present themselves in a good light to every member in this house.

In closing my remarks Sir, there is just one other statement I would like to make with regard to telephone service in this province, and that is, when the program is finally concluded, according to statements made by the minister in the city of Melville, the town of Canora will also be removed as a long distance toll centre, and there will only be one toll centre stretching from the Qu'Appelle Valley to the northern part of the province, one toll centre for that entire area of this province, which includes a large part of the province of Saskatchewan, and I think again we have an argument for asking that that part of the province requires more long distance toll service than is going to be provided under the actions of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that I have mentioned that economy alone is no reason for the reduction of necessary service and because there are

March 23, 1962

many ways in which we can provide economies to the people of this province, rather than reducing services in any one of our main centres, and not giving equality of services to the various regions in this province, it gives me great pleasure to move this motion, seconded by Mr. Gallagher, the member for Yorkton.

Debate adjourned (Mr. Williams).

MOTION: RE GRASSHOPPER CONTROL

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Moves:

That this Assembly respectfully requests the Government to give immediate consideration to instituting a comprehensive, province-wide program for the control of grasshoppers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will note this resolution has been on the order paper for about three weeks, since then the convention of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities has been held. Today 200 municipalities are gathered at the museum for a grasshopper control conference. I think it is most fitting that this resolution should be discussed at this time, and I was very pleased to see a resolution and program transmitted from the convention of the Association of Rural Municipalities, and I notice amongst the resolutions that were presented to the convention, a resolution from the R.M. of Vanguard No. 40 and I shall read it:

“Whereas, a very large number of farmers are unable to finance the purchase of dieldrin or similar poison to provide for the destruction of grasshoppers, as required by the bylaw, owing to a complete crop failure in some of the municipalities in the southern part of the province, therefore be it resolved, that Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture be requested to make a grant of 50 per cent of the costs of the required poison to the municipalities in the crop failure areas.”

I wholeheartedly agree with this resolution. There were three or four resolutions presented to the convention, and I hope the house will bear with me when I read them. I have another resolution here, number 45, district meeting

number 6, North Battleford: R.M. of Tramping Lake No. 380: I am sorry the member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) is not in his seat. I think it should be brought to the attention of the whip on the other side of house, that we would appreciate better attendance from the members. I think he could do a great deal in helping the farm situation. He is a neighbour to my constituency and you very seldom see him in the house.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Pretty crummy — pretty low.

Mr. Boldt: — It is the business of the members to be in the house and not outside of it. This is the resolution:

“Whereas, it is imperative that supplies of dieldrin and similar chemicals be available on very short notice due to sudden outbreaks of insect pests, and
Whereas, neither the source of depots at Moose Jaw nor Rosetown are readily accessible by direct rail service to many points in the province,
Therefore be it resolved, that we urge the provincial government to open a storage depot at Saskatoon so as to give service to the entire northern part of the province.”

I think too this resolution is very timely and very essential. I would also like to read a resolution from the R.M. of Laird. This municipality is in my constituency and reads as follows:

“Whereas, the community pastures are polluted with grasshoppers and are a menace to surrounding farm lands,
Therefore be it resolved, that this association impress upon the provincial government the importance and necessity of combating this menace, since it is of no value to surrounding farmers to spread their own lands for grasshoppers, if nothing is done to eradicate grasshoppers in community pastures.”

I think these resolutions are all well founded, and we hope this government will take note of the requests by the municipalities.

March 23, 1962

At this conference today I also note on their agenda they will be discussing the control of grasshoppers, they will show a film, "Grasshoppers Can Be Controlled," and also on their agenda, "The Grasshopper Outlook and Policies," in adjacent states and provinces. I had prepared a speech on this resolution before this convention was held, and I am quite proud to say that my speech contains most of . . .

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? Will he tell us where are the members from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker), Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre), Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) and Pelly (Mr. Barrie)?

Opposition Member: — Sit down! That giraffe never sits down.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Opposition Member: — He's closer to a monkey.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that most members of this house will agree with me that the 'hopper plague' will be a severe threat this year. No one will want to admit that they were content with the control a year ago. I think it is fair to say that the time to control them would be in the first year of notice. Every effort should have been made to control them when they were in a limited area. It is evident by the forecast of the 'hopper infested areas' that this has not been the case.

