

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**33rd Day**

**Tuesday, April 10, 1962.**

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

**QUESTION: ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION**

**Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I wonder if I might direct a question to the Premier. In view of the fact that we are starting morning sittings today, I wonder if he could tell the House whether there is much additional legislation still to come down, or are we near the end insofar as bills are concerned.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I have not checked specifically, but my understanding is that the legislation is all complete now, there may be a minor exception to that.

**QUESTION RE: SEED**

**Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the very serious problem that can arise out of the seed coming into the province infested with tartary buckwheat, I would like to know if the Minister of Agriculture is taking any precautionary measures to see that seed of this type is now allowed in the province at this time.

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, any seed that comes into this province must have a controlled sample certificate and free of any seed including tartary buckwheat.

April 10, 1962

## MOTION: UTILIZATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

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

**Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, the other day in this House we heard one of the weakest efforts that has ever been made by a minister of the crown trying to justify the existence of a crown corporation. His arguments were completely devoid of any logic; there were times when the minister himself must have had very serious doubts concerning the relevancy of his statements to the motion that was under discussion.

First of all I think it would be wise to read the motion again for the benefit of members of this House, because in view of the comments made by the Minister of Natural Resources I am wondering whether he knew which motion he was speaking to at that time.

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

Now you will notice this resolution refers to a Saskatchewan crown corporation operating in the province of Saskatchewan, and in spite of the obvious motion, the Minister of Natural Resources the other day, made a deliberate attempt to imply the timber board was operating on a Canada-wide basis. He referred to the fact that softwood productivity is only two per cent of the total for the whole of Canada. Now this of course may be true but it certainly has no bearing on this resolution. The minister went on to say that the timer board handles only one per cent of the total production of lumber in Canada, and again perhaps this is true, but it has no relevancy here. What is relevant to this motion is the fact that the timber board controls 100 per cent of the spruce and pulp production in the province of Saskatchewan. Now this 100 per cent monopoly makes the 50 per cent monopoly of General Motors, and the 40 per cent of Sun Life Assurance which the minister took great pleasure in quoting, seem like peanuts.

Therefore I would like to ask the minister, and it is unfortunate that he is not in his seat, not to try and distort the truth by quoting statistics for Canada as a whole, but rather to admit the 100 per cent monopoly that the timber board has in this province.

The minister then went on to muddy the waters a little more by quoting figures for the average price of lumber in 1944 and 1961, and then he went on to quote the price for automobiles in the same year; whatever automobiles have to do with timber boards. He didn't say what lumber products were being averaged, so the figures used have very little meaning in this regard. The only figure that I would quote for the record is that timber operators receive \$41.15 per 1,000, while it is then sold to the public, and I have here a price list, 1960 — retail price list, for spruce, pine, pulp lumber, Saskatchewan Timber Board, select No. 1., \$96 per 1,000, and it is no use talking about any other grade but select No. 1, because the other grades are not fit for general building use. Now these are the figures that count as far as the timber operators are concerned, the \$41.15 which they receive will not pay the operating costs under normal working conditions, and it is only when there are extremely favourable conditions that an operator can make a profit. These conditions are seldom set.

The hon. minister then got around to his time-worn comparison of the year 1944 with 1961, or 1960. He reached the conclusion that from 1939 to 1944, there were an average of 121 sawmills less, than under the last five years of socialist administration. Well now, perhaps this is true, but that is not the important point. What is important, is that in 1944, in spite of the fact that labour was scarce because the war was on, the Liberals had 5,322 working in the forests of Saskatchewan, while in 1960 the socialists could employ only 3,438 or 1,884 fewer than under the Liberals. To any one concerned with the unemployment problem this is a far more significant figure than the number of sawmills in operation. The minister said that prior to 1944, more timber was being taken out than there should have been, and if it continued for the next 20 years there would be a serious shortage. Again this statement is partially true, but I wish the minister had told why the people of Saskatchewan were taking out more lumber than what they should have been the answer is clearly given in the annual report of the Department of Natural Resources, 1944, where it says the abnormal demands for lumber continued throughout the year, with increased quantities required for Britain, British Empire countries, and the United States. Yes, we were fighting a war; lumber was needed; Saskatchewan had that lumber, and I think we should be proud that we were in a position to provide it, and we did provide it.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**April 10, 1962**

**Mr. Guy:** — It goes on to say that the annual production was more than double that of the last pre-war years of 1938-39, and that would mean then that before the war from 60 to 70 million board feet were harvested every year. Approximately the same number that are being harvested by the socialists at the present time. There again I say we were not exploiting the lumber from our forest indiscriminately, but we had a role to play in the war effort and we played it.

The minister then went on to quote figures for the use of fence-posts and telephone poles and so on. One of his comments was the number of fence-posts jumped by an average of 250,000 for the last five years of CCF administration over that of the Liberal administration, but here again there is good reason for this. As the farmers used up the supply of fence-posts on their own land it became necessary for them to purchase them elsewhere. I could be just as ridiculous as the Minister of Natural Resources and ask him why he didn't quote the number of railroad ties that were being produced, because in 1944, 388,607 were produced under a Liberal government, but only 29,950 in 1961. So using the minister's logic, the Liberal administration must be nearly 13 times better than the CCF.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I wish to say about the remarks of the Minister of Natural Resources that he made the other day. However, I do want to spend some time on some of the remarks that he refused to make or that he didn't make.

It was most amazing that nowhere in the discussion of the timber board did he make any reference to the production and sale of pulpwood. Now of course we all know that the pulpwood industry in Saskatchewan has been an embarrassment for the socialists — their promised pulpwood mills never seemed to materialize. However, it would appear again that they are reaching into the closet and reviving an old skeleton. I see by a report in the Leader-Post, March 30, 1962, where my friend the Minister of Industry and Information went up to Prince Albert, and he said:

“Pulp mill within a year or so — the possibility of a pulp mill for Prince Albert within a year or so was discussed here Thursday by Industry Minister Russ Brown.”

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this is a dirty lowdown trick of the minister and of the government to once again go into the Prince Albert constituency when they know there is going to be a by-election, and deliberately promise them a pulp mill. The least the government could have done was announce the date of the by-election before going in there and making these ridiculous promises. However, an editorial appeared in the Prince Albert Herald which would lead me to believe that the people of Prince Albert are not going to be taken in by this propaganda any more, because on April 2, 1962, the following editorial appeared:

“Pulp mill again given publicity. The old saw of a pulp mill for this part of the province has reared its ugly head again with Industry and Information Minister Russ Brown bringing the matter into focus. The pulp mill has been nothing more than an election issue at various times and will probably remain in that role for many elections to come. Government officials themselves have said in the past that transportation difficulties were the main drawbacks to northern Saskatchewan obtaining a pulp mill. To our knowledge this has not changed an iota in the past few years.”

You will recall that when the opposition have asked why Saskatchewan had no pulp mills, while Alberta, Manitoba and British Columbia were getting them one after the other, we heard long stories about transportation difficulties and bad market conditions that were unfavourable to Saskatchewan.

The government had a little article in the Financial Post on March 30, 1962, where it quoted that the Regina representative for the Financial Post in his interview with members of the government has written this:

“Two chief problems in establishing a pulp mill in Saskatchewan . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I don't think this resolution deals with pulp mills and I have been allowing some latitude . . .

**April 10, 1962**

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to contend that the pulp production of this province is controlled by the Saskatchewan Timber Board, which is exactly what we are discussing at this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — This resolution is not debating the establishment of a pulp mill, and I think you are getting . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — We are debating the establishment of a pulp industry in this province, the fact that we have not got one because of Saskatchewan Timber Board's monopoly of the pulp industry.

“The two chief problems of establishing a pulp mill in Saskatchewan has been high transportation costs to market, and the markets themselves. The government now feels that the markets in the mid-U.S. will support a Saskatchewan plant. As far as transportation is concerned the government points out that the new pulp mill in Prince Albert and shipping pulp to the mid-U.S. and that Saskatchewan is closer than Alberta.”

I would like to say again that as long as there is an election in the offing, marketing, transportation, and everything else is fine, if they can promise a pulp mill to the people of Prince Albert.

There is no reason in the world why Saskatchewan has not had a pulp mill in the past 18 years except for the policies of the timber board and the socialist government.

A survey taken by the Stanford Research Institute said there was sufficient wood to support a half dozen pulp mills of 300 tons per day capacity in perpetuity, yet we haven't any to date.

Before closing I would like to also point out that it isn't only the monopoly of the Saskatchewan Timber Board which has been hurting our forest industry, but it is the unfair management, procedures, and regulations that go with it. There are many examples which I could cite showing the unconcern of the timber board for its operators, and the fact that these operators are forced to obey every command or else forfeit their licenses, prevents them from rebellion against the timber

board. I want to cite just one or two examples of those actions which are being carried on by the Saskatchewan Timber Board at this time.

You will recall that it was always the habit of farmers who lived along the borderline of our forest areas to supplement their farm income, to put their hired help to work, by operating a small sawmill during the winter months, but under the timber board this practice has come to practically a halt, due to the discrimination that has been practiced against these small mill owners. These men have found it difficult to get a good stand of timber from the board. When they deliver a load of lumber the timber board takes 400 to 600 feet of what they call cull. When asked if they can take this cull home so they can use it for sheds and so on, since they are not being paid for it anyway, the timber board refuses to let them take it off the lot, and then wonder where this cull lumber goes. In one case I could cite, a mill operator on his way to his farm with some real cull lumber, was going to use it for a shed, he was stopped by a timber board official and forced to take it back to his mill site and burn it. In fact, fires must be kept burning at all times to burn the cull lumber so that farmers from the district cannot come and pick it up to use around the farm.

Another case brought to my attention was where an operator was delivering lumber to the timber board for \$41.15 per 1,000. He decided to use some of this lumber to build a truckbox at his mill site. A timber board official came along and charged him \$65 per 1,000 for the lumber he had used to build that box.

From these few instances it is clear that the timber board is not concerned with providing a useful service but is concerned merely in the regimentation of their operators.

Summing up my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that no other government agency has ever affected our lumber and pulpwood production as adversely as the Saskatchewan Timber Board. They have created an atmosphere of mistrust among their operators, they have cut down employment in our forest industry, they are keeping private enterprise out of the province, and they have throttled the marketing of our pulp and lumber, and with their monopoly the only profit after you go through the maze of socialist arithmetic that is shown would appear to go to the employees of the timber board rather than for any useful purpose, and for these reasons I am very pleased to support the motion of the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie).

**April 10, 1962**

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, my father used to say God help us from the ignorant, and when I listened to the hon. member speak I couldn't help but think of what he told me.

If anybody has been making mis-statements in this House I think it could be said that the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) has made them.

I would like to answer the hon. member who has spoken, I would like to point out some of the things he has mentioned. He said 100 per cent of the spruce in Saskatchewan was cut by monopoly of the timber board. That, Mr. Speaker, is not true. In my area there are a number of people that hold private lands and cut spruce; there are communities as well as municipalities that have reserves which have been received from this government and who cut spruce, and I personally know of operators who operate in the north on lands of the Indian Department and in other areas, and so it can't be said that 100 per cent of the spruce timber is being cut under the control of the timber board as he has mentioned.

If the people along the forest fringe today have not the spruce to cut for lumber as he has suggested, then the only reason is, as I will point out later on, the fact that there has been no timber of that species left to cut, and I will point out, Mr. Speaker, as I go on, that this is actually a result of the policy of former governments of this province. The hon. member mentioned that we had cut considerable timber in 1944 and some one or two years prior to that, because of demands of the war, but he failed to mention that this kind of practice of clear cutting started at the beginning of the century. We have no objection in trying to help the war effort if we are involved in it, but in this particular situation concerning Saskatchewan, it wasn't just 1943, 1942, or 1944, when we cut excessive amounts of timber. I will prove today from the records that excessive amounts of timber were cut since the beginning of the century, and that is the reason why today, we have not the resources in this province we should have.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — This motion, Mr. Speaker, suggests that the services of the Saskatchewan Timber Board should be dispensed with, and that the timber operations revert to the kind



of system which pertained when private enterprise parties ruled in this province, and the reasons are given in the motion. There are two — first that by getting rid of the timber board it is said that there would be more utilization of the timber resources, and secondly that by so doing there would be more employment in the province of Saskatchewan, and I intend to prove, of course, that this premise is wrong on both counts. I am going to square my jaws and take a look at the situation.

As a matter of fact, if one examines and makes comparisons of the forest industry today with that of twenty or thirty years ago, some very interesting situations come to light. It seems most appropriate that as I have had some experience in this field in the past, and I have some knowledge of the present, and know what is going on, I should speak up in this House in the interests of the forest workers, who operate in the north. I would say it is most apparent if I am not to question the motives of hon. members opposite, that this resolution was sponsored because of lack of knowledge. Yes, lack of knowledge of the operations of the timber board. Hon. members know just as well as I do, and I am very surprised at the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) for having drafted this resolution and for having presented it in the house. They know just as well as I do that the timber board was set up as a marketing agency, and a contracting agency. It is the main contractor of the people of Saskatchewan. It is not an agency which is involved in the conservation of the timber resources — that is a job for the Department of Natural Resources. They should know better. I wouldn't be surprised if it had been some member who came from the south who didn't know anything about timber who made up this resolution, but the hon. member for Pelly lives in the timber area, and he knows just as well as I do, what the purpose of the timber board is.

With regard to employment, the other item in the resolution, the timber board again can only be involved in employment to the extent that the Department of Natural Resources opens up areas, and as we open up areas, we employ more contractors who employ men, and in that way the timber board could be responsible for more employment. Directly the timber board is only responsible, as far as employment is concerned, to the extent that they need people as clerks, people who manage and transport the products, and they are not otherwise involved in the employment policy.

Let us take a look at the Saskatchewan natural resources story, and I would say that nobody can deny that this government has done a tremendous job of conservation over the past few years. This was not the

**April 10, 1962**

case with any of our resources under former administrations, as hon. members know. However, if they are not quite certain I would like to quote the following from the Forest Protection of Canada, 1913-14.

I will have more to say about the resources when they were under the jurisdiction of the province, under Conservatives and Liberals. This was under the dominion government — the report of 1913-14 and I quote:

“Forest Conditions of Dominion lands in Saskatchewan.

The province of Saskatchewan not only leads the prairie provinces in the production of wheat and oats, but also of lumber.”

