

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
SIXTH SESSION – FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE
8th day**

Monday, February 17, 1964

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

On the Orders of the Day

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker: — Before I call the Special Order, you will recall Friday there was a point raised on which I reserved my decision. In order not to interfere with the radio time, I wonder if the house would be willing that I give my ruling between speeches after the air time is over.

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

(Later)

Mr. Speaker: — Hon. members will recall that during the course of the debate on the Address-in-Reply on Friday last, the hon. member for Last Mountain, the Minister of Industry and Information, presented the hon. member for Morse, the Leader of the Opposition, with certain recordings which the Minister stated had been made from radio broadcasts of speeches made by the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber during debates of previous Sessions. A question of privilege was raised to the effect that the hon. Minister was in contempt of the house by virtue of the fact that he had made or caused to be made an unauthorized report of the proceedings of this house. It should be noted that the question at issue is the act of recording, not the contents of these particular recordings. I reserved my ruling at the time, and now wish to advise the house as follows:

May's Parliamentary Practice, 16th Edition, at page 42, defines parliamentary privilege as:

the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each house collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by members of each house individually, without which they could not discharge their functions, and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals.

Since proceedings based on a question of privilege take precedence over other business of the house, it is my duty as Speaker to determine whether or not a prima facie case of a breach of privilege has been established.

The head of privilege relevant in this case appears to me to be that of freedom of speech, a freedom which the House of Commons of the 17th and 18th Centuries sought to ensure through the exercise of its right to exclude strangers and to control the publication of debates and proceedings. Anson, in The Law and Custom of the Constitution, Volume 1, at pages 161 to 163, shows how essential were these safeguards in the days when intimidation and wilful misrepresentation were very real threats to the freedom of debate, and May adds at page 55, that in the 18th Century an aristocratic Parliament maintained these safeguards because of a certain impatience with the pressure of public opinion.

This undoubted right to control the publication of debates is a right which Parliament has never relinquished, but the proscription of unauthorized publication has, for more than a century now, been more honoured in the breach than the observance. Reports of the debates and proceedings of the house are made and published, according to Anson at page 164, "on sufferance", and May adds at page 56, that "So long as the debates are correctly and faithfully reported . . . the privilege which prohibits their publication is waived."

I must also advise the house that I have given consideration to the suggestion made on Friday last during the very helpful discussion of this question that there was a distinction between the reproduction of debates in a newspaper, on the one hand, and in a recording, on the other. On reflection, I do not feel that this distinction can be sustained since the prohibition respecting the publication of debates includes, according to May at page 55, not only a printed publication, but also any "copy or notes of anything . . . that is propounded or agitated in the house." Moreover, May again states at page 47, that it has been a condition of parliamentary privilege since 1704 that no new privilege, "no warranted by the known laws and customs of Parliament," shall be created. Thus, it would appear that in terms of parliamentary privilege the making of a recording of debates broadcast from this house must be dealt with as a form of publication.

I must therefore conclude that while insistence on the privacy of debates in this house would be consistent with the ancient custom of Parliament, it would be quite inconsistent with the modern concept of parliamentary democracy recognized in Westminster since the late 18th Century. Should the house decide that the making of an unauthorized recording of a speech broadcast from this house constituted a breach of privilege, it would follow that any other record or proceedings not specifically authorized by the house, which could include newspaper accounts and reports of the debates, would also constitute a breach of privilege.

Therefore, while I thank the members for bringing this important matter to my attention and giving me the benefit of their experience, I rule that it has not been established that the making of an unauthorized recording of a radio broadcast of a speech made during debate in this house is prima facie a breach of privilege.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Michayluk for an Address in Reply and the amendment thereto by Mr. Boldt.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — I wish, Mr. Speaker, to thank the house for permitting me my full air time. I assure you that this is greatly appreciated by myself and I hope it is appreciated by the hon. members opposite as well.

When I adjourned the debate on Friday afternoon, I made some reference to the viewpoint expressed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the erstwhile hon. member representing Milestone (Mr. Erb), both of whom heaped condemnation on the government for its presumption to bring in a medicare plan after receiving a clear cut mandate from the electorate to provide universal medical care for the people of this province.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, some credit could have been given to the Premier, for the very able and patient manner in which he negotiated during this difficult period, with the result that we now have a medicare plan that seems to be acceptable to the hon. members opposite. Therefore, it seems strange to me that this continued ill-conceived criticism continues in a manner detrimental to establishing a more co-operative relationship in order to make this plan a success. They endorsed the existing plan, attempted to even take credit for it, with only some minor changes. If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that we will hear less and less of the line of criticism that we were treated to on Friday last.

The Leader of the Opposition's prim reference to the throne speech was a casual statement that it marked the end of an era. But he did not say what kind of an era. The throne speech is indeed the end of an era of great progress and contains positive programs which will step up the tempo of progress and contains positive programs which will step up the tempo of progress experienced in the past twenty years in the four years ahead.

People only want changes if it is changes for the better. Well, the future of Saskatchewan never looked better. Saskatchewan's per capita income is now perhaps the highest in Canada, perhaps only outdone by Ontario. But it is the highest per capita income in our history. This can be read too in relationship to the criticism that our per capita taxes are at the highest. But when our taxes in this sparsely populated province are considered on a mill-rate basis, we find the taxes here are lower than they are in the adjoining provinces.

There never was a time in the history of this province, Mr. Speaker, that we could look forward with greater assurance to continued

economic progress in the years ahead. Even the two partisan Liberal dailies in a continuing attempt to get rid of this government on the basis of purely political bias, have changed their tactical grounds as well. I read an excerpt from an editorial appearing in the Leader Post under date of February 13, 1964, to make this point. It says:

In the tendency to perpetuate aging regimes, Canadian electors are overlooking the fact that our democratic system works best with occasional changes of government. This prevents administration from becoming entrenched and from acquiring delusions that they were predestined to continue to govern through a divine right as the only ones capable of running the affairs of state.

It goes on:

Mr. Lloyd and his colleagues appear to have succumbed to this delusion, and this was evident in the addresses of the government supporters in the moving and seconding of the traditional throne speech motion. It will, no doubt, stand out in other contributions to the debate, from those who sit to the right of Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that this government has never at any time claimed or aspired to rule by divine right. We have made mistakes that we have corrected. Adjustments have been made, but we do say that on balance the overall programs of the government over the years have brought about a great era of prosperity to this province. We don't claim infallibility, and it is only on the basis of facts that we will go to the people and place the facts before them in the hope of again being privileged to serve the best interests of the people of this province. And it is only on that basis that we hope to be the government of this province for the next four years.

Now, I wish to place some facts on the record in respect to agricultural programs and policies that have not only stabilized the economic position of that agriculture, but have brought increased agriculture, particularly in the livestock sector. The Liberal Party of Saskatchewan recently in a very hasty manner threw together what they are pleased to call an agricultural policy for this province. In the short time available to me I hope to deal with this so-called agriculture policy and compare it with that which is presently being done in the particular areas mentioned in the program of the Liberal Party.