When we look at the map that has been published by the federal and provincial governments' agricultural departments, relating to the infestation, we will readily notice that practically all of Saskatchewan farming area is threatened and in some areas very severely. This will mean a major effort on the part of the farmers to keep them under control if a crop is to be expected. An estimate as to the total loss to the farmer in 1961 would run into the millions. That 1962 will be a worse year is not for me to say, but we must be realistic and acknowledge the fact; we have a greater area infested with eggs than in 1961, and moisture conditions in most areas are not as favourable as last year.

With similar weather conditions as of last spring we could have three times as many grasshoppers as last year. If we should have a cool wet spring this picture would not be nearly as bleak. Not knowing this the farmers and municipalities must be prepared for an all-out attack or it will be just a matter of waste and the crop will be gone.

First, I believe that with the experience we have had in the past to fight this menace, the government should promote the program of co-operation with states bordering southern Saskatchewan and Alberta and Manitoba, to launch an all-out attack in the coming season. What I mean by this is that too much of the marginal land, submarginal land is receiving no attention at all. There is little value of trying to fully control the grasshoppers when only the interested cultivated areas are being taken care of. In a dry year the grasshoppers will move in from areas that have not been treated and eat the crops in spite of the fact that the farmers may have had perfect control of their grasshoppers up to a certain time. These large blocks of marginal and submarginal areas must be the responsibility of the government, and in order to be successful these areas must be treated. The only effective way of doing this and the least cost is that you must have the co-operation of this program of control with the neighbouring provinces, states, farmers and municipalities.

Secondly, I believe that the farmers must have financial assistance if an effective program is to be carried out. This assistance could be based on the size of the farm or to those who qualify for P.F.A.A. payments. I would particularly prefer assistance to the family size farmer. The big farmer will look after himself. With many a farmer in the position today where he has had to buy all his feed, and will have to buy his seed, fuel and repairs, I cannot see how he can carry on an effective control program. The idea that all should come under this assistance I believe is wrong. I do not think the farmer with the 40 bushel crop should come under this category, perhaps not all farmers receiving P.F.A.A. should come under this category, but certainly we should base it on the family size farm, either two quarter section farmer and should leave it up to the municipality to decide who would qualify. If this assistance is not given it could be quite possible for many farmers to harvest very little in spite of the fact that moisture conditions for a crop year could be favourable. I hope the government will see the need of this responsibility.

March 23, 1962

Third, I also believe that a warehouse storage plant should be available to the municipalities in the city of Saskatoon, as this warehouse could be rented on a monthly basis for three or four months, and it should give service 24 hours a day. You will notice that the grasshopper infestation has moved up fifty to one hundred miles further north, and it is very inconvenient for the municipalities in the north to go to Moose Jaw, Rosetown or Regina to pick up the poison.

Fourth, I believe the government should embark upon an educational program through the facilities of our university of grasshopper control for the farmers of Saskatchewan. This grasshopper control is not a yearly chore, hence I believe some farmers need to be reminded of the best methods of control and the most economic one. This I believe could be done very effectively to one or two radio or T.V. programs. If well advertised in advance through pamphlets or local held meetings by the ag. reps. Now I know the government will tell us that this will be a costly program. I do not think it will be. I would suggest that the qualified farmers that have a 50 per cent discount on the cost of the poison. I know of numerous instances where this government could save this amount, and I shall briefly name some of them.

I would suggest to the government in order to have this program they could cut out the radio broadcasts of this legislature. I have only been here a short while and I know the introduction of the broadcast has brought about a most undemocratic procedure in debate. Hon. members are not being given a democratic right to debate because of it.

Cut out the government advertising of crown corporations on radio and T.V.

Cut out government advertising in newspapers, including the Commonwealth.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Even the editorials in the Leader-Post.

Mr. Boldt: — We could abolish the centre for community studies and fifth I think we could finance this program if the abuses of social aid were taken care of.

If these recommendations would be embarked upon I believe the government would find ample funds to carry

out the program without the added burden of taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move, seconded by Mr. McCarthy, the foregoing motion.

Mr. J. Thiessen (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, listening to the hon. member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) on this resolution I feel there are a lot of things that should be said about this. I think we possibly poisoned grasshoppers by the Department of Agriculture before this Hon. Minister of Agriculture was at the game, and I would like to spend a little time in telling the hon. members how he used to fight grasshoppers and what the government of that day did for the farmers and the grasshoppers, and I think to cover this I would want a little time to study it, and I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: RE C.B.C. EXPANSION

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

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks in regard to this motion. I am very pleased to be able to support the motion of the hon. member from Shaunavon (Mr. Kluzak) and I want to congratulate him for bringing this motion into the house. It is a motion I think that pertains to a large area of northern Saskatchewan, and I think we all agree that the time is past when residents of our province because of geographical locations should forego some of the pleasures, amenities perhaps, that other areas of the province have at their fingertips. I think it is the responsibility of all governments to attempt to provide services to all their residents.