I would like the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) to note this . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — It must have been a Liberal government then.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** —

“Its lumber cut in the north much exceeds that of the other two provinces combined. Twenty-three mills operating in 1912 reported a total cut of 157,255,000 feet board measure, with 2,535,600 at the mill. This was nearly all spruce, some jackpine was cut, and this is usually thrown in with the spruce.”

It goes on to say:

“A little tamarack was cut for stable flooring, inside finish, and door frames, but as a rule these trees are too small to be sawn.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, this indicates the extent which the forests of Saskatchewan were being ravaged by exploiters, and by the people of little understanding at that time. Millions of board feet of timber, as shown by records, were obtained from the crown under questionable circumstances as early as 1908, and if the hon. members are interested and want to go back searching in basements of some of our offices they will find what I am saying is true.

The area between Prince Albert and Big River was the particular area which was ravaged — fifty miles wide, one hundred miles long — the best timber in this province was clear cut and taken out in a matter of a few years.

I go on to quote:

“There are fifteen large saw mills and owing to the rapid development of the province during late years, and the consequent increased demand for lumber, these mills have had to enlarge the capacity from time to time. One of them already has the capacity of six million feet per month.

At present most of the lumber used in building in this province is brought from British Columbia, and it is an ordinary thing for the amount of freight charges to exceed the value of the lumber. So the advantageous position of the Saskatchewan mills compared with their British Columbia competitors can easily be seen, in view of the fact that their market is close at hand for all they can produce.”

It goes on to say:

“The forest belt extends for many miles north of the Saskatchewan River, and with proper care and fire guarding should supply an enormous amount of lumber for many years to come.”

That was 1913-14. Where is the lumber today? Where are the forests today? I would like to quote a little more:

“The lumber mills did a good seasons business in 1912, and employed 8,619 men who received \$3 million in wages and salaries. The total product of the mills during the year was \$7,512,000. There were also 28 additional sash and door factories employing 1,000 men who produced a total of about \$2 million worth of finished material.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, such was the industry in the province of Saskatchewan in 1912 when timber woods were easy to get and it was easy to get into the forests, and to clear cut. I would also like to point out that when the last profitable block of timber in the area around Big River was cut and removed, then (very fortunately for the company) the Big River mill burnt and that was that.

I would like to ask the members of this House, and particularly the member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) —

**April 10, 1962**

does he think that denuding the forest in Saskatchewan was wise utilization policy? Was it wise to sell our resources for a few cents an acre? If he doesn't believe what I say, I will prove it to him today. Was it wise to open up this area between Prince Albert and Big River for homesteads? Much of this was sub-marginal land, the lands opened up for homesteads, and where to this particular day we have had nothing but poverty and distress throughout all the years I have been there. Was that a wise utilization policy, a wise conservation policy of former governments?

According to the same source that I quoted just previously, I make reference again:

“The area under license in 1911-12 was 2,145 square miles, and under permits 310 square miles.”

I am going to have something to say about berths:

“The licensed berths lie roughly in two regions, one of these in the territory for the first seventy-five miles of the Canada Northern Railway west from the Manitoba boundary.”

That is near where the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) lives; he should know something about it; that is one of the areas that was given away.

It goes on to say:

“Extending south of the line for forty-five miles north of the Saskatchewan River, and the remaining berths lie largely in a belt of country fifty miles wide, stretching northwest from Prince Albert one hundred miles, and very few berths under license are in the forest reserves.”

Now isn't that strange? All this timber was outside the forest reserves which was given away to friends of the government of that date, and

“These containing little merchantable timber, timber of the northern spruce type already described.”

Mr. Speaker, estimates of the available spruce of that time, according to the records that we have, indicated that Saskatchewan had from eight to thirteen

billion feet of spruce timber, which would mean that we could easily have cut around 500 million cubic feet annually or each year, if we had followed the right kind of policy of conservation and proper utilization.

I would like to refer to the report of the Saskatchewan Royal Commission on Forestry, 1947, chapter number 4, which I think is a complete condemnation of Liberal forest utilization policy and I quote:

“We see little use in reviewing some of the cases of timber disposal in the early days of the Dominion administration, which justly caused public outcry.”

My hon. friend from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) was just a baby in those days and would not remember, but I still remember how the public cried out against the ravages that were practiced in this province.

It goes on to say:

“Then as now the handling of the forest was looked upon as entirely secondary to the successful settlement of farm lands. Comparatively few citizens were vitally concerned about setting up of proper methods of protection and administration that would assure of perpetuation of the forest in the high state of production.”

I could say there were very few governments of that day concerned about this situation, certainly not to the extent my hon. friend from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) is today. It goes on:

“The same situation could fairly be said to exist today as that in 1947, and it must be admitted that despite outcries against unwise exploitation of the forest and the granting of timber berths on an unfair basis, that forest fires, due largely to the carelessness of people, have done far more to reduce the marketable stand of timber and the production possibilities of the provinces’ forest lands than all other causes put together.”

Now there is the situation in 1947. We have it in this report, and hon. members opposite could have read that report just as well as I have read it. I repeat so that it may not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that many of these berths were obtained at a few cents an acre,

**April 10, 1962**

and to prove my contention I am going to submit and lay on the table a report or map of an area down by Weekes. This is the berth, Mr. Speaker, in yellow, half a county, 18.8 square miles that was given away. Yes, it was given away, that is the term I would use, or sold at a very low price to what was called the Red Deer Lumber Company, later on the Red Deer Lumber Company transferred it over to The Pas Lumber Company in 1925, and do you know what they paid for dues there? Only \$1.00 a thousand board feet — of course, in addition they paid a \$2.00 license fee, and they paid \$15.00 a year fire tax — a tax of \$15.00 of an area of 18.8 square miles. This was under the Liberal government, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to lay this on the table.

There are the facts, if my hon. friend wants to know and satisfy himself he may look at the map. I have here the dues on the timber cut shown as \$1.00 per thousand feet up to 1950, and then the CCF government in 1950 decided that people should receive more for this timber and they raised the dues to \$3.00 a thousand, and of course my hon. friends opposite go up in the air because we raised the dues and we raised the taxes.

I submit to this House that when this company could in 1950 receive \$59.93 wholesale per 1,000 feet of lumber, that we were entitled to get a little more than \$1.00 from them. The timber board prices at that time were much less. As a matter of fact in 1951 the price of lumber wholesale by this company, The Pas Lumber Company, according to the information I have, was \$66.66 which is more than the timber board charged as a wholesale — retail price in 1961, the price last year, if the hon. members will recall the information given us in the Crown Corporation Committee. The year 1951 was the last year of operations carried on by this company, and I don't know what happened to the berth since then, but I think after it was clear cut the land was turned over for settlement as was the case in Big River and other places.

I would like to remind hon. members and particularly the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) who should know some contractors in his area who cut pulpwood, just as I know some from my area who cut pulpwood, as to how these people operated.

First of all the Liberal government in Saskatchewan gave contracts to people like Sedwick (if you want to recall that and you should know him) and Hett and Sibbald from Prince Albert and to others. What did these

contractors do, Mr. Speaker? They sub-contracted to their friends; they went out and found little people like myself to go and cut pulpwood, and the man in between got anywhere from 50 cents to \$1.50 a cord commission for pulpwood. Yes it is very noticeable that the man who worked in those days got \$1.00 a day for cutting wood, working in the bush, or he got a small payment for cutting cordwood, but the commission agent, between the contractor and the wood worker got \$1.50 a cord. That is the kind of system the hon. members and their party like.

Do my hon. friends know of the Northern Cartage Company near Prince Albert. When I was a lad we homesteaded for quite a number of years, and I had to cut cordwood to help keep the family, and do you know where we got the permit? Not from the Saskatchewan government or from the Department of Natural Resources, I had to go to the Northern Cartage Company, and pay them 25 cents a cord for every cord of wood that I took out and hauled into the city of Prince Albert. That was the situation. Our forest resources all across the province were in the hands of private people, millionaires of Canada, of the United States, and of Great Britain, and even after the war, Mr. Speaker, up at Candle Lake, there was still one of those berths which I would say contained the best block of timber in this province (and the Minister of Mineral Resources knows of it quite well, he can bear me out) about a township of this land received or obtained from the government before our time, on the same basis of possible a few cents an acre — timber three and a half feet in diameter — and what happened. The McDiarmid Lumber Company went in there and clean cut it in two years. They took every tree, large or small, with no consideration of the future. There again is your private enterprise, and your Liberal party's policy insofar as timber is concerned.

It seems that my hon. friends, when they bring in a resolution like this, ignore the facts of life. It seems we have to teach them some of the facts of life, and I want to remind them again that in their time the operators, the people that went into this business, exploited the resource and exploited the people. They had a free-for-all, and a grand picnic for themselves, and they worked together, in cahoots so to say, and I am going to quote from page 137 of the same article, I quote from the same booklet which says this: — “The manager of the Prince Albert Lumber Company Limited has stated publicly that the company would not mind having to cut

**April 10, 1962**

according to forest reserve regulations, provided all the other lumber companies in the country did the same, so that one company would not be competing with another under any disadvantage.”

This is the kind of system they would like to have — monied interests coming into this province and joining together so that one wouldn't hurt the other. This is a public statement and my hon. friends can read it for themselves if they want.

Let us take a look at how people fared in those days, and I am going to refer hon. members to “Logging in Saskatchewan's Carrot River, 1944” which was written by Mr. B.A. Matheson, and I quote:

“This 1,400 man force of The Pas Lumber Company would take out forty to fifty million board feet of lumber each year. Log booms were made up near the estuary of the Carrot River, then floated down to the Saskatchewan, six miles to a good sized saw mill at The Pas.”

That is in Manitoba, by the way if hon. members don't know it.

“The mill ran twenty-four hours a day, turning out approximately 100,000 board feet of lumber per day.”

And if you figure that out it comes to something around two and a half to three million board feet a year.

“Rough lumber was piled in yards for a year of seasoning, then was shipped to the United States. The average wage for lumberjacks for winter logging was \$1.00 a day and board. The men worked from daylight to dark in winter, from seven in the morning to six at night when daylight lengthened. During the river drive the company paid three to three and a half dollars a day for fourteen or fifteen hours of work.”

(no overtime my friends)

“There was plenty of work, nourishing food, good companionship, steady income, so there was seldom any complaint against the company.”



Now that was one side of the picture, and the same article goes on and if you read another paragraph you see how people fared, and I quote:

“Accidents were common among the river drivers as they tried to loosen the log jams. Those who drowned were mostly buried along the shores of the river where they were working. The men were mainly floaters from other parts of the world, and it would have been impractical to try and send their bodies home, so the graves may still be found in the meandering one hundred mile Sipanok channel, and the Carrot and Saskatchewan Rivers.”

Such is the plight of workers under free enterprise, Mr. Speaker.

To summarize I say this; firstly the government of the day gave away their prerogative and rights to resources to private people and foreign companies under very favourable terms and questionable terms or conditions. Secondly; these owners of timber berths exploited the people who worked in the forest, and by failing to use conservation methods, were responsible for the ravaging and clear cutting of excellent forest areas in Saskatchewan, if I put it mildly. Thirdly, profits which were made were not returned to the people of this province or country, either through taxes or the building of roads, bridges, or such other work. In those days they didn't even have to pay income tax, as my hon. friends know. Fourthly, I say, Mr. Speaker, these companies were not interested in employment, but only in making profits out of people.

Let us compare the situation today. As I have said before the Saskatchewan Timber Board was set up as a marketing agency and as a contracting corporation, to provide the best possible service in the harvesting and marketing of our forest resources. Since this corporation came into being, it has complied with the regulations concerning the management and the harvesting of timber. This corporation I know from personal experience has opened up new areas far removed from markets and from rail heads, which private operators were not interested in, and some of these areas are a considerable distance, and I can name them. Some of them are away up at Dore Lake, north of Montreal Lake, way up past the Swan Lakes, which are all over one hundred miles north of Prince Albert. The timber board has over the years operated on a very small margin, I expect at times they even lost a little money; I am not sorry about that, because they have turned over either to the people of Saskatchewan or to the operator (because the board is the contractor) as much money as it is possible to turn over to them after the

**April 10, 1962**

lumber is sold on the markets. I know this too, and from experience, that certain adjustments were made which had never before been made by private operators.

I know when the pole operators up at Candle Lake were having a tough time, because of distance and roads, and other problems, the timber board raised the price to be paid for these poles by 25 cents on one occasion, and I think 50 cents on another occasion. Did you ever hear of private enterprise doing that? Under their contract you either swam or you sank while we have tried to see that the people who work in the forest could carry on profitable operations.

Finally it must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that under free enterprise considerable forest products, such as lumber and fence posts were black-marketed without payment of dues, and surely the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) should know that, because I know it, and I don't live very close to Pelly. It is known that a considerable amount, carloads of forest material was black-marketed, and the government lost dues, and the forests were being denuded because there were not any controls at that time.

Since the timber board has been set up there has been very little, if any, black-market, and of course the people of Saskatchewan are getting the dues, which the province is entitled to, and which money is being used to good advantage.

I would like to point out too, and again from personal experience, and out of the mouths of some of these contractors, one of them I think is well known to the hon. member for Pelly, where they cheated operators. Not only did they cheat the government in the dues they were supposed to pay, but they cheated the people that worked in the forest on the amount of stumpage and cordwood and so forth. We don't do this today, also it must be remembered that because we have a timber board we have been cutting material that was never cut in Saskatchewan to any extent before, such as telephone and power poles, which used to be shipped in from British Columbia and other places. It must be remembered that this same material that has been cut in this province has provided work for the people of this province; has been sold to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and to the telephone companies; and to lumber yards and to people generally, at a lower cost than it would have been possible to obtain the material otherwise. Certainly this employment would not have been possible if we had continued to ship in lumber from British Columbia, or other parts of Canada.

I would like to mention in connection with employment, one other point; because we have these operations under the Saskatchewan Timber Board; because we have cut the kind of material that we have, that we have been able to provide jobs for truckers, and I know quite a few truckers who live in my own community who have jobs of delivering lumber from the area in the north to all parts of Saskatchewan, to telephone companies and to private people, and this all helps to bring about employment, and it only goes to show how wrong the hon. members who sponsored this resolution are in their contention about employment.