As usual my Liberal friends are twenty years behind the times. They seem to be completely unaware of the new and extensive policies and programs that have been developed in the Department of Agriculture over the years. I begin by stating that in 1946 the budget of the Department of Agriculture was in the order of \$800,000. The agriculture gross budget for the current fiscal year 1963-64 including revenue and capital expenditures totalled \$11,154,000 plus supplementaries for both revenue and capital totalling \$1,292,000 making a grand total in the current Budget of \$12,374,000 and one can add the \$1,000,000 dedicated to the construction of a veterinary college which makes a grand total in the current fiscal year of over thirteen and a quarter million dollars to service our expanding agriculture industry.

I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to refer to some of the developments that took place since 1946, when the agriculture budget stood at around \$800,000. One of the first moves that was made was to transfer the Lands Branch from the Department of Natural Resources to the Department of Agriculture. When this was done in 1947, some 10 million acres of land were classified for proper use. About three and a quarter million acres of these lands were vacant in 1949. Since 1949 two and a quarter million acres of vacant crown lands had been brought into use by long term lease disposition either for grazing or for cultivation purposes at a nominal rental.

In the case of grazing lands, lessees were encouraged to improve carrying capacity, by rental and crop share concessions. As a result of classification all rentals are based on the lands carrying capacity for grazing purposes and its productivity for cultivation purposes. The leases and rentals for cultivation leases range from 1/6th to 1/10th crop share rental depending on the soil's productivity. This is the first time in the history of this province that rentals were so based. Over 17,000 farmers have benefited by acquiring crown land on an individual lease basis. The individual lease policy played a significant role in encouraging cattle production.

I wish to make a further comparative reference to the Liberal agriculture policy, but before doing so I wish to take the one plank in the Liberal platform that deals with credit. When the hon. Leader of the Opposition made reference in his speech in this plank, he mentioned that the Saskatchewan Family Farm Credit Agency had only made some 430 loans. He overlooked entirely the fact that a major source of credit has been made available to enable young farmers with limited financial resources to become established in agriculture. I associate this credit with the administration of crown lands just referred to. In 1952, a new policy of making cash payments to crown lessees for clearing and breaking new land was introduced. Under this policy approximately \$10,000,000 was paid out in cash and rental credits to assist a total of 5,164 crown lessees to develop over 600,000 acres of land for cultivation. This is a sizeable contribution and, Mr. Speaker, this has proven to be one of the finest credit programs ever designed to enable young people of limited financial resources to become established on the land.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nollet: — In addition, Mr. Speaker, in six new settlement areas alone, nearly \$2,000,000 was spent by the department for drainage, road and land development, under other policies to assist in establishing young settlers in these new settlement areas. Outside of these areas of course, several millions of dollars were spent for drainage, flood control, principally in the fringe of settlement, to protect the farmers against water damage.

The throne speech mentions a new source of credit which will be made available in the Department of Agriculture for agriculture rehabilitation, in association with our pasture and fodder project development program within rural development areas on behalf of farmers who have no credit standing from the usual sources of credit. This will be a rehabilitation credit program associated with community pasture and forage development.

I noticed another plank in the so-called agriculture platform of the Liberal Party. It states on request they will convert present veterans leases on crown land into purchase agreements. Mr. Speaker, do the hon. members opposite not know that this policy has been in effect for the past twenty years? Again they are twenty years behind the times. Do the members not know that in 1946, when the Veteran's Lease Agreement was instituted it contained by agreement with V.L.A. an option right to purchase after ten years of tenure. Veteran lessees became eligible to purchase in 1956, to date 1,242 veterans have purchased their farm units, totalling 400,000 acres of land at a price based on economic productive values far below current land values. Three hundred and seven veterans have elected to continue to lease. The terms of the sale agreement are the most generous offered in the history of this province. The veteran lessee may pay 10 per cent down and the remainder over a twenty year period at 3½ per cent interest. Simple interest, Mr. Speaker. In July, 1961, the option to purchase was extended to all crown cultivation lessees. Liberals in this case are behind three years. They are doing a bit better.

Again sale prices have been established on a equitable production valuation formula, far below current land values. In all cases crown lessees are very aware and appreciative of the fact that the established sale price is reasonable or a bit more than reasonable in light of the sharp increases in land values over the past years. A total of 5,660 cultivation lessees have purchased or have opportunity to purchase under existing crown land policies, and the Liberals now propose that this is a new program that they are presenting to the people of this province.

I wish to say something about land allocation. The Liberal platform makes some reference to this. They speak of setting up an independent allocation committee. Well, with this I must agree that we do want complete independence and freedom from any political pressures from any party whatever. We have been endeavoring to discharge this responsibility and leases and locations have been based on policy, however, Mr. Speaker, as long as the allocation committee and this function comes directly under the minister's department, the minister is bound to be the Court of Last Appeal. And perhaps there is merit in a proposal that an outside committee perform the function of allocation.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nollet: — There is nobody that would be happier to be free from some of the obligations and pressures that occur than I and I can assure the house that never at any time have I let politics interfere from one side or the other in allocation of lands.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nollet: — And this will never be, Mr. Speaker, as long as I have some responsibility in this matter. I think it would be a good thing to release hon. members opposite too, from the obligation and necessity of having to come to me or having to go to the allocation committee. This is not a very happy sort of a position to be placed in by any member of the legislature and we will look at the possibility as to whether we achieve a more satisfactory manner of taking care, not only of allocations but of assignments as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to a few programs that are in prospect for the future. Very big programs. I would like to refer to the Saskatchewan Delta Area. We are near the end of new land resources in our province suitable for cultivation. The only large area remaining that might be reclaimed by drainage is in the north-east part of the province, known as the delta area. It contains approximately 700,000 acres. We don't know how much of this acreage is suitable for agriculture production. We don't know in detail the cost of the development, although estimates have ranged as high as \$22,000,000. This gives the house some idea of the magnitude of this project. The fact that we are able to look at this project, now, is made possible because of the construction of the Squaw Rapids reservoir and the South Saskatchewan reservoir, which we feel has given us sufficient river control to enable us to safely and profitably develop this area for agriculture production without too great a danger of reoccurring flooding that has taken place over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now also refer again to the South Saskatchewan project. People overlook the fact that we are still faced with huge expenditures in the continued development of this project both for electrical power, for industrial, recreational, and for irrigation purposes. The estimate for developing the total area for irrigation at one time was placed somewhere in the order of \$40,000,000. We will have to proceed with this development in the future and we are glad to do so. It is these types of programs, Mr. Speaker, that have kept this province moving progressively forward. We are a long ways from tired, Mr. Speaker, we are looking to the future in anticipating of establishing new records for economic development and progress in our province.

Now, I would like to refer, Mr. Speaker, to things we are doing now, and again in relationship to this emaciated Liberal agricultural program. I note the first plank the Liberal program states "Promote diversification, especially expansion of the livestock industry through special incentives, cattle, hog, sheep and poultry", and we will leave it go at that. Again, they don't seem to be aware of the fact that all of these things have been done on a mass scale over the past years and it is for this reason that we have an increasingly large number of cattle in our province.

Another plank in relation to this one was "inaugurate a vigorous program to build up feed and fodder reserves in wet years and to provide insurance against drought years". Again, Mr. Speaker, the major programs and objectives of the department have been direct to this end. For example, we were able to surmount unharmed the effects of one of the most severe droughts in Saskatchewan history, as a result of the progress that has been made today. We not only maintained our basic cattle population, but have since continued to increase our cattle population. The income from livestock and livestock products in 1961 reached \$185,000,000 or nearly 50 per cent of the cash income received from cereal grain. This income insurance in the bad 1961 crop failure year surely justified the expenditures that were made for developing increased acreage for pasture and fodder supplies, and to meet the problem of drought and expanding cattle population.