I feel also that in view of the fact that there are many areas of our province in the north and in the south that are considerable distances from the larger centres such as Regina, Prince Albert and Saskatoon, where there are considerable recreational, educational and social facilities, that the provision of television services to these areas would certainly be most welcome. Television services could fill probably quite a large gap in this lack of entertainment which people in these areas suffer from.

March 23, 1962

It is particularly true I think in the northern part of our province, in areas such as Meadow Lake, Creighton, La Ronge, Uranium City and so on, where the winters and nights are very long and very cold usually, that television would be able to bring them a great deal of enjoyment, would enable them to keep up with the news, sports and public affairs and so on that is going on in other parts of the province as well as in Canada.

Now I didn't think the time would ever come when I would miss television, but after spending the winter in Regina, I can hardly bear the thought of going back to La Ronge and not being able to find out what Yogi Bear, and Huckleberry Hound are doing. My family I think agree wholeheartedly with me. I could also watch the Attorney General on provincial affairs if his turn should ever come up to participate. That would be the best part of all.

I hope this motion will receive the unanimous support of this Assembly, and that the federal government will take steps to extend these services to all the areas which are at present not serviced by television.

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution I wish to associate my remarks with those of the hon. member from Shaunavon (Mr. Kluzak) and the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Stevens). The resolution requests that television services be expanded to include outlying and border areas of Saskatchewan presently out of range of existing stations.

The objective of this resolution I submit, Mr. Speaker, and I also contend, will not be realized until the proper authorities: 1. Plan a step by step pattern for complete coverage of Saskatchewan's outlying areas all the way from Meadow Lake to Eastend, and 2. That the proper authorities do some straight talking, establishing that the ultimate objective is complete coverage by sufficiently powerful substations to bring the advantages of this medium to every inch of Saskatchewan.

If present television station owners cannot do the job and will not do the job, then the authorities should be prepared to bring this informative and cultural modern day media to the people of Saskatchewan through the publicly-owned C.B.C.

We have had privately-owned utilities, and the

outlying areas have been ignored, whether it has been electricity or natural gas. This pattern has been established time and time again where a privately-owned organization with the attitude of public service second to profits has left people without proper service. One only has to come face to face with the shortcoming of the telephone system of British Columbia or Ontario, or the electrical system of Alberta, to realize how uninterested privately owned utilities are in proper and complete service.

I recommend to the legislature, Mr. Speaker, the unanimous adoption of this resolution, but with it, this rider: If it is going to take 50 years to expand this service under private ownership, let us not hesitate to extend the services now through the use of public funds.

I submit there is a precedence, the C.B.C. at present subsidizes sponsorship of valuable and enjoyable programs, and I do not criticize this, I think in applying this principle in the production of television programs then we should be prepared to subsidize the cost of satellite services to fringe areas.

Time and time again we talk in terms of keeping people on the farms and developing the smaller communities away from our larger centres. The request contained in this resolution whereby television will be brought to Rosetown, Eastend, Lac La Ronge and Beauval, would be in step with and complement the efforts that are being made to maintain the family farm and the small community. Television brought to the people, television in their homes, would be one more service, and one less reason for moving to a larger urban centre.

In summing up, Mr. Speaker, let us ask the proper authorities to plan the television coverage of this province now, and too to bring the service to our neighbours through the use of public funds if privately owned organizations cannot or will not do it. I am sure this resolution will receive the unanimous approval of the legislature. This is a service that will develop Canadian culture, a source of Canadian entertainment and an enjoyable past time that should not be denied anyone because of where they happen to live.

If the proper authorities have to construct, staff and build C.B.C. facilities in this province to provide the service we are asking for, let us encourage

March 23, 1962

them to do so, for in addition to providing television to all of our people it would open new fields and new opportunities for Saskatchewan citizens in the field of drama, music and engineers.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the resolution.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I really don't need to rise but I wouldn't want the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) to report in the Prince Albert Herald that he was the only one that spoke of this need for the people of the north among other subjects, so I must make very clear that I am in favor of this resolution, and am certainly going to support it.