I would also like to add this, I do know a number of these operators who work in the forests of the north; some of them have done very well. Those that were operated in a husband-like manner and knew what they were doing did very well. I know one young chap who was an orphan, with a quarter section of land which belonged to his mother, who couldn't make a living who went into the forest, and in a few years time had made enough in pole production that today he owns a hotel just down the line here past Fort Qu'Appelle. He is not the only one, there are many others who have done as well as he has.

I will say this, and I have said it before, maybe all the operations of the timber board were not profitable. We have the case at Big River, and as I said I am not ashamed of it. At times we have possibly lost some money at Big River, but we have provided work for quite a few people in that community. We provided work at Dore Lake, cutting timber for the mill in that community. Had we not had a timber board, Mr. Speaker, the community of Big River would have disintegrated. Surely we have some responsibility to the people of this province to see that where subsidies are necessary or where help is necessary, that we give that kind of help, and I am very proud of what the government of Saskatchewan through the timber board has done for the community of Big River.

In conclusion, it must not be forgotten that whatever money the timber board has made has not gone into the pockets of big contractors or profiteers, who then may have gone on to Bermuda to spend their life in ease, but these earnings or profits have gone back to the people of Saskatchewan. First of all we paid as much as it was possible to pay on a safe margin to the operators, then what is left we used for the building of roads. Many of these roads have opened up lakes and sports areas, and whatever of the money that was left

**April 10, 1962**

has gone into the treasury of the province of Saskatchewan in the same way as dues that are collected to benefit all the people of Saskatchewan; and so I say, Mr. Speaker, that when I listened to the hon. members opposite, who I think should know better, I am more than surprised that such a resolution has been presented in this House, because if there has been any criticism of the timber board, certainly it was not in the field for which they were responsible. You could have criticized the administration but you cannot criticize the timber board for its utilization policy or for conservation which properly belongs to the Department of Natural Resources. You can see, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly cannot agree with that kind of contention, and I certainly will not support the motion.

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on this motion. We have listened to the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) raving and ranting, but in spite of all his remarks, in my opinion he has failed to justify the complete monopoly of Saskatchewan Timber Board for timber utilization and marketing in Saskatchewan. In the past crop year, where the economic situation in Saskatchewan has been very serious, where we have many of our smaller farmers in very difficult circumstances, where more than in any other province in Canada, we have seen and felt the results of the lack of population growth certainly few operations have stifled free enterprise and initiative more than the timber board, and some of the other socialist monopolies that we have operating here in Saskatchewan. The member for Cumberland and the Minister of Natural Resources and others can quote statistics all they like, but in spite of this they will never convince the people in Saskatchewan who require a supplementary income that this is in the best interests of the whole province. We only need cite the lack of a pulp mill in Saskatchewan. Many surveys have been conducted on this matter and it is estimated that we have sufficient timber resources to support several such mills. Now what is their answer when we asked them why we still have not got pulp production in this province? They have no answer, Mr. Speaker. When the enemies of free enterprise stand on their feet as the member for Cumberland did this morning, how in the world are we going to interest capital in coming into Saskatchewan to assist in the production of pulp. In fact I think he made the statement, if I hear it correctly, that it was fortunate the Big River mill burned down. I thought that was an

astounding statement from the member for Cumberland. I hope he didn't mean to say that.

Mr. Speaker, when we come back to the motion of the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie), the purpose was chiefly to permit producers freedom in disposing of their production. Why the province should completely stifle the wishes of the producers with regard to the marketing of their timber is more than I can understand. They are suffering of course from all the weaknesses of a monopoly. They are obviously afraid of competition, and if we study the majority of the monopolies operated by this government, I think we can agree that none of them could survive in open competition. None of them could survive without the financial advantages enjoyed by their monopoly. None of them could survive in free and open competition with private enterprise. So one must look further to find the motive behind this since the hon. member has admitted that the monopoly of the timber board may have operated at a loss at times. In fact we know that in some cases the administration costs have taken away any advantages or any profits that the Provincial Treasurer might enjoy. What is the motive? Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the main motive behind the timber board monopoly as far as I am concerned is just one more effort to put the people of the province under the thumb of this government, and to stifle initiative in every possible way in order to gain sufficient power to perpetuate socialism in this province. They may pretend that their main concern is conservation, which of course in itself would be a very noble motive, but, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, there is no reason why we could not have permitted the small farmers more freedom in their efforts to supplement their fading farm income, as many of our more northern farmers used to be able to do. No one denies, Mr. Speaker, that there may have been abuses by some operators in this province, and certainly one could find many abuses practiced by the timber board if one were to go through the records. The main fault of the timber board has been the fact that it has stifled the initiative of the small operators and prevented the province from enjoying the type of income it might have had, if production had been more open.

I think we have already heard sufficient proof, from the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) that employment has suffered.

**Government Member:** — He doesn't know what he is talking about.

**April 10, 1962**

**Mr. Foley:** — I notice the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) did not attempt to refute the figures of 1,800 less employed today than were employed in 1944. I was very interested also to hear of the demands made on our Saskatchewan timber during the war and the part which it played on our war effort. Any attempt by the members on the other side, Mr. Speaker, to try and belittle that effort is no credit to them or to the government. I have had the opportunity, as many members have, of seeing something of the vast timber resources in our province. I have also had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of going into the province of Alberta, and observing what is taking place there under private enterprise. I have had the opportunity of visiting the large pulp mill at Hinton, Alberta, and observing the hundreds of men who are employed in that very essential operation. As far as I can see, Mr. Speaker, and I don't pretend to be a timber expert, there is no reason why years ago in this province, more effort could not have been made to bring similar industry and employment into Saskatchewan. Thus in spite of all figures and statistics which the members opposite may use to try and justify this crippling monopoly, one has simply to observe the difference between the pulp operations in Alberta and the lack of them in Saskatchewan to judge the effects of the timber board monopoly in this province. I will be happy to associate myself with the member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) in supporting this resolution.

**Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised at some of the statements that have been made originally in this motion, and further by the contributors to this debate. The last two speakers from the opposition made it obvious that the only contact that they ever had with timber was probably a pencil or toothpick, for all they know about the timber operations, past and present, was obvious from all the things they said, and some of the things they did not say.

Now this resolution, Mr. Speaker, says that we should terminate the monopoly of the timber board, and that the freedom should be permitted to the operators for disposing of their production — their production. Well now, first of all I believe that the production from crown lands is the production of the people of Saskatchewan. The timber board is an agent for the marketing

of timber, and the Department of Natural Resources is the caretaker of that timber. It seems to be quite all right, the members opposite seem to think it is quite all right, for the people of Saskatchewan to work away, pay for reforestations, pay for fire protection, pay for all the things that are required to maintain and bring this timber to maturity, and then we are supposed to be Santa Claus and hand it over to a few operators to reap the harvest. It is like saying to the man that goes out and harvest in the fall of the year — I own the land, I plant the wheat, I did the summerfallowing the year before, but because you move in with a combine, you are going to own the crop. This is a ridiculous argument, and I wonder when the people opposite are going to wake up. I wonder when they are going to wake up.

This timber is a God-given property of the people of Saskatchewan, all the people of Saskatchewan. We maintain we nurtured this timber and it is our privilege as a government to see to it that the people of Saskatchewan get their fair share and not have the timber taken and stolen, ravished as the member for Cumberland said for years and years before this government took office, and I know something about this because I have worked in that timber back in the thirties and I know exactly what the story was.

Talking about monopolies, talk about your monopolies, well let me tell you a bit about monopolies. I was naive enough back in 1934, to hike up into the timber with a broad axe, thinking that I could get a sub-contract and get one or two thousand ties, a friend of mine and myself, and I would be able to go out there and make a little money. I wasn't afraid of work, so I just thought I would go up there and I would get a contract and get myself a little timber. Well I went out and located some timber and that was free, but when I went to the forest ranger at that time, he is called conservation officer today, I was told that in order to get a contract I would have to contract for at least 25,000 ties. I couldn't get a contract for one or two thousand ties, which was ridiculous according to the ranger. The department didn't bother with this type of thing. He said it was impossible, that I couldn't do this. He said I'll tell you what you can do — you can go and see the contractor that has the contract in this area, and you can probably sub-contract. Well I went to see this gentleman in question, and he said, it will cost you 15 cents a tie. He said, I am already paying 10 cents a tie to Hett and Sibbald in order to

**April 10, 1962**

get this 25,000, I am already paying 10 cents a tie to them. I said, what do they do? Well, he said, they don't actually put any money into this operation, but they back me. For instance, I get credit at GWG Garment Company, I get credit at the packers, and I get credit at the wholesalers, to bring my supplies in and they simply back me and in the spring when the production is off the line, I give them 10 cents a tie because they have underwritten the results.

Well I remember the operation. I finally gave up the idea, because it was impossible at 15 cents a tie, when ties were worth 52 cents for No. 1 and 45 cents for No. 2 if you had to operate at 15 cents a tie less, it is impossible to do anything with piece work. I went to work in this lumber camp at \$1.00 a day, on a 12 hour day, plus board, and at night I kept the books for this particular business, about two hours which happened to have a lot of "live-stock". In fact the boys were busy at night changing their underwear, they kept turning it inside out so they could run the live-stock to death getting back on the right side. It was a privilege to get into a shack where there weren't any extra live-stock.

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

**Mr. Kramer:** — That was togetherness, yes, you bet it was.

**Opposition Member:** — You would enjoy it.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, when the operation wound up in the spring most of the men in those days were working for \$15 or \$20 a month. The reason I got \$1.00 a day is that I undertook to do a job that two fellows were doing before — both the slabs of ties and the books.

**Mr. Foley:** — You were overpaid.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Oh yes, I ate too much too. It was the funny thing, but I will say they certainly put up good grub.

**Opposition Member:** — Underworked and overpaid.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I was not complaining — the board was excellent and that was the only reason the men stayed.



Well, Mr. Speaker, when these men went out of there in the spring, the majority of them went out owing the concession there from \$5 — \$10 and \$12 because they were out more overalls, mitts, their smoking tobacco, their supplies, than they earned through the winter, and then they had to go out to the farms and work for \$20 a month.

This is but a small part of the picture that existed. I have a friend sitting up in the gallery who was trapping muskrats in that country at that time, and he knows the story well. I am sure that if the gentlemen opposite don't agree with me, I know one or two members at least in the gallery may. They learned living which is quite different to the people who are speaking now from the opposition side of the House, who have never known the real story, the only thing they are going by is hearsay, trying to mislead the public into thinking that their monopolistic friends were private or free enterprise, and that monopoly did not exist; the real monopoly that did exist prior to the advent of the timber board.

I maintain Sir, that the word monopoly in this resolution is entirely wrong, that any concern that is owned and controlled by the people of Saskatchewan, or any government, cannot be a monopoly, this is a public service. It cannot be a monopoly anymore than the Canadian Wheat Board can be a monopoly. Here is the point that I wish to make today — that this is not a monopoly, the whole wording of this resolution is wrong in its content.

I want to go into a few more reasons why I support the timber board today. Small operators now know what they are going to get, and if they go into difficult areas, they can get larger amounts. We heard the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) talking about Alberta. I would like to ask him why some of the mill operators right in his territory came back from Alberta. Did they ever tell him? Did they ever tell him the deal they got from Swanson, who has the similar monopoly I mentioned in Alberta, where Swanson and Miller have a contract on all the best timber in northern Alberta? If you go in there you sub-contract from Swanson. Mill operators came back and they were mighty glad to come back — a good many of them. Sure they went — they were dissatisfied, but they came back. Some of the people that are operating in the north right now had all they wanted from Alberta, and they came back because they know they are getting a better deal right here, and this too can be proved.

**April 10, 1962**

**Mr. Danielson:** — Just like . . . need oiling.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I can name them, a good number of them — truckers — small contractors. Now as long as you have a controlled cut, you have a cut of timber that isn't wasted and ravished, the type of operation, the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) mentioned that operators were indulging in prior to the advent of the timber board, prior to the advent of this government which started a real conservation policy, which, Mr. Speaker, has been recognized by the federal Department of Northern Affairs and Resources, as the best conservation policy in Canada. This is a statement that was made, I am sure the Minister of Mineral Resources remembers when this was made, that Saskatchewan's conservation policy was the best in Canada. These things are overlooked by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now I notice the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) said that we make no mention of the fact that 1,800 less people were employed today than were in 1944. If this statement is correct, I would say that he probably hasn't heard of power saws, he probably hasn't heard of any automation whatever. It just didn't happen. He hasn't heard of the fact that they are using "cats" and trucks in the north where there used to be miles of teams of horses going down the road, with a teamster behind each one. He never heard of that. If he had ever worked in the timber he would have known how ridiculous his statement was. If in 1962 we should be employing exactly the same number of people, putting out less timber under a controlled cut, than we were in 1944 or 1943. This again just goes to show you how little he knows of what is actually happening in the timber industry today. Automation apparently has no place, it hasn't happened as far as the Liberal party is concerned. They are still back in the dark ages as far as their thinking is concerned, this is also true of other things on other points they have mentioned.

With the timber board profits are ploughed back into the province. They are not taken out to the United States, to the twin cities, Minneapolis and St. Paul, and so on, as they were before, and I believe this is a sound policy. I am satisfied we are building our timber resources, and our timber resources are being taken out on a sound foundation, we certainly have every reason to support whole-heartedly the activities of this timber board.

Certainly there is the odd mistake made. You can't possibly hire people without somebody making an odd mistake. But any mistakes that are made, Mr. Speaker, by people of the timber board, I am satisfied, are made in an honest attempt to do something better, not mistakes that have been made deliberately to fill the pockets of a few wealthy friends of monopolies, as was done by the Liberal party, and the former Tory party, in our timber areas with our timber resources prior to 1944, all the way back to the time when this province was formed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this — that because of these things, and because of a few other things that have not been mentioned, let us take a look — whoever heard of a private company, one of these private monopolies, providing lumber at cost for unfortunate people, people who had lost their homes by fire, for community and church organizations and so on. Right in my constituency the community of Radisson built a stadium with timber board material, timber board lumber. It is estimated by the chap that was in charge, the chairman, I asked him what he thought was saved, compared to any other organization if he had bought the lumber from the Beaver Lumber or somewhere else, and he said, we figure that the timber board saved us \$12,000 on our rink. It is a beautiful rink, certainly the hon. member for Athabasca knows about it, and the people of Radisson are very happy with the timber board, and very happy with the saving that originated.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — His father-in-law lives up in that area, and he ought to know all about it. What the people of Radisson think of the deal they got from the timber board. People who have lost their homes by fire, communities and so on, can actually get their timber at cost. This is a humanitarian organization, and this is another thing that no private monopoly has ever done that I know of, outside of a very few and extreme cases.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and tell you about some of the sins and so on that have gone on in the past under the Liberals, but I think the people of Saskatchewan are aware of them.