May I, therefore, mention just a few of incentive programs that have accomplished our basic objectives now belatedly included in the Liberal Party's agricultural policy.

For example, since the department's forage program was inaugurated in 1947, 63,000 orders were received from farmers for nearly 11 million pounds of forage seed or enough to seed a million and a quarter acres of land.

Again, forage seed was made available free of charge to municipalities for sowing roadsides to grass. In addition to other factors the roadsides sown to grass also provides a source of fodder. Under this policy, over 8,000 miles of municipal roads have been sown to grass and this is a sizeable acreage, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the other desirable aspects of weed control.

Further, in the interests of obtaining a good supply of a suitable variety of alfalfa seed for pasture purposes, special arrangements have been made with alfalfa growers in California over the past years to produce rambler alfalfa seed for distribution under our forage programs and to be made available for the sowing of provincial and co-operative pastures. Earned assistance for forage and pasture co-operation in the Ag-Rep branch alone, since the program of assistance to co-operatives was established in 1949, pasture improvements to the extent of \$2,000,000 were undertaken by some 124 co-operative fodder and pasture associations and to date there are 124 of these. In 1949 there were only two. The department's 50 per cent contribution to this type of development amounted to well over \$600,000 as an earned financial incentive.

Pasture and fodder was thus provided for 20,000 cattle owned by 1,600 patrons. It is interesting to note that the total assistance in this branch alone for other purposes as well, totalled well over \$2,000,000 including weed control.

This is not all, Mr. Speaker, by any means.

May I again return to the lands branch. In addition to those programs already mentioned, the lands branch also provides financial incentives, programs to encourage livestock expansion by the construction and operation of provincial pastures. There were only three provincial pastures in 1947 when the lands branch was transferred to the Department of Agriculture. There are now 35 provincial pastures supplying grazing for over 40,000 cattle and services for some 2600 patrons. By 1965, the number will increase to 44 pastures to provide grazing for 51,000 cattle and by 1966 there will be 51 pastures to provide grazing for 57,000 cattle and to some 4,000 patrons. The land branch alone has invested a total of \$2,700,000 in community pasture development. This is not all, the conservation and development branch was established in 1949 when it was given the function for all physical development work in connection with pastures, drainage reclamation, irrigation development, and dry land project development. This branch organized in 1949, from that date to March 31, 1963, spent a total of \$19,452,000 for the purposes of establishing pastures and reclaiming land by irrigation, by drainage, etc.

This branch cleared and broke and sowed to forage nearly 96,000 acres of land, and constructed over 1,300 miles of fences, and constructed well over 1,300 miles of irrigation and drainage ditches, to assist in the progressive development of some 209,000 acres of land for irrigation contained within the boundaries of water users districts, aside entirely from the South Saskatchewan project.

The C. & D. branch has also planted trees, some 800,000 of them to control soil erosion. Mr. Speaker, these are only some of the major programs and financial incentives made available over the past years to achieve greater productive stability and to increase our total agricultural production. With the advent of assistance under ARDA programs, all of these will be expanded and stepped up in the years ahead. Regarding veterinarian services, here again a veterinarian district program was instituted by the passage of The Veterinarian Service District Act in 1945. Two districts were organized in the fiscal year 1945-46 and there are now 47 veterinarian service districts in operation. Veterinary scholarships, a bursary plan was instituted in 1945-46. We have made available over \$100,000 to veterinary students who trained and studies veterinary medicine at the Ontario Veterinary College. Animal disease control, we led the field in Bangs control, with the result that later on the federal government assumed responsibility for the Bangs testing aspect, and I can say to the house, that at the present time the entire province is a TB free area, where all of the testing has been done once, we are also a Bangs free area, we have reached the point now where we can discontinue the calfhoo vaccination program.

The Veterinary College, another contribution made to service our expanding livestock industry. \$1,000,000 was made available to the university at Saskatoon last year for the possible establishment of a veterinary college on the campus of our university. I am most pleased, Mr. Speaker, that agreement was finally reached to locate the new western veterinary college in Saskatchewan, to provide additional services and encouragement to our growing livestock industry. I know the hon. members opposite tried to take credit for this veterinary college, but there is no one worked any harder than myself to finally get this college located in

Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad that we have accomplished this objective. I hope that when the new western federal animal diseases laboratory is decided upon that it will also be located in association with the new veterinary college. This certainly will give us a wonderful set-up right in the centre of the western livestock industry, and will very adequately serve the four western provinces.

Another Liberal plank states "a more intensive research program to assist farmers, to improve their operations". Well, Mr. Speaker, this has been done too. Certainly the Agricultural Machinery Administration which carried on a great deal of research and practical field testing of farm machines has been of immeasurable benefit to farmers who rely on expensive and complicated machines to carry on modern farm operation.

A new cattle finishing feed loft has been established on the university campus in Saskatoon to provide resulting research information for our livestock producers. It is hoped that a central performance testing station for beef cattle may also soon be developed in association with this project.

In the field of agriculture economic research and farm management. The farm management division, a new division in my department is providing extensive and valuable information to our farmers to assist them in meeting the economic business and management problems associated with present day farm operations.

In addition, the new economic research branch of the department will provide valuable information to our farmers in respect to the serious economic problems confronting them. Also, in addition to the above, the province actively supports research by way of financial grants to the university, in various special fields where research and information is greatly required.

The family farm improvement branch and the rural electrification program, have done more than any other programs to assist in the expansion and development of efficient farm production units for livestock, dairy and poultry products. The family farm improvement branch is now extending its services to provide assistance not only for water and sewage installations, but to also include provision for technical services to assist farmers in planning specialized farm production enterprises.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation establishing this branch was severely criticized by the hon. members opposite, when it was brought into this house, but it's now recognized as one of the finest programs in the Department of Agriculture; it has done more than anything else to improve labour efficiency on the farm and to bring modern conveniences to the farm home. But it was criticized, Mr. Speaker. Now they pretend to come out with an emaciated agricultural program and say to the people of this province, "Well, here's something new". Another thing, crop insurance wasn't mentioned. We have a crop insurance plan and we are now negotiating with the federal government for re-insurance. When we obtain an agreement with respect to this, there will be an opportunity of expanding this program greatly without serious financial liability being assumed by the province itself.

A new emergency well drilling program, one that was instituted in the drought year of 1961 was continued for three years and to day 200 community wells have been developed to take care of some of the serious water problems in certain areas of the province.

I mention very briefly the bredgilt and sow program. This is an emergency measure, the reason for it is our hog population dropped because of exceedingly low prices in the early part of 1960 when the price of hog fell to \$17.00 a hundred weight, followed by a drought year in 1961, when feed price relationship to hog prices were adverse and this situation brought with it a great reduction in hog production in our province and in order to redirect this trend and stimulate renewed interest in hog production, we introduced on an emergency basis a program of paying a \$30.00 premium for each bred sow or gilt to farmers who increased the number of bred gilts and sows by adding to their regular breeding herd.