I would like to point out very briefly that we have not only small communities in the north, we have in fact some that are quite large, take for example the Flin Flon area, the whole community has about 14 thousand people, and for some years now they have been denied this very good service. The people of both Creighton and Flin Flon have been trying to get this kind of service for some years, and has had difficulty, and I think the passing of this resolution will help, not only that large community, but will make the services of T.V. available to many of the people in the small communities of the north, in my constituency as well as in the constituency of Meadow Lake and Athabasca.

I think too, it should be noted though it may have been said that after all this is a service that is being paid for by the people of Canada, as well as the people of this province. It is paid partly through taxes as we know, and we don't mind these taxes for services. Some hon. members opposite of course do mind paying taxes for services but we don't. One other way we pay for such services is through the advertising media, receipts from which is used to pay for many services to the T.V. station, and so because of the fact that we as individuals and as citizens of Canada and of the province, do pay for these services, I think we should ask for them, and see that they are extended to every possible area of our province and our country, and with those few words I have certainly indicated that I am going to support this motion.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — I had no intentions of getting up to speak on

this motion because I thought it was a very good motion. the accusations that were brought forth from across the floor certainly needs answering. The junior member for Regina (Mr. Whelan) mentioned that the free enterprises do not, will not, or something to that effect, put our satellite stations to provide the services. I know for a fact, Mr. Speaker, that many stations have applied for extension, have applied for satellite stations and have been refused by B.B.G. This is often what happens when you have a government entering into an enterprise. It becomes monopolistic in its way and establishes controls which does not permit the people to go ahead and provide service.

Where the services are not provided then I agree wholeheartedly that in the case of C.B.C. broadcasting that the government should provide those services where it is not economical to provide the services generally, but in many cases the private companies and corporations in that respect have been denied that right, and I believe the hon. member from Regina should realize the situation. The case of Swift Current, Lloydminster, Regina and even Moose Jaw has applied for a satellite station and have been denied the right of establishing at the most opportune spot. Everybody knows or everybody should know that the area of claybank could have provided services to practically all the southern part of Saskatchewan, but the C.B.C. denied the stations. This sight is now providing this service by establishing in other areas. The same applied to Lloydminster. They applied for a satellite station and they are having a hard job of doing it . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I can't let that pass.

Mr. Coderre: — You will have an opportunity to get to your feet. Swift Current have had trouble to get the station where it is. They have some but not exactly where they would like to have it to give maximum coverage. I think these points should be made quite clear, and that the many private stations are trying to give maximum coverage at minimum of cost.

As I say I am not going to go against the motion because generally it is quite clear.

Mr. A. Kluzak: — Mr. Speaker, I have noted with interest the debate on this resolution and I am rather disappointed in some of the statements the last speaker made. I know they do

March 23, 1962

not apply in our area where a local private station was not willing to put in satellites, and it was definitely denied, and we are situated in my area up against the American border where we cannot hope to get coverage unless we get it from Saskatchewan stations from the north and as I have stated, they have been denied by the station concerned when we did apply for them. The satellites we have were financed by the people in that area, the station would not provide the funds to put in these satellites.

Therefore that is why I feel that these stations before they are licensed, the Board of Broadcast Governors should make sure that this station is prepared financially to enlarge the facilities in that area. I think the member from Regina when he spoke said in his remarks that the Board of Broadcast Governors should plan that in their issuing of my license, that these areas would be covered, and that was my resolution, that it would be planned so that the people in these areas would be given television reception.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to add.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 18: An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, in explanation of this legislation, this is to give power to the Department of Agriculture to enter upon land to conduct surveys, either engineering surveys or soil surveys. We didn't have that power under The Department of Agriculture Act, although we did have power under another piece of legislation that was confined entirely to projects that would be undertaken by P.F.R.A. purposes of making surveys. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if anyone wanted to prevent the University of Saskatchewan's soil survey service from entering upon land to make a soil survey, access could be denied to them. This merely gives power to make the surveys. With this explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, before we let this one go, I would like to know . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The motion should be put first. I thought you were going to ask a question.

Mr. MacDougall: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister, what protection it gives the landowner from surveyors and others entering upon his land without his knowledge, possibly tramping down some of his crop? What protection does it give them if they don't have to go and see the landowner before going on? Under the old system, I believe that under The Surveyors Act they could enter upon property and do their surveying, but I believe they did have to visit the landowner and let him know that this was going to take place. That was the question I wanted to ask in this connection.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, there is provision made in the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! It is my duty to warn the house that the minister is about to close the debate. If anyone wishes to speak they may do so now.