Mr. Speaker, I say that I cannot support this motion and I am going to vote against it.

**April 10, 1962**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the House ready for the question? I warn the members that the mover is about to close the debate. If any member wishes to speak he should do so now.

**Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to review the remarks that have been made by the two members opposite and the Minister of Natural Resources. I would first like to read this motion again. The motion reads . . .

Quote . . .

I would like to go back, Mr. Speaker, and just deal with what I called a monopoly in the remarks I made in introducing this motion into the House. What I said at that time:

“In this province in the Saskatchewan Timber Board we have a monopoly in the production sale and control of all spruce lumber and pulpwood, harvested and produced from crown lands.”

Then I went on to say in connection with the matter of conservation that we have heard so much about, later in my speech, I said:

“Applying reasonable and sensible conservation policies, a Liberal government would make our forest resources available to all interested individuals and concerns. There would be no strings attached as to price or marketing controls. Timber permits and timber sales would be granted on a competitive tender basis, open to everybody.”

I wanted to get that straight before I started.

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Natural Resources spoke to this particular motion last week, unfortunately I wasn't able to be present, but I have read a transcription of his remarks, and I am amazed at the content of the transcription and I am certainly amazed at the attitude and the remarks made by the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and the member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) here this morning. I hope

the people in the constituency of Cumberland become well aware of the remarks made by their member, and also the member of the constituency of The Battlefords because I know the member for Cumberland had a very poor cast to handle. I know that deep down within him he knows that what I say is correct.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — I know the people in the Cumberland constituency know that what I say is correct, but as usual the remarks have been made in order to confuse the whole issue, have been personal. The Minister of Natural Resources from the very start of his speech ridiculed me personally, and made some very disparaging remarks and I want to thank him for them, because the people in his constituency of Canora, the people in the Pelly constituency and the people in all the forest areas of Saskatchewan, will welcome me being criticized for bringing this particular resolution in, by the minister. I want to thank him for them.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — They are not hurting me. I am tickled to death the attack was personal. However, I want to deal with some of the remarks made by the member for Cumberland. He said that the timber board didn't have a monopoly, and he went on to qualify his remarks by saying that there were private operators, and there was timber on Indian reserves that was taken off. Well certainly I know that, every member in this House should know that, but there is a very small amount of timber owned by private people on private land, most of it pulp wood, a little bit of spruce saw timber, and there is some on Indian reservations in the north — certainly. Well I never said to begin with that the timber board had a monopoly on all the spruce, all the spruce products. He was speaking to this particular resolution, and I had explained this in the first place. I never claimed they had a monopoly, but the Minister of Natural Resources claims that I had said they had a monopoly on the timber production in Canada, and was relating it to Canada. This is absolutely ridiculous. I know there have been abuses in the past — I am the last one to stand up there and say there probably wasn't abuses in the past, but I want to point out these particular things — that forty or fifty years ago and today, and the last ten or fifteen years are two entirely different things.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Well go back to the thirties.

**April 10, 1962**

**Mr. Barrie:** — I will go back to the thirties. To hear the minister and the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) talking about 1910 and 1912, to hear him talk you would think that all the timber that had been conserved at that time should still be standing today; and he knows better than I do that timber matures, and once it gets to maturity, it has to be cut and used or it is a fire hazard, and we have many forests today in Saskatchewan with mature timber. He knows that very well, and nobody knows this better than the member for Cumberland.

A few years ago, in the thirties, the majority of the timber operators, the sawmill men in the northern part of this province, were men who made a part-time occupation. They farmed a little, raised livestock in the summer, and they carried on a small mill operation on the forest reserve or very close to it during the winter. These were the bulk of the operators. Then the member for Cumberland knows many of these people are still living today and will remember this, when he said they were a bunch of cheaters, black-marketers and so on. This is the statement he made. These were small people providing employment for their neighbours and one another. This is what he has branded these people with, and I think they will they will be pleased to know it, and there must be many in his seat, Cumberland.

He talks about the Big River mill. He took great satisfaction in that it was destroyed by fire.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I did not say that I took satisfaction — I pointed out that the timber had been cut out, and I think I mentioned, I don't know the exact words, that the mill was destroyed. As far as I was concerned, I wasn't happy and the hon. member knows about it. I don't want that . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Guy:** — . . . Fortunate for the company.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I would like the hon. member to withdraw that.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — No. No. It is on the records.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I don't think it was a direct imputation — what he said and we understood — if you have corrected the records, we cannot debate that point.

**Mr. Barrie:** — Mr. Speaker, these small operators in the thirties, and in the early forties, and even before that, were the people he claimed, because these were the operators he talked about at that time., they were the exploiters, the cheaters, and the black-marketers. They will appreciate that very much, some of their families will appreciate it very much, the branding of their operation at that particular time.

I want to just say a word or two in connection with timber, a lot of timber, more timber in the early part of this century in Saskatchewan, a lot of very mature timber. Much of it was taken out, I will admit there were abuses, as I said before, much of it was destroyed by fire, in those days.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Was any of it left?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Barrie:** — Well how have you been able to operate since 1944? How has the timber board been able to operate if you want to infer there was nothing left?

What I want to say is this — that back in those days much of the settlement in the northern part of the province couldn't have been made and wouldn't have been made if it hadn't been for this employment and I know he said they worked for \$15 a month and they worked 12 hours a day, but they did admit they were well fed. That was the only source of employment there was in those days for single men — they were out there trying to homestead and tat kind of thing, and this timber if it hadn't been taken by the Red Deer, or The Pas Lumber Company, or the Western Construction, or who have you, it would probably have been destroyed by fire and would have been a hazard. These companies, and there are members sitting on the other side of the House, that I think will admit and readily admit, that The Pas Lumber Company was the company that operated in this province for a long time, and they took out a lot of timber, but I don't think at any time, even the members who may be biased and prejudiced on the other side, that know the

**April 10, 1962**

operations of The Pas Lumber Company, insofar as their help was concerned, would criticize them as the member for Cumberland did. The Pas Lumber Company, I know among the men that worked there for years from my own community and others, was a company that had a reputation for being very fair and reasonable with their help. They didn't get two or three hundred dollars a month I know, I wasn't suggesting that for a minute. They were well fed and well housed. They didn't have the accommodation we have today in lumber camps. I know. They didn't have such accommodations anywhere at that time. The whole trouble is my hon. friends don't take into consideration that we have been, and we are living in entirely different times than what it was in 1900, 1904, or 1905, particularly in this province.

But, as I say, Mr. Speaker, they have tried to confuse the issue. I have a little sympathy for them because they have a hard job to defend this monopoly organization in this province.

I now want to deal principally with the remarks made by the Minister of Natural Resources. I am sure there are plenty of people in the constituency of Canora, where he comes from, that will be very pleased to learn of the attitude he has taken and what he has had to say in connection with this particular resolution, and of course, he claims that if the Liberals got in, as I had suggested when I spoke to introduce this motion, that we are going to throw it wide open, and that everybody would be in the game and clear the timber off in no time. I think I made this clear when I spoke to the motion. But he talked a great deal about mills. He said we have more mills in the province of Saskatchewan today according to the records, than we had when this government came into power. That is quite true — but there are mills and there are mills — and I have made inquiries, because I was amazed and the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and if the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) were here, they wouldn't certainly get up and say there are more mills operating in their particular areas or in the Hudson Bay region, than there was in 1943-44. I made inquiries from the department concerned, and I find out that the 510 mills that are listed in the report, is every conceivable small sawmill in the province of Saskatchewan. If a man at Shamrock or Shaunavon has a little bit of a sawmill that he cuts a few boards for his own use, if there is such a thing, then he is one of the 510 mills. I find there is much less, substantially less, than 200 mills actually adjacent, operating adjacent to, or in the forest



reserves, operating in the province today. Then I was told by the hon. member, the Minister of Natural Resources, that I was misleading people, and the statements I made were untrue, and so on and so forth.

I will leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House whether we have a more flourishing and a greater forest operation in Saskatchewan today than we had in 1943-44. Then they talked about the great benefits that Saskatchewan people received from the operation of the timber board. Probably if they took it generally, but they said there were certain people that benefited and the Minister of Natural Resources own figures that I am going to quote, there is less than 10 per cent of the production of the timber board sold by retail in Saskatchewan. Of the total sales of lumber, and these are the Minister of Natural Resources own figures that were used in his speech, there is less than 30 per cent of the total lumber used and consumed in Saskatchewan sold by the timber board — pardon me, Mr. Speaker, 30 per cent of their production sold in Saskatchewan — 70 per cent of what they produce in Saskatchewan in the way of lumber is exported into other parts of Canada and into the United States. So I wonder just what benefit we have been getting in Saskatchewan from this particular operation because apparently there is 70 per cent of the lumber they produce goes out and of the total sales in Saskatchewan they supply less than 30 per cent. There must be 70 per cent of the consumer lumber in Saskatchewan coming in from Alberta, British Columbia and other parts of Canada.

**Mr. Danielson:** — At less price.

**Mr. Barrie:** — Then he mentioned, I believe the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) also brought this up, but it is worthy of mention again. He said the average price at the timber board was \$65.17 a thousand. Well I live right close to the forest area, as the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) has said. I have seen rough lumber hauled by my door, 40 or 50 miles to a timber board piling yard to buy it for \$65 a thousand — you didn't buy it for \$85 a thousand. If it was a good grade of lumber you paid over \$100 a thousand, just recently a little less than \$100 a thousand. So to quote a price of \$65 for lumber and to say that the timber board has kept down the price to the producer of lumber in the province of Saskatchewan — that is the most ridiculous statement, I think that was made. Insofar as their defence along those lines, I can see

**April 10, 1962**

no merit in it, Mr. Speaker, and certainly I know that the public in the province of Saskatchewan who are buying lumber and such like certainly will agree with me, rather than the statements made to the contrary by them.

But, there is one other item that each member that spoke from the opposite side has made a great point of when they said they have placed the operators, the small operators and the large operators that are in contact with the timber board, have placed them in a very — I forget the word that the Minister of Natural Resources used — but they have placed them in a good economic position, or words to that effect. He said they paid an average of \$41.49 for the materials produced by the operators and delivered to the timber board yard. Now this \$41.49 is a figure that, while the operator was possibly paid this on paper, he certainly didn't get it because in the first place, and I am just taking an average figure, in most places the trucking from the operation in the forest or the saw mill to the timber board yard, I think a conservative estimate would be an average of \$5 a thousand has to be paid the trucker, and which is deducted from the \$41.49. Then in addition he would have to pay an average of \$6 dues, deducted from the \$41.49. So if you take the \$11 and deduct it from the \$41.49 this operator is getting about \$30.49 on an average for his production. Now, in spite of what they say in connection with the operators in the province being satisfied, they have no other alternative but to work with their equipment for the timber board or get out of the province, because they have no timber to operate on unless they do that.

I am going to make the statement again that there are very few, if any operators, operating for the timber board in the province of Saskatchewan, and there are some very close to where I live, that are satisfied with the deal they are getting and the spread between what they get and what the timber board asks for the finished product. That is what they complain about. Of course, they don't tell Mr. Kalmakoff, the man in charge of the timber board, or they won't come and tell Mr. Kuziak who is determined to have this board carry on — certainly they don't tell them, because if they did they would soon wipe them out. They would soon wipe them out. But I know that every timber board operator in this province, and I hope what I have said, I hope what the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) has said, and what the member for Battleford (Mr. Kramer) has said, and particularly what the Minister of Natural Resources said, I know in my heart that every operator

agrees with what I say and not with what they say.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — I think the words used — they come to my mind now — that they brought economic stability to the producers. That is a great joke and nobody will laugh more than the producers themselves.

I noticed, Mr. Speaker, there was one item the Minister of Natural Resources very carefully avoided in reading the transcript of his speech. The member for Cumberland had very little to say about it and I don't believe the member for The Battlefords mentioned it either and that is pulp. Now in this province we have and I don't think anybody will dispute it, millions and millions of cords of pulp. Much of that pulp is matured. Many of these trees they would use for pulp are matured today and are the areas where the greatest fire hazard and the greatest cost to the people of this province, in fire prevention and fire control, is in the areas where this pulp is so plentiful. You don't need to take my word for it. This government hired the people from the Stanford University, and I believe it was the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who quoted that report this morning, and the people who made the survey claimed that we could operate in perpetuity five or six pulp mills in this province. That indicates to you the potential resources we have of pulp.

Now, the timber board handles some pulp every year. I am not going to weary the members of this House this morning with going into the details. But I believe it is a year or two years ago, in this House, I brought to the attention of the government and to the Minister of Natural Resources at that time, the . . .

**Premier Lloyd:** — On a point of order, if I may, Mr. Speaker. The member has just made clear that none of the members on this side referred to pulp. I think the rules of the debate are that he can at this point only introduce material relevant to what has been said in the debate. Therefore, I suggest he is out of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — . . . He cannot introduce any new argument into the debate.

**April 10, 1962**

**Mr. Barrie:** — I will deal very briefly with this because I think it is an interesting part of this particular motion. There is a great difference in the price one mile within the Saskatchewan — Manitoba boundary for pulp and one mile in the province of Manitoba because I imagine the timber board probably tried to take the profit in between. I don't know. But I am satisfied of this, Mr. Speaker, that if we in this province — it may not pertain throughout the whole northern part — but if this government would change the policy in respect to pulp wood alone, and allow private operators to obtain permission and go in and cut pulp wood in the northern part of the province, it would do exactly what I said in this particular resolution — that it will create a substantial amount of employment for people who are not skilled people, who could go in and take pulp from the bush, and if they could take their production and sell it directly to Pine Falls or to the people who are using pulp in the United States — unfortunately we haven't anybody here to use it — then I know that the production of pulp, the revenue to the government and employment would certainly benefit a great deal. But for some reason or other, I don't know the reason, for some reason or other, those particular people who are buying pulp, if there is a little bit off private land in Saskatchewan, along the Manitoba-Saskatchewan boundary, those people who are buying any pulp that they can obtain in the province of Manitoba from private operators don't care to deal with the Saskatchewan Timber Board.