A few words about population in this province. There's been a great deal to do by the opposition about population in Saskatchewan. I would like to give the house some figures and I say this, Mr. Speaker, the reason that we have the decrease in population of this province and rural areas was because of the cost-price squeeze. Nothing else, and if our Liberal friends presume to take credit for the huge wheat sales

that have been made, they must also take the blame for the fact that the cost-price squeeze is still with us. Let's look at some of the facts Mr. Speaker, over the years. They would like to place the blame on the provincial government. They have said so, Mr. Speaker, but in the period from March 31st in 1946 to March 1963, there were 46,000 farmers in this seventeen year period who were forced off the land. That's an average, Mr. Speaker, of some 2700 farmers per year. There is no economy anywhere that could begin to absorb in alternative employment this type of liquidation from the land, but things have become stable since, Mr. Speaker, with industrial expansion, gathering momentum in this province and we now see a reverse trend, we see a gradual increase and a net increase in the population of our province.

I wanted to say something about railway abandonment, but your ruling yesterday forbids me to do so, Mr. Speaker, to any extent only to say that the federal government announced that they were going to have two ministers of agriculture during the last federal election . . . one for the East and one for the West. What do you know? Well, they finally realized this was such a fantastic idea – an idea that certainly would not have any unifying effect insofar as the Canadian economy was concerned and then they withdrew this proposal so instead they've set up a Minister of Forestry who is going to be, as I understand it, given the responsibility for the ARDA administration which is an agricultural program and a Minister of Natural Resources is now going to administer a primarily agricultural program and the Minister of Agriculture was to be the minister of rail line abandonment. That's all I wish to say regarding this matter at this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish him well.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nollet: — Oh I know the hon. members are happy. I have a lot more I could say that would make them unhappy if I had little more time and you'd applaud probably a whole lot louder when I sit down, if I could finish everything that I want to say to you, and incidentally place some more facts before the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of us don't realize what the function of government is in a modern society. Its function in relationship to not only economic stability, but economic growth as well. At one time, governments were very reluctant to have anything to do with the economic aspects of our country, now they have been compelled to take some interest in economic affairs because there's a growing demand for additional services throughout and these are legitimate demands and it's quite true that if economic development and productivity does not keep pace with this demand, we're in trouble. It's for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that this administration has assumed responsibilities, not for economic stability as such, but for economic progress as well and this calls for close cooperation with the private enterprise sector of the economy. This is an area where the two types of economies can co-operate and work very closely together in economic planning for the future, because it is a bonafide fact, Mr. Speaker, that with the population explosion, the demands for service, for educational services are going to increase. These demands will be doubled in the near future. The demands for educational facilities alone, it is estimated, will double in the next 20 years. We will all have to carry more burdens of cost for consumable services, and so governments have to participate more and more in keeping economy moving progressively forward. This is pointed up by the fact that everyone now looks at the gross national product with increasing concern, if it doesn't go up 6 per cent, we fear we're in for trouble. We must keep it moving forward, and, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech clearly indicates that this government is determined that we will not only co-operate, that we will continue to stimulate the forward progress achieved today in Saskatchewan and step it up in the next four years ahead. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour and Telephones): — Mr. Speaker, and may I first congratulate the mover and the seconder of the speech from the throne, the hon. member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) and the junior member from Regina (Mr. Whelan) on their

excellent presentation, and may I also congratulate all those who have spoken since, much of course, of which I do not agree.

This is the last time that I will be speaking in the legislature and the final opportunity I will have to publicly at least say goodbye to my colleagues on this side of the house and my friends, I think all of them who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker. I wish to thank all of those who have said kind things about me, during the past few days. It has been a pleasure and indeed a privilege to have represented the citizens of Regina in various capacities for well over the past two decades and I have appreciated the confidence shown in me and thank the people of Regina for it. I am going to miss public life after so many years, but leave it with no regrets and with the feeling that I have always done my best.

I have two important matters regarding which I particularly wish to emphasize, and will proceed with them first. One concerns minimum wages and the other the telephone service to unserved areas in this province. During December and January, the Minimum Wage Board held several meetings and made recommendations to cabinet for consideration. As a result, the weekly rates in effect since 1962 will be increased, effective March 1st to \$2.50 per week across the board, with a 10 cent per hour increase to part-time employees; logging and lumbering from 90 cents to \$1 per hour, and with cooks and watchmen, an increase from \$150 to \$160 a month. It might be added that the minimum wage rates are exactly the same for women and men. Other provinces provide lower rates for women. The government feels that the new wage of \$336.50 per week in the larger points, while not as high as asked for by labour does enable many persons to adopt a reasonable standard of living. It is not enough obviously to support a family, but it does protect the individual employed in the lower income classes of employment, from being exploited. Without such protection, the minimum would in many cases be much lower. These minimum rates have the broadest coverage and are the highest in Canada, with the exception of the heavy industrial area in Ontario, Toronto, Hamilton, St. Catharines, Oshawa, where construction rates are \$1.25 per hour and in other industries 10 cent per hour increase up to \$1 per hour effective in March. Elsewhere in Ontario, the rates are, as compared to rates in Saskatchewan, quite low. Alberta is next with \$34.00 a week in the four larger cities, for employees over 21 years of age and a downward scale for younger persons, and lower rates for female employees.

I was pleased to see in the Leader Post of February 14th, that most restaurant proprietors would accept a minimum of \$1 per hour. The \$36.50 per week rate amounts to 93 cents an hour, but there is certainly nothing to prevent the restaurants and hotels from paying \$1 an hour if they care to do so. This is something, Mr. Speaker, for the Minimum Wage Board to keep in mind for their next meeting. The same article quotes minimum rates in Ontario at \$1 per hour, British Columbia from \$1 to \$2 per hour which is far from accurate. British Columbia has adopted fair wage rates in a number of occupations, usually arrived at by setting the rates a little below the union or going rates. We have something the same in this province, under the Industrial Standards Act. It is my intention to introduce a fair wage scale in the construction and automotive industries, during the next few weeks. We have had complaints of low wages and long hours in road construction and wish to have the changes in effect before the construction season starts. It should be remembered that his government has the welfare of people in the lower income brackets uppermost in mind, at all times.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan Government Telephones has some responsibilities to assist in the provision of telephone service to areas where to date other efforts have failed to provide it or where other means have not been available. With some sort of program in mind, an extensive study taking several months has been made and a committee has visited the unserved areas in the south and northern part of the province, and interviewed many people. Aerial maps were made. A report has recently been received and it is proposed that a committee be set up to decide on the methods of assistance and procedures. It will be a tremendous project and in all probability extend over a five year period. No further details are available at this time.

I listened with a great deal of interest last Thursday to the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) who spoke at length on the wonderful achievements of government of the day previous to 1944 in passing labour legislation. I happen to know something about this matter personally, because I was secretary of the Railway Brotherhood Legislative Committee for the six years from 1938 to 1944, and we presented the government with a brief each year. We asked, Mr. Speaker, on each of the years I mentioned, for legislation which would be considered very modest in these days, and

we did not confine our requests to improvements for the wage earner only, but did include better salaries for teachers, improved benefits for widows and orphans, improved benefits for injured workmen and for dependents, when killed in industry, better protection at points where highways crossed the railroad tracks, etc.