Mr. McDonald: — Is he closing the debate, or is he just answering the question that was asked by the member for Estevan?

Mr. Speaker: — It is a technicality. I think it would be better if there were other questions if he could answer them all at one time. It will be easier for The Chair and easier for the members.

Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, just in connection with the proposed amendment to the agricultural act which we find before us at the present time. I listened to what the minister had to say in regard to allowing his men to make surveys and I would suggest that this is one more infringement on the rights and privileges and people who own land.

March 23, 1962

Section 8(a), I quote:

“The minister may, by surveyors, engineers, agronomists, workmen and servants (that takes in just about everybody) enter upon any land to whomsoever belonging, and survey and take levels of the land and take such borings and samples from the surface or lower levels of the land as he deems necessary for any purpose relating to the development, study or investigation of any irrigation, drainage, flood control, water storage, underground water or land reclamation project (and those three words “land reclamation projects” take in a pretty wide field) the development, study or investigation of which he considers to be in the public interest.”

Now I made the notes which were attached to this Bill No. 18 as stated by the minister and I quote:

“At present the Minister of Agriculture has no authority to enter upon the land if the owner objects.”

I suggest that is a jolly good way to keep it. If the owner objected under the old agricultural act and the minister thought that he had some project in hand that was in the interests of all the people then he could make application to the courts of this land to decide the question. The courts would issue an order as to whether or not he should tramp over the farmers land or whether he should not. I would suggest that he is trying to bypass and short-circuit the courts of Saskatchewan by bringing in this amendment. I would suggest that whether or not anyone could tramp over land or whether he can't is up to the courts of this province.

This gives the Minister of Agriculture permission to send any of his minions across our land without asking any permission whatsoever. He can have one of his servants on the back forty while the farmer and his wife are in the yard and nobody knows they are out there. Similarly if the farmer is out on the back forty he could have the surveyors in the yard and nobody would know they were there either. I would suggest common courtesy and the principles of freedom would dictate that he at least knock on somebody's door and ask them whether or not he can go and do this or that and if he was told no, then the courts of the land could settle the case.

Not only that, when you have an employee of the government going over your land at the present time, it is just natural to suppose that he also has an automobile with him and he is travelling across the land with that. And just precisely who is to know what quantity and type of weed seed he is spreading. I don't think I want any of the employees of the Department of Agriculture with their pant cuffs full of weed seeds walking over my land without asking permission and I don't think that any of my neighbours do either.

There is a compensation clause in the act in regard to any damage that might be done to the land, but I draw the attention of hon. members of this house to the fact that nobody knows whether they have had damage done to their property or whether they haven't in which a person may make claim under the compensation part of the act, because it takes two or three years for a weed menace to make itself shown. This is just part and parcel, Mr. Speaker, and all the same piece of cloth as the amendments that came into the house last year in regard to the highways act. It gave the Department of Highways privilege to bulldoze their dirt all over our land at will without so much as asking by your leave or permission. It is all part and parcel of the socialist invasion of the rights and freedoms of human beings.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Speak to the motion.

Mr. Snedker: — I am speaking to it.

Mr. Speaker: — You are not speaking to the motion. I ask you to speak to the motion and keep your thoughts on other subjects to a later debate.

Mr. Snedker: — This is an infringement on the rights and freedoms of farmers who own land. This is an infringement of our rights and privileges. This is part of the socialist dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Snedker: — And you deny me the right to speak on it. Typical of the socialist arrogance that is displayed towards farmers. You would arrogantly march across our land with the minions of the Department of Agriculture without even

March 23, 1962

having the courtesy to say you are coming or ask our permission. Then when you have left you will raise our taxes.

I oppose this, Mr. Speaker, all down the line. If the minister wants to send any of his surveyors around to survey our land and take samples — if it is in the interests of the farmers, the farmers will be the very first people to take his hand and say come on in, and if it isn't in the interests of the farmer then we should have the privilege of kicking him out. I suggest we do it and I am going to oppose this and oppose it all down the line as being all part and parcel of a socialist dictatorship. All you are trying to do is lay the groundwork — take your land samples, survey our fields to lay the groundwork for the boundaries of the collectivized farms that you are proposing to set up.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, would the member withdraw that last statement. There is plenty of precedent for this kind of legislation and justification. I will ask him to withdraw that statement. This is not the intended purpose of this legislation. I wish he would stop his nonsensical ranting and raving.