I have talked to their representatives and asked them why they didn't come in and give contracts . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I believe the hon. member is now introducing new material and I would ask him to refrain . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, could I point out that the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) dealt with the pulp question and the pulp question is an integral part of this motion. The member in closing the debate has every right to bring pulp before the house at this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member is referring to contracts on pulp in and out of the province. That point was not raised before — it was pulp production.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, it is one and the same thing. Surely to goodness this House is not going to be put in the position where pulp is an integral part of this resolution and discussed by the member for Athabasca and you are going to rule it out of order. I never heard of such nonsense.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am afraid he is out of order. The point of contracts was not raised and it is another topic.

**Mr. Barrie:** — Insofar as the meat in this particular resolution that is under debate, I am satisfied additional employment would be provided for the people that need employment as much as anyone in the province. I am satisfied the revenues to the government, which is something important to all of us, would be increased substantially over what they have been from the source of pulp wood in the way of use. I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, along with I believe every member in this House, that before too long we will see established somewhere in the northern part of this province at least one and possibly more pulp and paper mills.

I have to agree with the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) when he said it is a very peculiar situation when pulp mill promotion . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nicholson:** — On a point of order. I think your Honour ruled quite clearly that the resolution which is before the House sets out certain principles and at this point is not in order for the hon. member in closing the debate to open up a new debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The point which has been raised — the production of pulp has been mentioned. The point I ruled was that he could not discuss contracts of pulp because this point was not raised, and there is no chance to answer on sales and contracts. But pulp production was mentioned and I asked the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) not to stray too wide on the discussion of pulp. The member is now in order.

**Mr. Barrie:** — Mr. Speaker, I won't deal any further with that except to say that it is a very peculiar thing that great activity takes place just prior to certain elections

**April 10, 1962**

or by-elections in connection with the establishment of a pulp mill in this province. But I sincerely hope that we will have, before, long, in this province, a pulp industry because it means a great deal and it is a great potential source of revenue, employment and income in the province.

Now, I notice — I am just going to say in conclusion I could take up considerably more time on this subject, answering more of the scurrilous attacks which were made on me personally by the Minister of Natural Resources, but I just want to say this in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the last remarks of the Minister of Natural Resources when he spoke to this resolution — he said anyone going to vote for this motion is going to vote against the advantages the timber board has brought about. Well, it will be very interesting to note where the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Semchuk) the member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) and those other members in this House, representing particularly northern areas, where they stand on this particular resolution.

Motion negived on the following record division:

**Yeas — 18**

**Messieurs**

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

**Nays — 29**

**Messieurs**

Lloyd	Brown	Kramer
Meakes	Thurston	Johnson
Williams	Wood	Perkins
Blakeney	Erb	Stevens
Brockelbank	Nicholson	Dahlman
Walker	Turnbull	Michayluk
Nollet	Stone	Kluzak
Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Peterson
Strum (Mrs.)	Thibault	Brotten
Davies	Berezowsky	

## SECOND READINGS

**Bill No. 52 — An Act to provide for the Establishment of Local Government Units to be known as Municipal Units or Counties**

**Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, in regard to this bill, I may say it has been standing on the order paper for a few days, but we wanted the House amendments we have made in regard to this, which are quite extensive, to be in the hands of the members before we went forward with it. The municipal acts, the cities, towns, villages and rural municipal acts are up for amendments every year. These acts have been in force in the province for a good many years. I think it is quite understandable that we did have, through the course of the winter, many things which were difficult to establish in regard to these two new acts. Several of these amendments which are proposed here, were proposed by a meeting of the local government council a week ago Saturday, which we have had the opportunity to bring in in this way.

Part I of this act, Mr. Speaker, makes provision for the establishment of common boundaries for schools and municipal purposes and for county boundaries. Part (2) which is a purely permissive section allows for the setting up of municipal units. These municipal units will not necessarily include towns or villages within the areas. They may come in by agreement afterwards. It does not include school units either. There is no amalgamation between school and municipal units proposed in the setting up of the municipal units. So the vote there will be only of the rural people in the area. This part of the act sets up the provisions for circulating of petitions and the taking of plebiscites in regard to setting up of municipal units. Those who will be qualified to sign petitions and those who will be qualified to vote on a plebiscite will be the electors of the rural part of the municipal unit.

There are some who have felt that this vote and this planning of the petitions should be restricted to the burgesses only in these areas. But I feel that this vote should be given to all those who have a legitimate interest in regard to these changes. I feel this could not logically be confined to burgesses only, that if we were to take this attitude it would be a retrograde step in regard to the voting privileges of this country.

**April 10, 1962**

The act also sets out the constitution of the council. In the act as it was printed and put on your desks, it made provision for two councillors at large. The thinking behind this idea, Mr. Speaker, was that it would tend to get away from anything of divisional proportionment and having the work of the county or municipal unit carried out on a divisional basis. We wanted to promote the idea that all the business of the county or the municipal unit would be done on a county or a municipal unit scale and not broken down into each councillor being in charge of his own division. We felt that the bringing in of councillors at large would have a strong tendency to do away with any tendency this way.

However, the local government council, in discussing this with them, and with others, there is a feeling that there might be a tendency for the more closely populated portions of these counties or municipal units to have an opportunity to dominate the councils by having their own divisional councillors and a strong chance of being able to elect the councillors at large. Also there was thought that possibly the allotment of a couple of extra divisions in the municipal unit or county would have a tendency to retain a somewhat closer relationship between the councillor and the people of the division — then what would be the case if there were larger and fewer divisions in the county or municipal unit. This part of the act also provides for the setting up committees in the municipal council for purposes of looking after agricultural matters, finance, health and welfare, as well as public works.

Part (3) of the act deals with the setting up of counties. Many of the provisions that are provided here are much the same as those in the portion that deals with municipal units. However, in counties, as you know, the municipal and school functions are combined and here towns and villages will be expected to come in for school purposes provided they are already part of a school unit in that area. We will be expecting the part that is in connection with the school unit to come in and form part of the county. The towns and villages will not be expected to come in automatically for municipal purposes. They may come in later, by agreement, in total or for certain services that they wish to perform in conjunction with the county. In this case the vote will be allowed to all those in the proposed area who would have a vote under The School Act. The qualifications for voters would be the same as those at the present for the school units.



In this case, both the urban and the rural people will be given the opportunity to sign petitions and the opportunity to vote. This is a change from what was proposed in the printed act that was before you. It is a little difficult to establish just who should sign the petition and who should have the opportunity to vote in this plebiscite in a case where the rurals are in for both schools and municipal services, whereas the urbans are in only for school purposes. It was finally decided that we should give everyone in that area that is concerned in this question, a vote, and that we must have the majority among the rural people who are voting on this subject and we must also have a majority among the urban people who are voting on this subject. We must not only have an over-all majority of both the urban and the rural, but we must have a majority among that portion of the county which is rural and a majority among these portions of the county which are urban — a double majority would have to be found on this plebiscite before a county would be formed.

There is another House amendment proposed here in regard to the representation on the council by the urban people. The act before you provides that representation be given on the county council for the urban people by appointment from the school board of the urban centres. This change that we are proposing allows them to be elected in the urban centres. The representatives on the county council for school purposes from the urban centres would be elected by a house amendment which is proposed at this time. There will also be the setting up of committees in regard to county councils. The same committees that I mentioned a little earlier in regard to the municipal units, in addition to an educational committee.

There are numerous other house amendments which are set forth here, which I think are of a minor nature and there are other smaller aspects of this act, which I think would be better discussed in committee, therefore I propose at this time that this act be given second reading.

**Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this bill. I listened with a great deal of interest to what the minister said about these amendments. It is a little confusing, a whole bunch of them coming in

**April 10, 1962**

at this time, but I think now we all realize that at last we have this larger unit bill which has been kicked around for the last three or four years, and I think this is a dream-child of the Minister of Mineral Resources over there. He told me in 1945 . . .

**An Opposition Member:** — He is still dreaming.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . and doing very well thank you.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — . . . I hope they are pleasant ones. He told us in 1945 that whether we wanted it or not, we were going to have larger municipal units and this government has been working at it in the meantime by various means to bring it in. Of course, up until very lately they said it would be brought in without a vote. I am pleased to see that they have changed their mind on that. It is what we have stuck out for all the time . . . You don't need to say no. It is only within the last year that when we asked for a vote you voted against it.

Because this government has been unable up to now to get the consent of the rural municipalities, they went to a lot of different ways of trying to bring this in and I am going to enumerate them. Before I do that, I want to say this, that the rural municipal men of this province haven't been opposed to larger units or to some revision of municipal boundaries, but they have been opposed to this thing of the government telling them what they are going to do. I just want to enumerate a few of the things. First I want to call your attention to the fact that the rural municipal men still haven't changed their minds on the system of larger units that this government has been trying to poke down their necks. Instead of going around and asking them what they want they have been trying to shove it on them.

I would like to read an article that appeared in the Leader-Post during the time of the municipal convention. It said:

“Continued rural opposition to reorganization was evident in resolutions submitted Wednesday to the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, in Regina at the convention. One resolution approved by delegates says that they are consulted before any consideration

was given to an adjustment of local boundaries. The SARM desire for a vote before a change is made was restated in another resolution. The lone resolution which favoured reorganization asks that the county system be applied to the province as soon as the government sees fit, was almost unanimously rejected. The resolution was submitted by the RM of Big Stick. (I don't know whether there is any connection there but it is certainly appropriate.) The convention also approved a resolution stating the SARM was definitely opposed to the enlarging of municipalities except where municipalities wish to do so voluntarily."

I think that has been the position of the rural municipal people right down through the years and they haven't changed.

I just want to enumerate for a few minutes the different ways that this government has attempted to set up these units. The municipal men weren't so much opposed to the reorganization of units as they were the system that you are doing it under. The first attempt was to set up the Baker Commission. I am of the firm opinion that it was set up to pave the way for larger units. I believe that was one of the main reasons it was set up for. They produced a whole stack of dominion statistics that anyone could read in the library, but their main theme was that our rural municipalities were weak, inefficient and had outlived their usefulness, and could not be trusted to handle unconditional grants and a lot of other high pressure propaganda.

Following the Baker Commission, we have the so-called conference. It wasn't a conference at all, in my opinion, it was a brain-washing deal, where we listened to minister after minister get up and their main theme was that the municipalities were weak, they were inefficient and they weren't able to handle unconditional grants. They also inferred that if the municipalities went into larger units, they might expect to get unconditional grants. We don't hear anything about this in this legislation and that is one of the weak parts of this legislation. I agree with the member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) that there isn't too much the matter with our present municipalities that couldn't be largely helped if not cured by unconditional grants. But this government, of course, don't feel that way about it.

**April 10, 1962**

They think that they are not able to handle them, but it was definitely set out at that conference — it was inferred, that if we went into larger municipal units, then we could expect to get the amount of grants that we are entitled to. That part is noticeably absent in this bill.

Following the conference we had the continuing committee. This committee was made up of some of the same personnel as the Baker Commission and their work is now being revised by the advisory committee. Another one that got into the deal was the Centre for Community Studies. It was made up of some of the same personnel of the original Baker Commission and some additions and now we have the large Municipal Advisory Commission. All these things, Mr. Speaker, have cost this province a million dollars. It might have cost more. It is a sorry exhibition that this government has spent a million dollars of the taxpayer's money to thwart the thoughts of the rural municipalities. That million dollars would have done a lot to help our municipalities in our present set-up.

Now, and only now has this government started to do what it should have done in the first place, namely, consult the local people concerned. They have only started now, after they have spent the million dollars, they have only started now to do what they should have done in the first place, consult the local people concerned. If they had adopted this attitude in the first place, we would not have had this province in the state of utter confusion it is in now, with all our local people in utter confusion and we would have had a million dollars to help our municipal people along the way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that there are so many of these amendments, and owing to the fact that there is a lot to discuss, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **SECOND READINGS: (ADJOURNED DEBATES)**

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

**Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend The Larger School Units Act**, be now read the second time.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate on this Bill 42 a few days ago, I did so after the Attorney General had attempted to read a lecture to this House concerning the activities of members on this side of the House, and the activities of past governments, be they Liberal or Conservative, in the province of Saskatchewan. Of course, I had another reason for adjourning it. The bill which we just finished discussing, Bill No. 52, had not been given second reading, and I would ask the Attorney General now to reflect for a moment if he will, at the contents of Bill No. 52 which is now on the table before him. The very condemnation of preceding governments that was levelled by the Attorney General, in other words permissive legislation under The Larger School Act, is very similar in that it is permissive legislation that we now have in Bill No. 52.

Mr. Speaker, this is typical of the thinking of the Attorney General, and of many of those people who think similar to him. The Attorney General, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and those people who believe in the philosophy that the Attorney General obviously believes in, are Fabian socialists. Mr. Speaker, there is only one difference between Fabian socialism, and any other kind of ism that you and I are concerned with today and that is the manner in which you arrive at the end result. The end result is the same thing. But my friend being a Fabian socialist, is prepared to take ten years, a hundred years or three hundred years if need be, to bring about the complete socialization and the complete dictatorship in the province of Saskatchewan. My friend, the Attorney General, and his colleagues didn't have the courage, when they were elected to power to do in this province what they are now attempting to do under Bill No. 42. They took the power unto themselves to set up certainly larger units in this province without consulting anyone. I don't think he even consulted his mother. After they got the province in the mess in which we find as far as education is concerned today, now he has the audacity to come back into this House and to tell the people of Saskatchewan that you are going into larger units as far as education is concerned, whether you like it or whether you don't.

The Attorney General stood in his place and said that in his opinion he was better qualified to decide what type of education should be provided for our children than were the parents and taxpayers of this province.

**April 10, 1962**

Mr. Speaker, this is the fundamental difference between socialism and liberalism, or toryism. The fundamental difference is this — that a socialist believes that he or she knows better what is good for our people than do the people themselves. We in the Liberal party do not believe that. We believe that the people have ability to make these decisions for themselves and they ought to be given the opportunity to make these decisions that he has ability enough to decide how his own family should be educated, but that is his own prerogative. But I certainly do not want the Attorney General or this government in general, to tell me how my family ought to be educated.