Although we were received and listened to courteously by the cabinet ministers, I cannot recall one item of legislation that was ever passed as a result of our representations. As far as I can recall, my colleagues on that committee were all Liberals, who did not seem to mind the repetitious turn downs. Later on these same men greatly appreciated the improvements made in labour legislation by this government.

The member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) mentioned the Workmen's Compensation (Accident Fund) Act of 1930 which we still have. The first chairman was a Moose Jaw lawyer, and prominent Conservative. Following the Liberal victory in 1934, he was replaced by another Moose Jaw Lawyer, a prominent Liberal. When we assumed office, we found that the policy of the Workmen's Compensation Board was as follows: Turn down the claim if possible; never give the injured employee the benefit of the doubt; show if at all possible that the injury was a recurrence of some previous condition and reduce the percentage of compensation or cut the man off altogether as quickly as possible. Needless to say, a much more humane policy has been adopted by the present board and the injured workman now received fair treatment. Management is too, we find, in agreement, and complaints from them or injured persons are few and far between. There are approximately 35 men killed in industry each year and close to thirty thousand accidents. The fund, which by the way is financed entirely by the employers, is in excellent shape. But, Mr. Speaker, look at the benefits we found in the act of 1944, 66 2/3 per cent of the injured employees wage payable while off work on account of injury; we immediately raised it to 75 per cent, and every province in Canada has over the years come up the same percentage.

Another feature of the act was the seven day waiting period, which meant that the injured workman got nothing at all for the first seven days of injury. We immediately cut it to three days and later eliminated it altogether. So now the man gets compensation from the first day. Other provinces have followed our lead. In 1944, compensation could not be paid on a higher amount than \$2000 a year, regardless of how much the employee had been earning. We have increased this ceiling to \$6000 per year and have been followed by the province of Ontario, but others, Manitoba, British Columbia, Alberta are still on a \$5,000 ceiling with less in the Eastern province.

Widows of men killed in Industry now receive \$100 per month. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition criticized a \$10 increase two years ago. The closest to that amount is in the province of British Columbia which pays widows \$90 per month.

There have been numerous other improvements, but I cannot take all my time on the Workmen's Compensation Act, which is admittedly the most favourable in Canada for the injured workmen and their families who have benefited not only in Saskatchewan but all across Canada by other provinces following our lead by improving their legislation.

Officials of the motion picture industry, Mr. Speaker, located in Toronto and New York, have through their Winnipeg offices, been putting the pressure on to do away with censorship altogether and strongly oppose the elimination of obscene language. Realizing that many people feel strongly on this matter and some to whom censorship is a bad word, I thought that it only fair that the general public should be given the opportunity to express an opinion and have conducted something of a survey with the assistance of the daily newspaper, as to the feeling of the public regarding the use of obscene language in motion pictures.

Six words were included in my statement to the press and the Leader Post censored them to three, and the Star Phoenix to two. The public reaction has been overwhelmingly in favour of eliminating bad language and many are favourable to more strict censorship of scenes, dialogues, etc. in moving picture shows. The CBC also comes in for strong criticism. A total of 94 individual letters were received together with four petitions containing 119 names for a total of 213 persons. I understand there were a few more in this afternoon's mail, who indicated that bad language in films should be eliminated and censorship tightened. 24 letters were received indicating that there should be no censorship, some of these persons thought that the restricted adult classification was

enough and here are some of the excerpts and I'll use three from each side. Now here's one from Calgary and this is what this gentleman says:

There is so much filthy trash on the magazine stands and the theatre billboards and over the radio and TV that it is no wonder why youngsters are growing up thinking they are the accepted thing. Read the statistics, loose morals effect our crime rate, those illegitimate births, divorce rates, juvenile delinquency, etc. tremendously and whose ob is it to hold the line against these evil influences, is it not the reason we have censorship. I earnestly urge you to examine the movies closely, examine the magazine racks of our drug stores, shopping centres etc. carefully.

Now from a lady in Regina:

In the treatment of infectious diseases, the first step is to isolate the person. I would be a great help if the writers who have obscene minds that produced the vile, vulgar and brutal plots to be isolated with the directors and producers until they could be treated. Censoring is the only way such men get the idea that there is a growing rebellion against the types of films hatched out of such warped distorted mentality. Who knows, those men might enjoy God's clean air, after they climb out of the gutter. Let's hold the line against imported dirt, censoring is one way of cleaning up North America.

Here's another one:

It was my good fortune last summer to attend the International Council of women conference in Washington. Films came under lengthy detailed study. I am certain that quite a few people realize what an insidious and vicious miasma is spreading all over the world from these producers of filth and violence. The delegates from the so-called underdeveloped countries related a story so disgusting that Canadian and American delegates hung their heads in shame to think that we were responsible for bolstering this kind of visual entertainment on people who already have their hands full. The flimsy protective measures in the United States are next to useless in preventing the export of the worst films that would not be tolerated in the United States for general viewing. The opinions so often expressed that we are curtailing individual right to choose what he wishes to see here or read etc., is rather stupid in the light of thoughtful study.

Now here are excerpts from three on the other side:

My husband as well as myself feel this way. Movies should not be censored if they are intended for adults. Freedom of choice should be allowed for the individual. Specification "Restricted Adult" could still be used and enforced on the local theatre level. I am a registered nurse and a student of psychology so this has been well thought out. My husband is the manager in a department store and has contacted many people from day to day and he has heard the same opinion expressed many times.

Another one:

The government has neither the right nor the duty to decide what kind of movies I may see and what kind of dialogue I may hear. The only right I can see the government taking in this matter is setting the minimum age for viewers.

And here's the last one:

On censorship generally I feel very strongly that adult people should have the right to exercise individual judgment regarding what they see or do not see on the screen and that the classification of films, not censorship, is the answer. I refuse to give up to any person or persons my right to choose my reading or my film or stage entertainment and I feel that it is an infringement on my rights when someone in Regina decides that my ears are too tender to hear a certain word or my eyes would be harmed by viewing a certain scene. Censorship, after all, boils down to a set of individual prejudices enforced on others. Certainly there are many films made today which are not suitable for viewing by children or adolescents and they should receive an "Adult Only" classification and be left alone.

That's the end of the letters that I brought with me. Those persons who wish to do away with censorship altogether and classify extremely indecent films as "Restricted Adult" are really saying that the day a young girl reaches 18 she is ready for obscenities from the screen together with scenes depicting robbery, murder, mayhem, rape, attempted rape, extreme sadism, prostitution, homosexuality, indecent exposure, intimate remarks and scenes concerning sex. Our censors are up against these things almost every day of the week.

Another answers his letter by referring to undesirable literature, girly magazines I think he said no news-stands in which young boys seem greatly interested. It is my information that news-stands must take a percentage of the pornographic or salacious literature, much of it, masquerading under the innocent name of comics. In order to be able to purchase the decent magazines and periodicals, in other words the undesirable trash is forced on them if they wish to be in the business of operating a news-stand. The federal government has made sporadic attempts at cleaning up this ugly situation, but has always bogged down on legal precedents, loop holes, hair-splitting technicalities, taking years going through the courts. Tremendous profits are made by the producers and agents of this gutter-type reading matter.