Mr. Snedker: — Yes, you would like that. Now the minister . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The minister rose on a point of privilege and asked that that statement be withdrawn.

Mr. Snedker: — What statement does he want withdrawn?

Mr. Speaker: — That this legislation was intended for collectivized farms . . .

Mr. Snedker: — Mr. Speaker, just a minute . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think the hon. member would want to mislead the house or give a wrong impression.

Mr. Snedker: — I don't want to mislead the house, Mr. Speaker, and I will withdraw that statement and I will make the following

statement, and listen to it carefully. That in my opinion this piece of legislation is the thin end of the wedge for the purpose of surveying our land for the purpose of delineating the boundaries and taking soil samples for the purpose of collectivized farming. I hope I got that across.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Snedker: — Now, let me continue further. The argument has been made that this is the same type of legislation that covers various other things in our province. I know what somebody on the other side of the house is going to get up and say that when you install a power meter on your farm, you allow the man to come in and read the meter — that when you install a water meter in your house to accept services from the city of Regina you allow the man to come in and read the water meter — that when you install gas you allow the man to come in and read the gas meter and I agree, but just a minute. That is a contract that has been entered into by the property owner and the person providing the service. When he asked for the service to be rendered to him, when he asked for the installation of the power meter, when he asked for the installation of gas, when he asked for the installation of water, he knew full well that somebody was going to come and read those meters. But I suggest the Minister of Agriculture hasn't got any meters to install and I would suggest that if he comes marching around on our land he jolly well asks permission before he gets there and I am opposing it all down the line.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I wonder if my hon. friend would mind answering a question. He said in the opening part of his remarks that without this legislation that method open to the Department of Agriculture was to make application to the courts in any case where the farmer refused access to the farm for the purpose of conducting these surveys. I would like him to tell me under what law or statute there is such provision for surveys.

Mr. Snedker: — If the Attorney General doesn't know the answer to that question he shouldn't be the Attorney General of the province.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of such provision and I thought my hon. friend would help me out and it would make for a wiser Attorney General.

March 23, 1962

Mr. Snedker: — You will find it in the Agricultural Act.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — No, I am afraid not.

Mr. Snedker: — I think you will.

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolesley): — I notice that the act is being amended as the Minister of Agriculture has stated. At present the Minister of Agriculture has no authority to enter upon land if the owner objects. Mr. Speaker, I believe that I am in agreement with much that the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) has said because I believe that the farmers in this province today do not look very favourable towards this government and some of the actions they have taken in the past and by different departments of this government in dealing with the farmers in general. There are a great many farmers in the province today who remember the treatment they got from one crown corporation and I am going to name it — the power corporation. I think the attitude that some of the employees of that company took towards the farmer and entering the farmers land and the settlements they tried to get out of the farmers. I think that will linger for a good many years in the memories of the farmers. When this act is being placed on the statute books as the government hopes it will be at the present time, I am going to suggest that possibly if the government wants to commence a better type of relationship between the government and the farmers then they are going to have to change their attitude. I would hope before any official from the Department of Agriculture goes on to any farmer's land, as this act gives them the authority to do, that the first thing that he will have from the farmer is written consent and agreement to go onto his land, not the type of tactics that were employed by some of these other corporations in the past. As it is stated in this amendment, you have a great many ventures outlined here; you have irrigation, drainage, flood control, water storage, underground water, land reclamation and so forth and if this is going to be carried out on farmer's land — if you are just going to test for it then maybe the damage won't be so great but if you are going to go through and use this to give you authority to carry out reclamation work or something like that then there is the possibility of a great deal of damage.

The first consideration I would suggest, that

the government give to the farmers of this province is that they obtain a gentleman's agreement and written consent and first of all exhibit good public relationship between the farmer and the government before anything is done. Then you go on in subsection (2) and you stated — "reasonable precautions as may be necessary to avoid causing unnecessary damage to the land, and if any damage is done the minister shall pay to the owner of the land a reasonable sum to compensate him for the damage." Now I know from my own experience and I am going to use my own case so I can back it up and I won't be challenged. When the one corporation went across my land, after all the installations were completed, it was two years after the installations were completed before they ever came to me and asked for written consent to go across my land. I certainly hope that the Minister of Agriculture sees that this doesn't take place under this. Two years after this was completed they also came to me and asked if I would sign a settlement for payment. That was just one corporation.