The Attorney General talks about equal educational opportunities having been provided by this government. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. In the province of Saskatchewan today, we have families, and I could name them, where the head of the family has to rise early in the morning, drive fifteen miles in one direction to catch a bus to send half of his children to high school, come back, pick up the younger children, drive eleven miles in the opposite direction to catch another bus to send his younger children to public school. On the other hand, my children get up in the morning, half of my family go a block a half in one direction to a public school, or a block and a half in the opposite direction to go to a high school. Mr. Speaker, do you think it is equal educational opportunities when some children can trot off to school in a matter of a minute or two, when other children have to spend over an hour on transportation to get to a school? This province was never further from equal educational opportunities than we are today and Bill No. 42 will do nothing to bring about educational opportunities for our children.

A few days ago before I adjourned the debate, I referred to the fact that every member who sat opposite in this House, had voted against giving the citizens of our province the opportunity to vote on issues such as larger school units and larger municipal units. It is true. When the Attorney General stood in his place and said that the Premier had said in this chamber, to a conference that was gathered here, that there would be no change in municipal boundaries until a vote of the people concerned had been taken. He said that, but he didn't believe it, because the then-Premier of the province stood in his place, in this legislature and voted against the people of this province having the

opportunity to vote. I am going to read into the records the names of those people who voted against giving the people of our province the opportunity to vote in these questions.

The first one that voted against it was Douglas, (Weyburn). The second one was Brown, (Bengough); Bentley, (Shaunavon); McIntosh, (Prince Albert); Brockelbank, (Kelsey); Fines, (Regina); Nollet, (Cutknife); Cooper, (Regina); Gibson, (Swift Current); Sturdy, (Saskatoon); Brown — it doesn't matter what constituency — Brown, (Last Mountain); Howe, Douglas (Rosetown); Kuziak; Williams; Erb; Johnson; Dewhurst; Begrand; Stone; Willis; Berezowsky; Neibrandt; Davies; Meakes; Wood; Thorson; Harrop and Thiessen.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Would the hon. member tell me what he is reading from please?

**Mr. McDonald:** — I am reading from the journals . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I know that.

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . 1958, page 53.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman had any manners at all he would give the page of the book he is reading from.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I am reading from page 53 of the Journal, 1958.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member was evidently reading from page 97 of the Journals of 1958, not page 53 because it is on page 97 of the Journals not page 53. He says that the following persons and he listed them voted against the providing of . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, what is the point of order?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to complete a sentence . . . that the hon. members whom he listed voted against allowing the municipalities.

**April 10, 1962**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You have got to take your point of order before you make a speech.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — The hon. member said that the names he read voted against allowing municipalities to vote in a plebiscite for municipal reorganization. So the House won't be misled, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that the hon. member should have correctly read from the Journal of the House, these members did not vote against anything they voted for the following:

“that consideration be given to the report of the continuing committee on local government and consultation be held with local government organizations regarding the best method of ascertaining the wishes of the ratepayers.”

Mr. Speaker, those ‘nays’ which he quoted were not ‘nays’ at all they were ‘yeas’ and they were not on the question of a plebiscite but were on the question of whether the municipal organization . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think your point of order has been aptly raised, and I think you are now entering the debate again for the second time.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I apologize for saying page 53, that was the page on which this resolution was introduced, the vote does appear on page 97 and I want to thank the Attorney General for having made the few kind remarks which he just completed. The whole reason that I put this question in the manner that I did was in hopes that someone of the mental ability of the Attorney General would do exactly as he has done now. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is still the whole story. On page 53 of the Journal of 1958, for the information of the Minister of Mineral Resources, a resolution was introduced by members from this side of the House. On page 97 of the same journal the amendment was moved to that resolution. Those people that I named didn't have the courage to stand up and vote against the resolution, Mr. Speaker, so they made an amendment, they moved an amendment . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Two stories now.



**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . endeavouring to get themselves out of this trap.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — This is the second version now is it?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, you know and I know and the Attorney General knows if he would only admit it that the only reason for moving the amendment was to avoid voting against the resolution.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Who said we did vote against it?

**Mr. McDonald:** — We appealed, Mr. Speaker, the ruling of the Speaker who sat in the Chair on this occasion and we have appealed his ruling on many occasions and will continue to do so, because this is the method that has been adopted by my friends opposite when they haven't the internal fortitude to stand in their place and to take a stand on an issue. There isn't a man on that side of the House or any woman who in actual fact didn't vote against extending the privilege to our rural people and urban people to make their decision known on this particular issue, and the journals of this House and Hansard of this House will indicate that what I have said to you is exactly what has happened and has been the stand of this government over the last thirty years.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Why didn't you tell the true story in the first place.

**Mr. McDonald:** — The reason I didn't was because I thought you were sucker enough to fall into the trap and you did. The whole reason I didn't. If I had gone about it and read the whole thing you wouldn't have fallen into the trap.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — You got caught with your head in the cookie jar.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, here we have another, where members of the government, including the retired Premier, who will tramp the length and breadth of Saskatchewan saying, 'oh yes, you can have a vote' but when he was put on the spot, to stand up and be counted, he wasn't

**April 10, 1962**

there, just wasn't there. In actual fact there has never been a member on the government side of this House — a CCF member who has lent their support to the request of the rural municipal association on this question. I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this government didn't have the courage to do — when the larger school unit act was brought in, the thing that they are trying to do now. They think they have beaten people down to the point where they will accept it and this is the exact thing that they are now attempting to follow in Bill 52 and I expect you would rule me out of order or I would say more about that.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot lend my support to legislation that will give the Minister of Education of this province, I don't care who it is, I don't care what political party he belongs to, the right to tell any group of people in Saskatchewan the kind of education prerogative that ought to lie with this government or any other government, the people of this province should still have the right to make this decision for themselves. Surely we have not arrived at the point where in Saskatchewan we are going to give up our rights to a minister of the crown to tell us we are in this unit, that unit or any other unit. Surely we haven't arrived at that point and surely the government are not going to attempt to do today what they didn't have the courage to attempt to do when this act was first brought into the House. I cannot support the motion, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the second reading and I hope my colleagues will support me and I hope those people who sit across the way who believe that the intelligence of the electorate is equally as great as the Attorney General, will side with us. If we were to pursue the thinking of the Attorney General, I suppose he will do away with trial by jurors; I suppose he thinks that he or some judge is better able to judge whether a person is innocent or guilty than a jury. This is the thinking of the Attorney General.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — It is not.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I said before that he is a dangerous man and I think it is time that the House know it, Mr. Speaker, that he is a dangerous man.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I suppose it does get tiresome when hon. members opposite have

to be corrected and when the hon. member say that I am in favour of abolition of trial by jury, he is of course, misstating the facts, and it may be tiring to some people, but errors, falsehoods told by members opposite have to be exposed. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my right to deny any such attribution and I say I unequivocally and categorically that I have not at any time said that I believed that juries should be abolished and I say that when the hon. member says that, he is stating what is untrue, and what I think he knows to be untrue.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, again I wish the Attorney General wouldn't fall for these little traps. Mr. Speaker, I am going to — I won't bother reading this I will just refer to it. I am not going to go back and correct the records on what I said here this afternoon. What I said here this afternoon stands and there is nothing for me to withdraw. I want to tell the House that when the record was produced, after the Attorney General took part in this debate, that certain deletions had been made, and I suggest to you that the Attorney General deleted them, whether that is true or not but I suggest that he did, and what I said about the Attorney General in trial by jury . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege my hon. friend has just said that I have made deletions in the records of this House in respect to this debate and I must say that I have not made deletions in respect to any remarks which I made in connection with this debate nor have I indeed seen the remarks or the transcript of the remarks which I made in respect to this debate so again, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of honesty and fair play I suggest that the hon. member ought to withdraw that or at least the House ought to know my side.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Well suppose you didn't delete it, then probably some of your henchmen did, the thing is this, that the record is deleted from what you said in the House.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point, I think this is not nearly good enough, it is not in keeping with the responsibilities of members opposite when speaking. The member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) has stated that the Attorney General saw fit to interfere with the records of this House. The Attorney General has pointed out that he did not interfere with them and had not in fact seen

**April 10, 1962**

the transcript but I think it is up to the member from Moosomin without any qualifications whatever, to withdraw any inference of that kind.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the point is well taken and if any member states that anything has been altered or changed from the original transcript I think it is the duty of any member to bring it to the attention of the Speaker so the Speaker will have records checked.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, naturally if the Hon. Attorney General didn't delete it then I will withdraw the statement but I wanted to state that it is a rather peculiar thing that any remarks of the Attorney General when he calls governments of the past "gutless" don't appear in the transcripts, but I referred to the remark "gutless" immediately following the Attorney General's remarks, it is in the records and I leave it to you to decide what did happen.

Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I repeat again, I haven't seen that transcript nor have I made any deletions from it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I just said, that if you deny it, then I withdraw the statement I made that you have deleted it, what I am saying is that somebody did.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — It was a new word.

**Mr. McDonald:** — If you didn't read it, you should have, it is the most entertaining speech that I have read in a long time. Now the other place that the Attorney General went off half-cocked, he said that I said that he believed that trial by jury should be done away with. I do believe that, it is a logical conclusion when the Attorney General had told this House and here is the transcript. I will send it across for him to read, that he believes that he is more able and more qualified to decide how people of this province should be educated than the parents are or than anyone else, then isn't it a logical conclusion that he would decide who is guilty and who is innocent. I believe that, I don't care whether the Attorney General thinks it or whether he doesn't. I believe it.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Pretty far-fetched.

**Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on this bill the other day the Attorney General and the Finance Minister made certain accusations about the four superintendencies that are not in the larger school unit. He mentioned the deplorable conditions, especially the Attorney General. I believe that he said his seat in Hanley, before the larger unit came into effect that the schools there, the floors had holes in them, the windows were broken, and looted with rats and he left the impression that the schools were in the same condition today in the four superintendencies that are not in the unit as they were in these areas prior to the school unit. I resent this very much, I would like to put on the records a few things about the superintendency of which I am a citizen.

The Rosthern superintendency is one of the superintendencies that is not in the larger school unit and for the benefit of the Minister of Finance and the Attorney General, I would like to say this that in our larger school unit, we have new schools, we have bus services, I think we have everything which compares very favourable with the larger unit.

At Duck Lake, the town of Duck Lake has a large new school and auditorium, and the town of Rosthern built a new school last year and have a new auditorium. Hague has a large new school and will be building a new auditorium this year. Osler has a new school, Dalmeny has a new school and auditorium as well as Waldheim, in the Rosthern superintendency. I want to say this to the government on the opposite side of the House, that these conditions would have further improved if these superintendencies had not been penalized for staying out of the units, in the way of grants.

We have been repeatedly refused grants that the larger units are favoured with. You will remember that only a few weeks ago when I announced to the House here that the Bryant Oratorical Contest was won by a student in the Rosthern superintendency, as well as the Credit Union Trophy, was won by a student from the Rosthern superintendency. Furthermore, it has been

**April 10, 1962**

admitted by the Department of Education and elsewhere in the province that the caliber of the teaches from the Rosthern superintendency has been well recognized throughout the province and the teachers are in great demand. I think that it is most unfair to state that the parents in the Rosthern superintendency are not looking after the welfare of their childrens' education. We are not raising — I want to inform the House — illiterate children in the Rosthern superintendency and I feel that the parents in the Rosthern superintendency know what is good for them and we do not feel that the Attorney General should tell us what is good for us.

I certainly will not support the bill.

**Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate but in view of some of the very disparaging remarks directed to the people who I have the honour of representing by the Attorney General, I feel that I can't let some of the remarks go unchallenged, especially in the interest of the trustees in the areas that I have represented over the years.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, you realize that in the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley there is a very unique situation. Inasmuch as one half of the constituency is in a larger school unit of administration, and the other area of the constituency has never been convinced to this day that this government, through its educational system has been able to provide better services through the unit than they have been on their own. Years ago the statement had been made that before these areas were placed into the larger unit a vote has never been taken to this day in some of those areas in my constituency that are now in the larger unit. I do know this, that some few years after they were put into a larger unit of administration when a petition was drawn up and presented to this government asking that they have the choice of going back to the superintendency system, this was never recognized and to this day some of those are still in the larger unit of administration.

For the Attorney General to get up and indicate that the people in the superintendencies aren't getting as good a standard of education as those in the unit, I say is just a mere figment of imagination.

One of the towns just outside my own constituency, in fact the town of Grenfell, years and years ago, a high system of educational standards was set up in this town and to this day they are still turning out some of the finest citizens in the province of Saskatchewan, yes, and some now living in the United States of America at this date.

I would even mention to the people in this House that two premiers of Saskatchewan have attended or taught in the Grenfell School and of course our first native-born Lieutenant Governor. Further to that the person who today is secretary to the Minister of Agriculture or the equivalent to the Minister of Agriculture in the United States was educated in that town. These are the type of students we have turned out in the superintendencies and still turning out today. Then the Attorney General went on to say that in superintendencies; he used as an indication his own constituency of Hanley they had broken windows, floors needed repair, rats in the building and all that sort of thing but I would want to point out to the Attorney General that if that condition existed in his constituency it certainly didn't exist in my area of the province. The minute the larger unit came into effect in my area of the province what did they do, if there was a broken window in the school in my home town, out came a truck from the unit workshop in the centre of the large unit, a truck of employees drove all the way down the fifty miles to repair a broken pane of glass and drove back and as a result, that is where the additional cost — under the unit administration has increased and that is just one condition, but now I want to deal for a moment with the statement — “equal opportunities for all.”

We were quite proud of our own little school in our own local district, then when the larger unit came into effect instead of us being in a position as circumstances merited where we could provide ourselves with a brand new school, what happened, some of the old schools in the country that were abandoned, lo and behold were loaded upon a truck and brought in and dumped down along side our former school and then that wasn't enough, a couple of years later, lo and behold another broken down school, loaded on a truck, was brought in and dumped beside the other two schools and so today, Mr. Speaker, instead of having the equal opportunity with some of the other areas, we have got a plant with three broken down buildings all moved in from outside the area and that is some of the circumstances that some of our children have to put up with today.