Some fellow wrote to the Leader Post a few days ago saying he wanted his dollar back after seeing a movie he claimed was so mutilated by the censor that it was impossible to follow the story. Actually this particular picture did not have one word eliminated, and appeared on the screen exactly as it came in from Winnipeg. He has a point, though, and if more people demanded their money back after seeing some of these inferior pictures, it might do some good. Another fellow complained that the party stalwarts, whoever they are, are deciding on what is eliminated. This was the most irresponsible statement of all. In leaving the matter, I wish to thank the press at this time for their co-operation.

The medicare plan is proceeding splendidly and citizens of this province are no longer faced with staggering medical bills. It has been accepted by most people in the province as a tremendous improvement over the previous doctor sponsored plans which only provided from 25 to 35 per cent coverage and did not protect older people, who are the very people who needed it most. Many of these people had their life's savings swept away paying tremendous medical bills at 100 per cent. These are the main reasons why the medicare act was passed and in my opinion it is the most important piece of legislation put into effect since the province was formed in 1905.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Williams: — The government is happy about it because it has done so much good. The people of the province who have benefited are happy. It is even my impression, Mr. Speaker, that generally speaking the medical profession is happy. No more uncollectible bills, assured higher income, more doctors in the province to lighten the load. About the only exception is the "old guard" of the College of Physicians and Surgeons which have harassed this government on every possible occasion and who are dominated by the Canadian Medical Association, which in turn is dominated by the American Medical Association, the notorious A.M.A. or as someone has called it the American Money Association.

This group has, by spending millions of dollars, lobbying in Washington, D.C. been able to frustrate first, President Harry Truman,

President Eisenhower, and more recently the late President Kennedy, in their attempts to provide older people in the United States with a modest form of medical protection by legislation. In my opinion, a despicable action on the part of the A.M.A.

It was interesting to note that the income of medical men in this province from an average of \$18,000 a year has risen to approximately \$26,000 a year. This information came out in the press a few days ago, but for once the college said very little, and left a statement to be made to a salaried doctor employed by the Regina General Hospital. I gathered from his rather apologetic explanation that the profession was really not concerned with the money. Well, if they are embarrassed and feel they are receiving too large a share from the public purse, they could always reduce their rates.

The situation reminds me of a cliché coined by a Mr. Sam Factor, a member of the Ontario legislature back in the twenties or thirties. Speaking one day he was critical of some group being paid, he thought, excessively, and he used this express and I quote: "Taking the money with one hand and bellyaching about it with the other."

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Williams: — I am now going to say something about telephones, Mr. Speaker. Very recent improvements made in the operation of Saskatchewan Government Telephone are direct distance dialing. On January 11th, Saskatchewan Government Telephones put into service direct distance dialing, the first west of Ontario with the exception of a pilot plant near Red Deer, Alberta. The occasion was marked by a luncheon which approximately 40 persons from the news media and officials of Saskatchewan Government Telephones attended. Premier Lloyd made the first call to Tommy Douglas in Vancouver, and I made the first call out of the country to my daughter in Pennsylvania. The service has been well-received and in the first twenty-four hours, 3,003 calls were made. The cut-over immediately opened up over 80,000,000 telephones on the North American continent which can be dialed direct by the customer in Regina and nine adjacent towns. Others to follow are Saskatoon, in mid 1964, Moose Jaw early '65, Swift Current, late '65, Yorkton and Melville, early '66, Prince Albert, mid '66, North Battleford and Melfort, late '66, Estevan and Weyburn, early 1967. When DDD is introduced to these centers it also includes the connecting community dial offices. Previous to 1959, only exchanges with more than 500 telephones received twenty-four hour service. In that year around-the-clock service was extended to points with 200 or more telephones. Late last year 1963, it was further extended to exchanges with 100 or more telephones. This has been a tremendous improvement and greatly appreciated by our subscribers. In 1961, a ten-year program commenced to provide all telephones in the province with dial service. Today 63 exchanges have been converted and approximately 25 more will be done this year.

Last March, the Leader of the Opposition made quite a scene in this house regarding unemployment and wanted us to call Tommy Douglas on the long distance to find out how to end it. You will remember that, I'm sure. With a Tory government in Ottawa and a CCF government in Saskatchewan, he was sitting pretty as Leader of the Opposition (the Liberal party) here, but now with his party in power federally it will be interesting to see how he explains continued, even a slightly reduced, unemployment. The responsibility for unemployment rests largely with the federal government. The government of Saskatchewan has always considered full employment as one of its most important objectives, because of our severe climate it is inevitable that there should be some unemployment in our province, especially during the winter months.

However, the situation in which we were placed in 1961, and the number of unplaced job applicants was over 8,000 caused us some concern. It is true that there has been co-operation of all three levels of government, federal, provincial, and municipal, as regards the winter works incentive program. Hundreds of thousands of man-day work has been provided under this program since its inception six years ago. Unfortunately, so far the federal government has not recognized the need for a consistent full employment policy on a year round basis. This proved to be a severe limitation of our efforts to create all the necessary jobs here in Saskatchewan, and yet through our grants to municipalities, the government of Saskatchewan has increased substantially the job opportunities available to the people in this province.

The latest figures at our disposal which afford interprovincial comparisons are for the end of November, 1963. Apart from Ontario where the figure was the same, every other province in Canada had a higher percentage of unemployed. I submit that the record of Saskatchewan in

regard to job creating opportunities is as good as possible under present circumstances.

I have just one more subject here, two short paragraphs and I'll be finished, Mr. Speaker, A good deal has been said in and out of this house, in regard to affiliation of unions with the CCF or NDP if that name suits our friends opposite any better, and particularly, financial support by wage deductions at 5 cents or perhaps 3 cents per month. We have been told that the CCF gets tremendous amounts of money from this source, it has been claimed that members of these unions must contribute or be tagged as anti-labor or be discriminated against in some way.

Well, our friends opposite do not know the manner of thinking of the membership of these unions. Presuming some official attempted to tell his membership that they must contribute to any political party, or even vote for some political party, and he would be quickly told where to go. Any contributions made from union dues is with the full consent of the member with no suggestion of coercion in any way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more material here with I regret I will be unable to use, but I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I would like rise on this occasion and join with those who have spoken in this house with respect to those who are retiring and add my words to theirs in respect to their good wishes and hope they live a long and successful life, even though they are out of public office.

I would also like to express my feelings of congratulations to the mover and seconder, of the motion in reply to the speech from the throne, and, of course, I cannot agree at all with the amendment that is proposed. I support the motion and I oppose the amendment because I believe the speech from the throne offers positive programs, imaginative and progressive programs designed to meet the needs of Saskatchewan people in the province generally, and at the same time within the limits of sound financial practice.

I have been somewhat amazed, Mr. Speaker, by the feeling of depression and gloom of Saskatchewan's future, as expressed by the members of our opposition, and I was a little bit startled by the remarks of the hon. member from Morse (Mr. Thatcher). He described the people of this province as "poor country cousins" and I also was a bit startled when the member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) stated that the youth in this province is so poorly trained that they are "somewhat respectable". I heartily resent these statements, Mr. Speaker; I not only resent them because they are unfounded, but the are unwise, and they are untrue.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — I rise on a point of order. The hon. minister . . .

Mr. Turnbull: — Mr. Speaker, this is no point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! What is your point of order?