Then the Department of Highways — I am going to use this illustrate and hope it doesn't occur under the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Highways, when I was asked to submit my estimate of crop damages, I listed so many bushels of wheat and I naturally thought that the staff of the government, would knowing the year the damage was caused and knowing how many bushels of wheat the loss amounted to, they would figure it out. To my amazement, I never corrected them on this, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to point out how the farmers could be treated. I forget the number of bushels I listed but when the settlement notice was sent it was sent on the basis of \$1.20 per bushel for no. 2 wheat. I know that the Minister of Agriculture knows the grain business better than some of the other ministers and some of the other departments, but I suggest to the Minister of Agriculture, if he has to compensate any of the farmers on a per bushel of wheat basis that he knows that the final payment of a bushel of wheat is more than \$1.20.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Standing in the field?

Mr. McFarlane: — . . . Standing in the field! We don't leave our wheat standing in the field all the year round — we harvest our wheat and we sell our wheat . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — He doesn't know.

March 23, 1962

Mr. McFarlane: — We are paid initial payments, we get paid for an interim payment and we get paid for a final payment.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh, sit down.

Mr. McFarlane: — I will finish speaking. I am just telling the Minister of Agriculture because I think he will listen and I know you won't. I know that the Minister of Agriculture when he has to make compensation to any of the farmers for the grain crop that has been destroyed, it will be worked out on the basis of the initial payment plus the interim payment, plus the final payment for that year. I am only suggesting this so that the relationship between the farmer and the Department of Agriculture will be on a more amiable basis than some of the other relationships.

We know in this province that some parts of this act may be of benefit to the farmer because the item of major importance in the province today is of course the conservation of water. In the future, maybe this government and certainly other governments that follow them will work out a plan where this is intensified to a great degree. By doing that we will have more dealings with the farmer and we are going to have more compensation to pay. I suggest this so that there will be, as I said, Mr. Speaker, a better relationship between these two parties. It says on subsection (3) "No person shall obstruct, hinder or molest a surveyor, engineer, agrologist, workman or servant engaged in doing anything that he is under subsection (1) authorized by the minister to do."

I would suggest on behalf of the farmers that the officials of the government or those who have the responsibility of carrying out the provisions of this act take the same attitude. I would hope that when they go to deal with the farmers they will deal with them on a gentlemanly basis and cause no obstruction to the farmer when they are themselves carrying out the provisions. After all a farmer takes a great deal of pride in his land, he takes a great deal of pride in his crop. To those who may not be interested in farming, this may be of little concern to them when they tramp down and destroy or ruin a farmer's crop.

Sometimes when those who are sent out to try and reach a figure of compensation, they will naturally try to save as much as they can on behalf of the government. But in the eyes of the farmer, it is his way of life, his pride and joy — this crop and I say if the farmer is not to obstruct the officials who are sent out, then in all respects the government should do likewise to the farmer.

Mr. MacDougall: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — I cannot permit that as you have already spoken once.

Mr. MacDougall: — I merely asked a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — You asked if you could ask a question before the minister took his seat. You rose, I put the question and you resumed to speak.

Mr. Coderre: — Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 19: An Act to amend The Health Services Act.

Hon. W.G. Davies (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, the two proposed amendments to The Health Services Act that are contained in this bill are for the purpose of clarifying certain aspects of two kinds of medical care insurance plans when the new public medical care plan goes into effect in the province. The first amendment applies to municipal medical care programs that are financed by a general tax, that is by the way of a special levy. It is provided in the bill that when one of these programs is terminated the proceeds from the special levy after the obligations and outstanding claims have been paid is to be turned over to the general account of the municipality. Where the special levy has been made only over a portion of the municipality, a tax credit is to be placed against the municipal tax levy that

March 23, 1962

will next be made in connection with that portion of the municipality.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other amendment similarly clarified the position of a subscriber or a member of a health association who has prepaid the premium to the association for a period of time following the establishing of the new province-wide medical care plan, provided the subscriber or the member would be entitled to a refund of the applicable portion of the premium upon request. I should add, Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, that the first amendment has been discussed with Mr. Wilkinson, the secretary of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, and the Group Medical Services and Medical Services Incorporated officials have been appraised with respect to the second. With that explanation I would move the second reading of Bill No. 19.