**April 10, 1962**

If by virtue of reorganization and some of the policies of this government, then we could find ourselves a year from now having no high schools whatsoever and so we will find our children loaded up in buses and taken away to other areas, and then he speaks of equal opportunities for all. I remember, it was only two or three years ago in this House, I believe it was the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) pointed out conditions whereby some children out in the ranch country were seven miles away from a bus route and the Attorney General, the same Attorney General, at that time said that it wasn't the responsibility of the government or the Department of Education to see that these children got to the bus route, it was the responsibility of the parents, therefore, Mr. Speaker, when he tries to say that they provide equal opportunity for all, they haven't provided equal opportunities for all.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I understood the hon. member to attribute something, some remarks to me and I may have misheard him but I understood him to say that I had said that it was not any concern of the school unit whether the children got to school or not. If he said anything like that attributed to me, it is not so.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Further to that, Mr. Speaker, just to show that there isn't equal opportunity for all I will cite another instance, down in our own area we have an area where there are three schools in one plant now and as I said two of the districts were closed down and at the present time out of the children attending that school, the children from two districts are bussed. The buses go out, pick them up and bring them in, but in the other area, the area of the original school district, those parents all have to find their own transportation for their own children, so here again, in one little localized area, absolutely no equalized opportunity for all neither for the parents or the taxpayers or for the children themselves and so I suggest when the people in my constituency over the years have had the fortitude to go on their own and carry out their own system of education for the people and believing in all sincerely that they were fulfilling their responsibility, to the highest degree, I believe that they resent having the statements made by the Attorney General of this province that would place them in a derogatory or bad light, as I said and the way the legislation is intended at the present time after



providing these services all these years now they find themselves in a position whereby they can be brought into one of these systems of administration without having an opportunity to vote.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether those people at this time feel that they would be better off by being in a larger unit or whether they don't I think it is their democratic right to have the opportunity to decide by way of a plebiscite and because of the fact that they have been able to sustain a high level of education and provide a high level of education for their children over the years, in competition to the larger unit scheme, then I think that they should have the opportunity at this stage of deciding whether they want to carry on with their system or whether they want to go along with the system in other parts of the province. This has been their democratic right and in all sincerity on their behalf I cannot support the statements or the intentions of the Hon. Attorney General or the rest of this government.

**Mr. James E. Snedker (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with those words of my colleagues regarding this bill. I listened to the Attorney General speaking and shedding crocodile tears about the broken boards and broken windows in schools in his area, well let me suggest that when those conditions occurred down in our part of the country we grabbed up a hammer and some putty and some glass and went and fixed the floors and fixed the windows. We didn't allow conditions like that. I would suggest that if the Attorney General went into a school house in his area among his people and found conditions of that nature existing he would have been well-advised, before he made his political socialist speech in an endeavour to destroy democracy, he would have been well-advised to fix some of those windows and patch the floors.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Snedker:** — Of course I can understand why he didn't do it, if he ever tried to drive a nail he would hit his thumb and blame previous Liberal governments. He fails to give any credit whatsoever to the school system that was sent up in this province at the inception of the province which

**April 10, 1962**

was inaugurated by a Liberal government and did educate the people of this province and did a pretty good job of it I think. I got a dose of it and it certainly didn't do me any harm.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Don't blame it on that.

**Mr. Snedker:** — . . . If you want to apportion any blame you can take your choice of a couple of countries. I still suggest in all sincerity that if those conditions existed that the people should have done exactly what we did, many is the time that we have gone down to the school for no charge whatsoever, done those things that were necessary to do in order to keep our plant in good condition.

Just a word in regard to the unorganized schools in the superintendency in my area and I draw the attention of members of the House and all members, I think that those schools are a credit to the people in those communities. They have good schools, and they are doing a good job of educating their children, if there is any credit going to anybody it is certainly going to the people in the area and the people in the community, certainly there is none going to this government who viciously victimized them by means of reduced grants and other means in order to try and bulldoze them into a larger unit of administration. Repeatedly these people have voted against it. If these larger units of administration were such a whale of a good thing, I am neither condemning them or praising them, if they were such a good thing, the people in the unorganized area surely would be beating the door down trying to get in, but such isn't the case. Incidentally, in connection with the larger school units which we have at the present time, any member on the other side of the House whenever he gets up and speaks on education takes great credit for these larger school units, well, if the larger school units have been any success at all I am going to give the credit to the people and the taxpayers in the area that pay the shot and pay the bills and to the school boards for their administration, if there is any credit going to anybody, that is where it belongs.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Snedker:** — The indications that are given to us by the members on the other side of the House in regard to their attitude

toward education is a typically socialist attitude, that the state is entirely responsible for all education. I don't believe that, I believe that the family is responsible for education and I believe the church is responsible for education and I believe that the state should be there in an assisting capacity, not in a dictatorial capacity. I listened yesterday to a gem from the lips of the Attorney General, this is what he said, "I would not want to see educational facilities that presently exist in any organized unit adjacent to an unorganized area snatched from the children of that district just to gratify some silly whim of the Liberal party." Now what is the sill whim? Well a silly whim, Mr. Speaker, according to the Attorney General is the basic right of the people of our province to a vote on these things. The silly whim that he is referring to is what people escaped from Poland to exercise, what people were shot for on the streets of Budapest, that is the silly whim that he is referring to, the right of free people to exercise their democratic right to self government which is precisely what my friends on the opposite side are doing their very best to destroy, to whittle and chisel and erode in every way that they can, in order that they may bring the whole educational system of this province completely under the thumb of the Department of Education. If this erosion continues, if this erosion continues, we will face the time and we will face the day when the whole educational system of this province will be entirely administered by the government through the Department of Education and every school teacher will be a civil servant and every child will be brain-washed with socialist propaganda and therefore I am going to vote against this bill.

**Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, listening to the hon. members opposite and particularly when they refer to the matters of education in the province of Saskatchewan, I felt that I was obligated to rise and add a few words to the debate that has already taken place.

The hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker), whenever he rises in his seat and before he concludes ends up on a similar note, socialism, regimentation, and socialist propaganda.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — He should know.

**April 10, 1962**

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Talking on matters of education, I want to say that I have taught school in the province of Saskatchewan for some twenty-nine years. I recall the year when the Blaine Lake School Unit No. 57 was formed in the area where I am now teaching. I want to say as a school teacher and I should be in a position to know, I trust to a certain extent, what improvements have been made in regard to plants, what opportunities were made available to students attending schools in my area since the formation of the unit. The opposition maintains that the larger school units were forced on the people of the province.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That is correct.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — I want to remind my hon. friends opposite that the larger unit act made a provision that if a larger school unit operated for five years people in the area could petition and have a vote taken in the area. My hon. friends opposite know that there were areas in the province of Saskatchewan where petitions were made. Votes were carried out and in all areas where these petitions were made and votes taken the people in the areas concerned were satisfied to continue on with the larger school unit.

**Opposition Member:** — Did people vote in Blaine Lake unit?

**Mr. Michayluk:** — There was no petition for a vote after five years of operation, therefore, a vote was not necessary. People were satisfied and are satisfied.

The Blaine Lake School Unit was formed some seventeen years ago and I have taught in the Blaine Lake School Unit area since 1936. I taught mainly in rural schools. When my friends say that pupils or students had opportunities for education under the small district school set-up, I want to say this that I taught in two separate districts about eight miles apart. One school district was assessed slightly over \$53 thousand, the other district was assessed at \$198 thousand, more or less. I taught in both of these schools, before a larger school unit was formed, I do know what opportunities students had in the school assessed at \$198 thousand and what opportunities the students had in the school assessed at \$53 thousand, in regard to plants and in regard to facilities, playground equipment, libraries, and science equipment.

Now I am going to tell you what happened in the Blaine Lake School Unit in the past seventeen years. We had some 61 rural schools operating when the larger school unit was formed, today we only have fourteen schools operating and this is due to the fact that these districts are isolated. The roads are not good enough for conveyance of students the year round, but most of these fourteen districts that are currently operating want to have their students conveyed into urban centres. I know what has happened in the village where I am teaching, and have been teaching for the past twelve years. When I got on the staff at Krydor we had three teachers, teaching twelve grades. We had one teacher in the high school room to teach grades nine, ten, eleven and twelve. Today there is no high school in Krydor, but students not only from the village of Krydor and the Krydor district but the whole area around Krydor board a bus and not at seven o'clock in the morning as my hon. friends opposite maintain, but the earliest that these students get on the bus is at eight o'clock. These students that get on the bus at eight o'clock in the morning live twelve miles from the village of Krydor, they reach Krydor in thirty minutes, at eight-thirty, the students from the village and high school students from four buses are transferred into one bus and within twenty minutes they are in a composite high school in the town of Blaine Lake that has thirteen high school teachers, teaching all academic subjects plus shop, commercial and home economics.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — When I went to school, I attended a village high school, my dad had to pay a \$50 fee before I was admitted to that high school. Add to this \$30, in the hungry thirties, for board. Today, practically every student in the Blaine Lake School Unit lives at home. The parents have the supervision over their children when they come back every evening. This is the set-up; this is what the larger school units have done.

Now my hon. friend opposite said that somewhere, two men were sent out to repair a window. Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous can these statements get? The Department of Education does not set policies for the larger school unit boards. They maintain and formulate their own policy in regard to repairs and maintenance. It is correct that in Blaine Lake School Unit No. 57 we have one or two men that go from school to school where

**April 10, 1962**

major repairs are necessary and the reason for this is this that when the larger school unit was formed, some people in the area thought, well this is the larger school unit, these are the boards that have a lot of money and when work was performed locally they found that they were over-charging. Therefore the unit board came to the conclusion that it would be better to buy a truck or rent a truck and hire a man for the six months in the summer to go from school to school and do major repair work. As far as windows are concerned, this is done by the janitor and the janitors are paid a salary for the work which they perform. There is no such thing as two men going around from school to school putting in window panes.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — They don't care what they say over there, Liberal nonsense.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — I want to tell you this, that the bus that goes out from Krydor to a school which is twelve miles away and still operates and picks up high school students goes past two rural schools. The parents have asked the larger school unit board to permit their public school children to get on the bus and go to the school in the village of Krydor. They want their children to get their education in the village. Why? Because in the four major centres of the Blain Lake School Unit outside of the village of Krydor, there is what we call the graded school system or one grade per room. You will not find this situation in any rural school. What you find in the rural school is one teacher teaching grades one to eight and possibly eight, nine and ten and I did that. I taught that in rural schools for many years. I had an enrolment of fifty or sixty students and all grades from one to ten. This is no longer the case, what is more, I am going to tell you this, that there was a lot of politics played, by the Liberal member that I defeated in the Redberry constituency, who used the school unit for political gains. He said, well if you people elect a socialist, your high school will be closed in Hafford and all your children from Hafford will have to be conveyed into Blaine Lake. This has never happened and never will happen. We have a modern high school in Blaine Lake with twelve high school teachers on the staff, what the unit did was that a composite high school was built in Blaine Lake. Here they teach shop, motor mechanics, commercial, home economics and all academic subjects, add to this a large auditorium. This is what larger school units have done and I think that as a teacher for 29 years I know what I am speaking

about and I am sure that the hon. members that are in the teaching profession will agree with me in this respect. They may want to expedite education for political purposes.

We have four areas in the province of Saskatchewan that are not in the larger school units, and I happen to know something about one of the areas, because that area is immediately to the east of where I am presently teaching, and that is the Rosthern area. I will agree that the Rosthern area has made improvements. They have closed down their rural schools; they are conveying their children from rural areas into Rosthern, Waldheim, and into other centres, but they are doing exactly the same thing that the larger school units have done. I know one of the superintendents of one of these areas and I have spoken to him. There is no one that would be happier today than this superintendent who is in charge of the unorganized areas if that area was organized into a larger school unit. No one in this House needs to make political hay on the innocent boys and girls in this province for political purposes as far as education is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the bill.

**Mrs. G. Strum (Saskatoon):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. member who has just taken his seat, I think that was an excellent defence of the larger school unit and I merely wish to take the next level which is the level that I see the most of because I live in the city of Saskatoon and am president at the graduation services as an MLA. I was thrilled last year when I consulted my little booklet and I saw two students from the town of Kipling, because I went to see their mother when she was married. I don't suppose she had more than a grade five; her father didn't speak English, and when I congratulated the mother as we went down the steps, I said, I see your boy has his B.A. today, and she said that is just one of them, the other one got his M.A. today and the two sisters got their degree in pharmacy, four students from a family of a Hungarian farmers in the little hilly section of the Moose Mountain — I don't care if they are Liberal or not — I don't think they are that stupid — because they never, never could have one child in university without the larger unit, without the scholarships and the loans they would not have had two girls pharmacists and a B.A. and an M.A. at this point and they have only one boy left and he probably will be a PHD. Because of the example.

**April 10, 1962**

I am proud of this and when I look over the list of the graduating students and see the name, Hungarians, Romanians, Ukrainian, Greek, Jewish, I think what an excellent job we are doing of giving the children of immigrants a chance to be on the top level of our citizenship. When I see eight thousand students for Saskatoon and five thousand students on a new campus for Regina, when I see Saskatchewan taking a lead in science and medicine, and in agriculture I see these boys and girls coming on the buses, hitting the high schools and now hitting the universities and, Mr. Speaker, they would never have come to the university had they not been able to get through the high schools and they would never have had this standing had it not been for the larger unit and the buses, that for the first time have given these boys and girls a chance to get to where this instruction is being given.

If we are going to take the credit for being a democracy, we must take the blame for not making democracy work, and we have a chance to use these larger units as the previous speaker has just pointed out, or have a chance to deny this and as he pointed out, we can make political hay of this if we wish to. I am not for the right of the parent to rob his child of an education. If you go to the school for the deaf, you will see boys and girls there whose parents have cheated them for years. It takes two years before a child who can't hear can even get to grade one. The third year that that child is in attendance, enough work has been done to help him to communicate, but the law which says that every child has the right to education applies to the deaf and to the blind child, and although the parent may be ignorant and short-sighted that does not permit him to rob his child of education and for the same reason, every child in this province now if his parents will only take the trouble to see that he gets it, every child has a right to education and every child has a right to go to university if he has the ability and if he has the energy and the ambition to do it and our student loans and our student scholarships and bursaries have made it necessary now to have two universities in this province and of that I am indeed extremely proud. For those areas that have not taken advantage of the larger unit, I am sorry to say that they are being robbed and they are being robbed by people who know better and who are using it to their own advantage and it is to their shame that they are denying these students this advantage. These students will go through life intellectual cripples, robbed of the chance to take advantage of the science and all the



other benefits that this age can offer if they are given a chance to be exposed to the process, and so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the motion.

**Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what some of the statements made by the last two speakers had to do with this Bill 42. I rise to take part in this debate on second reading because of several statements made, one by the Provincial Treasurer and one by the Attorney General, there were several by the Attorney General.