Mr. Thatcher: — This: that I did not refer to the people of Saskatchewan as "poor country cousins". I said that people in eastern Canada are referring to them . . .

Mr. Turnbull: — I am sorry that that hon. member from Morse (Mr. Thatcher) feels that is correct, because obviously there are other people in Canada who don't feel that people in Saskatchewan are "poor country cousins" I have here the Star Phoenix, dated Friday, February 14, 1964, where a Mr. Alfred Gleave has just been appointed a member to the Advisory Committee of the Farm Credit Corporation. This man is an ordinary dirt farmer and he has won the respect of not only the people in Saskatchewan but in all of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Turnbull: — This sort of attack on the province generally is simply, of course, to make political gain. And I don't think the people of Saskatchewan appreciate this sort of approach, and I don't propose to use it. The fact simply stated is that Saskatchewan is booming, and Saskatchewan people realize it. In this same paper, Mr. Speaker, February 14th, there is on the third page an article entitled "Saskatchewan Really Booms, Business Records Tumble in All Directions in 1963", and any of you people that are interested in pursuing this in the house, can simply reach over and get your copy of the Star Phoenix and read it for yourselves.

The people of Saskatchewan know this. They know it as they drive through the province. People have seen their faith substantiated in physical things that have come true, the young people know they are properly trained, and are not as the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) claimed, "somewhat respectable". People in education fields generally have resented these types of statements.

I do believe, Mr. Speaker, and I was saying that all people in Saskatchewan are feeling a quickening in the province, they are proud of what they have done, they sense that they have within their grasp new opportunity they never guessed they had before.

I hope . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Turnbull: — I hope that as we explain the program as outlined in the speech from the throne and are able to present to the people of Saskatchewan the ideas and the programs by which they themselves may reach forward and reach new heights of development, in the same manner in which they have been able to do this task for the last twenty years. It was difficult in the last twenty years, Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous amount of stagnation and depopulation that had gone on in this province for the twenty years preceding that.

And I can see some of the members opposite chuckling and laughing about this, but this is true. Now, I guess the inference by the hon. opposition members is that I am now saying it is their fault. I never said any such thing, the fact of the matter was that the west and Canada generally had stagnated. People generally were in a depressed condition there was a world depression, and it took a good long time for the world to rationalize itself out of this after World War II. Our province is now running well along with the other provinces of Canada, and as I have said, we now have opportunity to bring in new enterprises and new ideas new programs, by which Saskatchewan can be kept in the forefront of Canada and not one of the "poor country cousins."

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Turnbull: — Whenever I am faced with a problem, Mr. Speaker, I like to turn directly to it and before I deal with education generally, I would like to set in the records of this house, exactly what the government proposes to do with respect to secondary school legislation.

There is a general impression that the government is proposing, first of all, new principles of taxation for secondary schools and separate schools. This is not correct. There is another general impression that the government is proposing aid to private schools. This, too, is not correct. We are going to attempt, through amendments to The Secondary Education Act, to eliminate the possibility of double taxation on separate school supporters, that exists because of The Secondary Education Act, and that exactly is the point in our legislation.

Now, in order to explain how double taxation on separate school supporters comes about, where a secondary education district exists, I must briefly review and place in the records of this house the genesis of separate schools and how they function.

A separate school is not a private school. A separate school is a board-operated public school. I am not now using the word "public" the way in which we generally use it as citizens, meaning grades one to eight; I am using the word "public" meaning operated by an elected public body with powers of taxation of property of the supporters of that system, and it is in this context that I refer to separate schools.

It is interesting to notice that separate schools in the history of Canada emerged in Quebec for the protection of the Protestant faith, and separate schools are not necessarily Catholic schools. In Saskatchewan there are now eight Protestant separate schools organized, one Protestant separate school district is functioning. The hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) will know where this one is. Now, if we review the legislation; it frames the basis for the emergence of these two public systems, the school system and the separate school system, both of which are operated by boards. We have to turn to federal legislation and this legislation is the Ordinance of the North West Territories Act 1901 and the Saskatchewan Act, 1905.

As all hon. members know, the provincial government does not draft its own provincial act that is the act by which the province comes into being, any more than a local municipal council can enact the municipal act. The municipal council functions within the limitations of that act, the Municipal Act is given to the municipal government by the provincial government. This province, as other provinces, is given its act by federal government, and, of course, our constitution cannot even be amended within our own governments, it is — — we have to work with the privy council in this respect.

Now, then if we turn to the Territories Act of 1901, we find in chapter 50, subsection 14:

Legislative Assembly shall pass necessary ordinances in respect to education, but it shall therein always be provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the territories of any less portion or sub-division thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make necessary assessment and collection of rates thereof.

This clearly establishes the concept of a school district, a board, and the right of such board to make necessary assessments and collect rates. I am quoting further:

and also that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic may establish separate schools therein, and in such cases, the ratepayers establishing Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools, shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

And this is clear enough. You have first of all, the definition of the school district, which can elect a school board, which can assess its property and levy its rates, and from this system a group may separate, whether it be Protestant or Catholic.

Now this same federal law was re-enacted in, not in actual words, but in substance and added to by the Saskatchewan Act of 1905, Ch. 42, 17-1, which says:

nothing in any law shall prejudicially affect any rights or privilege with respect to separate schools, which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this act, under the terms of Ch. 29 and 30, of the Ordinances of the North West Territories.

which I just read,

passed in the year 1901, or with respect to religious instruction in any public or separate school as provided for in the said ordinances.

and there is the framework in which we work.

Neither of these systems is a private system; both are publicly operated; both can levy taxes; both collect grants in exactly the same way, that is by the application of the identical formula; and both are subject to the regulations of the Department of Education and school laws. A private school does not levy taxes, does not have to follow our curriculum unless they choose to do so, is not subject to our supervision,

unless they choose to, does not have to use our examinations unless they choose to. They are private in every sense of the word. And I am not referring at all to private schools, I am referring to separate schools and to the “public” system.

Now then, I did mention that in certain areas the separate school supporters are faced with the problem of double taxation, even though it says that they shall be liable only to the assessment of “as such rate as they shall impose upon themselves, with respect thereon in the ordinances of 1901”.

How does this arise? It arises by virtue of The Secondary Education Act, which creates the third board-operated system. Now then, up until this point, Mr. Speaker, I have not mentioned anything about educational jurisdiction. Each one of the systems, the “public” school system, can, and do teach right up to grade 12.

But where a secondary education district is organized, the “public” school system then only teaches up to grade 8, and the secondary school system teaches from grade 9 to grade 12. The element of double taxation enters in because of an ingenious device of levying the tax. The tax is levied not by the secondary education board but by the city in which the secondary education district exists, and this is found in Chapter 168-47-1 of The Secondary Education Act, which says:

The council of each municipality requested pursuant to section 46, to levy a tax, shall levy a rate to be known as the high school rate sufficient to provide the sum required, and shall from time to time, as such rate is collected, subject to subsection 2, pay the same over to the treasurer of the district.

This is how it is done. When the city levies a tax on property, it applies to all city properties, and there is no basis in law by which the city, for city purposes, can separate its tax roll. This is only possible under school law, and so here is what we see: In the secondary education districts, if you have a separate school organized, the separate school supporter can tax his own property without any fear of being called upon to pay taxes to the other system. But if there is a secondary district organized, he has no choice but must pay the tax as levied by the city on behalf of the secondary system and then if he wishes to tax his own property again for his own school, he, of course, has to pay the double tax.