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, before the minister sits down I wonder if he would answer a question. It is not mentioned in this particular case whether the refund will apply to the case of hospital benefits or medical services or mutual medical hospital benefit association — whether the refund will apply immediately after the medical plan or health plan is in effect, even though the asking of the refund takes place one or two or three months after the plan comes into effect. It is not specified clearly in that respect.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — What would occur, Mr. Speaker, is this. The refund would apply only for that portion of time in which the refund was requested. If it was requested in the month of July it would apply for the month of August, September, October, November, December, if the prepayment was for that period of six months or indeed a year or whatever period. But it could not be made retroactive. If someone made a request for a refund of the premium in (let us say) September or October, this could not apply retroactively for the portion of time when there had been double coverage.

Mr. Gardiner: — I would like to ask one further question. Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering if the government has the power to actually enforce this clause on independent medical associations or insurance companies?

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, the bodies that we have spoken to have no objection whatsoever to it in the first instance

and say that this has been the practice. They have no objection to this being done. We believe that the power, once the amendments are passed, will certainly apply.

Mr. Danielson: — I just want to ask a question. The agreement between the individual who has taken advantage of the medical services — that is the contract entered into between the individual and the medical profession. That is a legal contract — it has been agreed to and the fee has been paid and the law of contracts applies to this. Have you got the power, by passing a bill of this kind, to nullify the contract? I think you should get some legal advice before you go ahead with it.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, my advice here of course is that the plans that we refer to here are provided for under particular incorporated associations. The habit of these bodies, where someone applies for a refund is now to do precisely what we are requiring in the bill. Now I can only say that my advice from the departmental solicitor (and he originally checked these matters with the law officers of the government) is to the effect that we do have these powers when these sections have been approved by the legislature. Now if there is any dispute on this no doubt we could discuss the sections in committee.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words with regard to the changes in The Health Services Act. I may not directly relate to the particular changes in the act because of course the principle, I don't think any one of us could take objecting to the principle itself, of seeing to it that refunds are made, but I would like to draw the attention of the minister with regard to this particular amendment to the act, and with regard to other actions that are being taken with regard to the implementation of the medical care plan in the province, that the minister take care that the people of the province are not placed in the position of cancelling various other plans because of an announcement made by this government about the possible commencement date of any medical care plan under the supervision of the government of this province.

I think the minister should be very careful and provide definite information to the public that they

March 23, 1962

should not release their present plan until such time as the government is actually able to carry out the commitments it has made in The Medical Insurance Act, and I hope that will be carried out because there is no assurance today. Last fall it was going to be April 1st, the minister stated now he hopes it will be July 1st, and there is no assurance today that this act will go into effect on July 1st.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — So I would state that when this particular change takes place . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The hon. member surely knows . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Why don't you rise if you want to speak?

Mr. Speaker: — I think the hon. member must realize he is getting away from the bill.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well I am discussing the various points this bill brings up because this bill itself could level this doubt in the minds of every person that has a medical care plan today, and I know the questions I am going to be asked when I go home because I am a collector for medical care services, I am also a collector for the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, and I can realize what people are going to say to me when the next payment for these plans come along. They will say this plan is going into effect July 1st so I won't bother paying it, there is only a month or two to go, and I think the government, the minister should when this amendment is being passed, as I say I am quite prepared to support it and I think everyone is prepared to support these amendments, to provide payment to the people of this province, but at the same time the government through the minister should see to it that no one loses protection from the plan he has now, and assure the people in no uncertain terms that they will receive their refunds and not to cancel the plans they have at the present moment in hope there may be a government plan in operation on July 1st.

I hope with those few words, Mr. Speaker, that

the minister will see that care is taken in this regard so that people in this province will not go without medical care until such time as the government plan goes into operation.

Hon. W.G. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one or two comments with regard to the remarks of the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner). Certainly the things he has in mind are very much in my mind and have been for some time. May I say this that anyone that is in any doubt that July 1st will not be the effective date of the government medical care plan, can maintain his coverage in M.S.I., Group Medical Services or whatever association involved beyond that date. Then at a time when he seems to be satisfied that the medical care plan is effective he may apply for his refund. If you will look at the provisions of the bill you will see that a person does not have to apply for a refund prior to July 1st but may apply anytime thereafter, and of course, at such a time you would get whatever portion of the refund applied in that period. I think if there are any doubts in the minds of people that the plan will not go into effect on that date, this should afford sufficient assurance for those persons who are now holders of benefits under private plans.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:28 o'clock p.m. on motion of the Hon. Mr. Walker.