The Provincial Treasurer, when he was speaking on this the other day, seemed to take exception to myself or the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) or anybody else, suggesting that we were in favour of — the Liberal party — larger school units when in essence he said we were opposing and doing all that we could to be destructive to the larger school unit system of the province. I would only like to say to the Provincial Treasurer at this time that when the larger school unit in my area of the province was formed I did not oppose the formation of the larger school unit, but because of the dictatorial attitude of the Department of Education and because of the financial difficulty that the unit found themselves getting into after the five year period, I did take some part in petitioning to have a vote taken in that particular unit and of course the minister and all concerned know what the results of that vote were, but as far as the principle of school units is concerned I think that he is not following anybody when he suggests that the Liberal party as a whole is opposed to the principle of better education for this province.

Some of the members who have spoken from the other side of the House would have us believe that all the Liberals on this side of the House were illiterate and that they wanted to keep all the children of this country or this province illiterate. I don't think too many people in Saskatchewan take the Provincial Treasurer or Attorney General too seriously on these matters. The Attorney General, in his usual display the other day tried to suggest that all members of the opposition were opposed to progress in the field of education, that they wanted to see our children denied the right to a high school education. He carried on this same line for quite some time, I don't think I will say too much about that particular thing.

**April 10, 1962**

In regard to the bill, Mr. Speaker, I think that the whole trouble in the original formation of the school units in this province was that if the government between 1944 and 1950 in its first five or six years of holding office in this province had done what it has tried to do in the last few years and set up a boundary commission and set up the boundaries of these school units that would be acceptable to the people within these units they would find themselves, or they would have found themselves, with less opposition from within these units. I think that the school unit system would have worked much better if they had done this, but at the time that the units were set up originally the government did not, like the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) said, have the intestinal fortitude to go to the people to study the matter out and to take the people's advice. We had a brains trust here in Regina who had one thing in the back of their heads. They decided that they were going to have their way and they were going to consult nobody as to how this was going to be done.

The main reason why I am not going to support this bill is because of the principle, that the Attorney General suggested here was in this bill when he was speaking the other day. He stated that there were practical difficulties encountered in taking a vote and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those people who are in unorganized areas today will frown on statements by the Attorney General or any other socialist in this province suggesting that it is too much trouble for the government to give people an opportunity to say whether it is good or whether it is bad, or what they want, or what they don't want. He says in regard to taking a vote, quoting from the other day,

“This government's position has never been in any doubt, Mr. Speaker, on this question, but we say, we point out quite properly that sometimes there are practical difficulties about this matter.”

Surely, Mr. Speaker, anybody who would make a statement as clear as that doesn't believe in democracy, I think all members on this side of the House believe in democracy and for that reason we are going to oppose this bill.

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, I too, wish to associate myself with my colleagues on this side of the House on voting against Bill No. 42. I have listened with a good deal

of interest to the debate that has taken place. One of the things that struck me was the inconsistency of this government. Here in the bill on the larger municipal units or counties there is provision for a petition and a plebiscite, yet here we are in Bill No. 42 wishing to remove that same right of a plebiscite. I took the trouble to do a little research on the introduction of the larger school units of administration into the province in this connection and I find that according to the records at that time forty areas submitted petitions prior to units being organized in these areas. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if that was an indication in 1945 of the interest of the people of the province in having a vote on this very important matter I don't believe anything has changed in the ensuing years in this respect and I am confident that the people of the province are just as interested today in being given the right to vote on this very important matter. There has been no suggestion as the hon. member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) has said, or no comment on the pros and cons of the larger unit system of administration which the previous two speakers on the government side saw fit to defend. We are primarily concerned and our opposition to this bill is connected with the removal of the proviso that the minister shall order a vote to be taken if a petition for a vote signed by at least 20 per cent of the resident ratepayers is presented to the minister thirty days after notice has been given.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in further pursuing the history of the petitions in 1945, while forty areas submitted petitions to have a vote, only 15 areas met the provisions of the act. In other words then the other remaining twenty-five areas were not given a vote even though they petitioned for it and the only one who had any say as to whether the petitions met the requirements of the act was the former Minister of Education, who now sits in the Premier's seat on the government side of the House, Mr. Speaker. As far as I know, he was the only one who had any say in determining whether these petitions met with his requirements and I say therefore, that this government is not concerned with the wishes of the people. The people clearly demonstrated to the government in 1945 and I am sure are prepared to demonstrate at this time that they wish the right to vote. Something was said about equal opportunity in education I immediately thought of the debate which took place with regard to the physical fitness bill, and the need for gymnasiums and auditorium service in our rural areas. I think we have a good way to go yet to give our smaller urban centres the same education facilities

**April 10, 1962**

as in the cities. I listened very carefully to the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum) who stated, "I am not in favour of the right of a parent to rob her child of an education." Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this is a damning indictment of all the parents in this province, for her to suggest that there is in this province any parent who would go out of their way to rob their child of an education. She went on to talk about university graduates in a certain area. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that every parent in this province is out for the very best type of education that they can provide. All we are suggesting is that they be given the right of a vote in a democratic manner and if in her remarks the lady member for Saskatoon indicated her opposition to this, then I feel that she has an apology to make to all the parents in this province.

**Mrs. Strum:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I said no such thing, I said, the child has a right regardless of the ignorance of the parent.

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, I wrote down exactly what she said verbatim and I repeat, she stated, "I am not for the right of a parent to rob her child of an education." As far as I am concerned when we arrive in this province at the time when the parents are no longer to have control over the education of their children, then I guess we will all have to leave the province.

**Mrs. Strum:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question? I would like to ask the member, are you in favour of a right of a parent to rob his child of an education? Are you in favour of that?

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed that the hon. member would even make such a suggestion about any parent.

**Mrs. Strum:** — Well answer it, yes or no . . . yes or no.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Foley:** — So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province have already indicated that they do wish to be consulted on important matters of this nature and the

very fact that forty of the areas submitted petitions in 1945 is an indication of that. It is interesting to speculate as to why the government are afraid to continue to give that right to the people. Why? What is the real motive of removing this section from Bill No. 42? One only, one obvious conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and that is of course that they suspect that there will be strong opposition to their move with regard to any further changes in educational administration of this province. So I say then because of the inconsistency of this government with regard to the democratic right of a petition and plebiscite and because I believe that the people in my area as well as the people over the province wish to have a democratic right to vote, I cannot support bill No. 42.

**Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is anything left to be said really. There has been a good deal of misinformation and some incorrect statements made and I don't propose to start to try to offset various statements made by the opposition or will I attempt at any time to convince them of their particular point of view because I know that this is impossible. It did strike me as rather hilarious though to see them drawing from both sides of the argument at the same time and endeavouring to walk the line of a tight rope walker at a circus. It reminded me somewhat of the white knight in Alice in Wonderland who proposed as I recall the verse. "I have hit upon a plan to dye my whiskers green, and then to buy so large a fan that they could not be seen." This is just about the direction of their argument. On one hand proposing something, on this hand discounting it; on one hand saying that they are against it, on the other hand saying that they are in favour of the unit. The member for Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) saying that his children are deprived the rights of better education because of the act of the larger school unit and on the other hand saying that they were undertaking some centralization and this would probably be good.

The important point here though is that I notice the Leader of the Opposition has not spoken on this at any point, and I suppose it is because he heard when I said that we are proposing a House amendment to provide for a vote in those areas that formerly were not organized then will be influenced by this type of an amendment. I don't know what the rest of the members of the opposition were listening to at that time but I did make that point quite clearly and it will be brought out

**April 10, 1962**

again in their committee.

I also pointed out that when I introduced the bill, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that we would be introducing a House amendment to provide for a vote where an area was being affected none of which had formerly been in the unit and this is consistent with our policy, because in such an area, none of which was formerly in a unit and the boundaries were established, this therefore, represents and means a change of government, this area is in exactly the same position as the areas that are described under the county act and to be consistent and logical we must therefore provide for a vote in both cases.

**Mr. Foley:** — May I ask the minister a question?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No you can't. You are not in your own seat.

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — In the question of boundaries, I think we have reviewed that fairly adequately. There have been some statements made though that have rather sharp and severe overtones and I would just like to comment on them just for a bit. I am going to discuss about the philosophical argument that is going on in education which has been going from the time of Aristotle and Socrates as to whether or not you should educate the person from the point of view of being best suited to the state or whether you should educate a person on the basis of his own work. This is an old and ancient argument and the question I am not going to touch on — the question raised by the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) — about the relationship of church and state, this has been settled over a thousand years ago and I am not going to get into that one, but I would like to mention just for a bit the right of a parent. The other point that I would like to touch on just for a bit is the question of centralization of powers.

In respect to the right of the parent, this government has never interfered with the right of the parent to determine the level or the quality of education that a child should have. In fact the other thing has happened in the history of evolution of the educational system and members, some of the members have lived through it all. The original settlement time of 1910-13 when suddenly the country was filled with settlers and

schools had to be provided and the necessity of strong government action at that time. The next stage was when, following the thirties and the drought and the depopulation of some areas of the province, a great depression which meant the centralization of districts into large districts of organization.

Now the third phase of having built this capital we are now confronted with the problem of determining even more clearly what we are going to teach in the schools. This history of education has always been designed to provide the community with the best possible machinery to satisfy the needs of the people as they saw it. Now this has changed as we have moved forward and it is going to change again, Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary for me that we are moving in such rapidly changing times that even the goals of education as we knew them as students are clouds and if you talk to industry and if you talk to teacher and if you talk to university people it is perfectly apparent that the things and the direction in which we were taught in school are now being held under sharp question and the reason for this is that at one time we thought that all we had to provide for our children was a strong academic type of education and now we find that of course there are a great number of our pupils that never get to grade twelve and go to university and we must move into the vocational training side. Here is a whole new area that thirty years ago, not even ten years ago people were scarcely concerned with and now this large and expanding area of education is thrust upon us and these types of questions are totally beyond the resources or the imagination of local communities, because they lack the knowledge in knowing for instance what types of skills and trades our young people should take. We judge things in light of our own experience and it is going to require the imagination of teachers, trustees, university and industry, and it will take all the energy we can muster and a good deal more finance than we are now raising to solve this question in education so that our parents can provide their children with the best possible education to meet a rapidly changing world.

Now one other thing that rest on this question on the right of parents, is of course the question of the separate schools. I just want to mention this just for a minute. In this act, larger units act, and all school acts, the right to the separate school districts are carefully protected.

**April 10, 1962**

This government has gone a great deal in the direction of protecting the rights of the minority groups in fact our bill of rights was one of the first in the Dominion of Canada and in these amendments the right of the separate school districts are carefully protected, and the charge is sometimes made, Mr. Speaker, that the larger units have been unfair to those parents who wish to give a certain type of religious education to their own children.

I would just like to mention that we have conducted a survey to find out whether or not centralization has effected religious instruction adversely or not. This is what we have found. We have found that a number of schools which regularly provided for religious instruction prior to the formation of the units was 218, excuse me I said that incorrectly, there were 218 schools that have been closed due to centralization that formerly used to provide religious instruction and the approximate enrolment of these schools at the date of the closing was 3,114. There were some other schools that did not give religious instruction but now have such instruction available for their pupils in central schools and there are 296 such schools. If you compare the total enrolment because the size of the schools of course have changed in the interim, you find that the approximate number of pupils for whom religious instruction was available prior to the centralization in the province of Saskatchewan total 16,639, whereas in 1961-62 the approximate number of pupils for whom religious instruction is now available is 24,266. So therefore, we feel that the centralization process has not affected the right of the parent to give his children religious instruction if he so desires and we admit, Mr. Speaker, that there are schools, individual schools, that have been closed, where formerly there used to be instruction and this now because of the centralization, this particular point has not been able to follow through and give the same service that they did before. I admit that those particular points exist but in the over-all picture there is a net gain of almost eight thousand students now receiving religious instruction that formerly did not.

The other question that rises in connection with the right of the parent, that I would just like to talk about is the teaching of a second language and the language that I am going to refer to is French. In using the same methods of survey we find that the approximate number of pupils for whom French instruction was available prior to centralization in Saskatchewan was 5,783. The approximate number of pupils for whom French is now available is 8,551. Here again I think it



can be demonstrated that centralization in the formation of the units has not affected the teaching of French or the teaching of religion in the schools but has actually been beneficial and allowed some schools and some pupils who were formerly denied this privilege of obtaining the services.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Will the hon. member permit a question, Mr. Speaker? What year does he refer to when he says prior to centralization?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — The exact year is not here on this report, I presume it is 1944, but I could find the exact date for you.

**Mrs. Batten:** — What would be the total increase in population of the school children since that time?

**Hon. Mr. Turnbull:** — I haven't got the natural increase on this particular chart but the statistics are so compiled so that this factor is reckoned with and if you want the breakdown of natural increase in those areas, this can be broken out for you.

I wanted to touch on those two points, Mr. Speaker, because these are very important points to many of our people in Saskatchewan. I am not for one minute suggesting that the unit has solved all these questions but I am saying I think in all fairness that the units have not come between the parent and the child. The centralization process which is the centralization of community authority has been such so that the parent at all times could determine a better level of education for their children, speaking in Saskatchewan as a whole. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are on sound ground on proposing our amendments. First of all for the reason that I proposed, that we are not going to trust any form of school administration on an area which formerly was totally unorganized before.

Secondly, I think that we are on sound ground in proposing these amendments because we have discussed them with the trustees executive and they are in accord with us. I think we are on sound ground because, nowhere do these amendments interfere with the right of providing high level of education to our young people and allowing

**April 10, 1962**

the opportunity of even providing higher levels of opportunity and I would like to go farther, Mr. Speaker, and say the higher levels of opportunity must be provided and presented to us in Saskatchewan and all of Canada, one of the major problems that must be solved. I believe we are on sound ground, Mr. Speaker, because nowhere do these amendments interfere with the right of parents nor do they infringe on the rights and privileges of separate schools.

Therefore, I support the amendment.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 29**

**Messieurs**

Lloyd	Brown	Kramer
Meakes	Thurston	Johnson
Williams	Wood	Perkins
Brockelbank	Erb	Thiessen
Walker	Nicholson	Stevens
Nollet	Turnbull	Dahlman
Kuziak	Stone	Michayluk
Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Kluzak
Strum (Mrs.)	Thibault	Peterson
Davies	Berezowsky	

**NAYS — 15**

**Messieurs**

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

Bill read the second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 o'clock p.m.