How many areas exist in Saskatchewan where secondary education districts are organized? In Saskatchewan, there are 16 only. And the important point here, Mr. Speaker, is that in all the rest of Saskatchewan this possibility of double taxation does not emerge. Thus it does not emerge in Melville, in Rosetown or in Biggar. There is no problem. It only emerges where the secondary school district is organized and it seems to me as I studied this system longer and longer; and I got it finally through my head, so I could understand it as clearly as I am able to understand it, that either one system or the other must be wrong. They both can't be right. Either we should have the separate school system cut off every where in Saskatchewan so that none of them can teach past grade nine, and have them all contributing to the collegiate taxes, or else change it the other way.

Because the Secondary Education Act is a provincial act, and the other acts are federal acts, it seems to me that over the years the principles of separate schools are clearly established in laws other than our own. The best thing that we can do is allow those people who are separate school supporters in secondary school districts, the option of settling this matter themselves if they wish to do so, and that is why the amendment that we will introduce will be permissive in scope. The separate school supporters will not be compelled to split the high school system if they don't want to. But if they do want to they will have the same right to do it as they have done in Melville, etc. and which they do in Alberta.

It is interesting to notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Alberta Act, provides for the two systems of education: the school system, and the separate school system and the Alberta legislature never passed a secondary education district act, a secondary education act, with the result that they have never had this sort of a problem. The provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia don't have this problem, because their provincial acts do not provide for separate schools, and so no separate schools emerged. They have parochial schools, which as you know, Mr. Speaker, are private schools organized on a parish basis.

We and Alberta are almost identical but Saskatchewan's problem is that we have 16 centers in the province, which are the cities and the larger towns, and it is in these areas the separate school supporter is face with the problem of double taxation. The problem is not a question of tax support. Separate schools have the right tax, even the separate schools in the secondary education districts can tax, there is no law that prevents them from taxing. It is not a question of education. The separate schools have the right to teach up to grade 12 and do teach up to grade 12, even in the areas where secondary education districts exist.

That is not the problem and there are no new principles in here. The problem is in the emergence of double taxation and the unfair burden that places on one group of citizens. Now how do we propose to solve this? Well I am not proposing to introduce details of legislation at this time because we will be into it when we introduce the amendments and the house will, I am sure, be discussing it back and forth. I would say, however, that the amendments will be permissive in scope, that the initiative will be placed upon the separate school supporters to decide what to do, that there would be no automatic time limit put upon them, to force a hurried decision, they will have to study, to consider because some of the problems are immense in size, Mr. Speaker, particularly in respect to debentures and unscrambling of different other sorts of problems. The problems as to how far the separate school supporters may wish to move into academic as opposed to vocational training must be considered with great care, because of course, vocational and technical training is tremendously expensive, and it is my humble opinion for what it's worth, that no single school authority has sufficient of a financial base to move into technical and vocational training and it will require the co-operation of all. Thus as you will see, and the house will know perhaps, the vocational high school in Prince Albert is not just under the jurisdiction of the Prince Albert Collegiate Board, in respect to allocation of seats but one third of the space in the vocational high school in Prince Albert is reserved for people around the unit; that as we develop our proposals for further vocational development we should consider the idea of a regional vocational school. The capital costs in vocational education are expensive, capital costs are not a burden on the local government I know, but the back-breaker is not in capital costs, Mr. Speaker. The back-breaker is in operational costs.

Now then, in addition to the possibility of dividing the system which is not a compulsory division, but will be brought about by a vote amongst the separate school supporters if they wish, we provide another option, and the option will be to allow the two boards to work out a joint program, if it be wished. And here we have in mind a trail that's already been broken by the Yorkton community by the signing of the Yorkton agreement. This is a very interesting and worthwhile experiment, Mr. Speaker. Here you have a Roman Catholic private school making an agreement with in fact the Protestant collegiate board. They did not split apart, they moved together. By moving together to a common board which in fact places the question of the operation of the private school, St. Joseph's college, under the collegiate board. Within the terms of the agreement the responsibility of curriculum, responsibility of inspection, responsibility of hiring teachers, provided that the teachers meet the requirements of the separate school supporters is a matter of the collegiate board. Here you see something that is working. And there are other illustrations that can be used in Saskatchewan. I have noticed for instance that in the Turtleford unit, you have a small separate school district, which has worked out an agreement with the Turtleford unit, and I encourage such areas where the problem is too big financially to think about dividing the system to try to work together. I have been encouraged since our announcement of our proposed resolution of this problem, by my being contacted by two city systems, and the city system includes separate system, as well as the collegiate and the public school board, who have come to me and suggested that we ought to be considering a simple board of education for the city at the same time allowing provisions for the various requirements of each. I think this is a proper approach and it has come about, Mr. Speaker, since our move indicating to Saskatchewan that we are going to propose the amendments.

Why has it come now? I believe that it has come because where formerly separate school supporters are subject to the restrictions of the Secondary Education Act understand now that they have the right to move in a number of directions, and it is only when you have groups with these rights to move towards co-operation or not, that co-operation

in fact becomes possible.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Turnbull: — In the next few months, we will find out, Mr. Speaker, just how far the various members of this house are prepared to move with the government to resolve this problem and to see how far they want to move in it to make a little political hay. It's a field in which political hay can be made, I'm perfectly sure; but I am of the opinion that the house is pretty well unanimous in trying to resolve this question in fairness so that no single group is faced by restrictions nor by double taxation. I am convinced that most members of this house accept the federal laws which set up this province as being the scope in which we must work, and I am looking forward to seeing what happens in the few months to come.

I would like to turn in the next few minutes, Mr. Speaker, to the question of educational finance. I do this because the speech from the throne mentioned an increase of \$5,000,000 for a public school and secondary schools. It is interesting to review this total amount of money that has been spent for the years in school grants, and attempt to arrive at "what does it really mean?"

To take a look at the first question, and that being the total amounts of money, I have here the annual report '62, '63 which lists comparative classifications of grants 1962-63 on page 90, ranging from the year 1945 to 1962-63, and the total amount of grants in 1944-45 was \$3,100,000 and this has increased almost by 100 per cent every year until you get to 1962-63 when it reached \$34,200,000. This is in a period of twenty years. Take this up to the year 1962-63; this table does not list the grants spent this year; we must consider the amount that we have spent in 1962-63, and this is \$36,700,000. This represents about 45 per cent of school costs. To this we will add the \$5,000,000 which will bring it up to about \$41,000,000 and we will we think be able to meet about 47 per cent of the operational costs of the school system. This does not include the other types of program that the department of education carries on, and it doesn't, of course, have any reference to the university grants. I will be dealing with those separately.

Now there was a statement made in the house the other day by the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) who felt that his own jurisdiction didn't get quite a fair enough share, and did quote accurately the \$8,000, which he thought he should have had, or which he thought should have been increased in respect to capital grants, and I think that he did a fair job of quoting accurately the amount of grant that he thought that they were getting in that particular area. It is a difficult thing to calculate though because this area is now undergoing consolidation and it's a little bit dangerous for me to assume what the rates will be, and it is not quite correct to simply average the rates of the existing school districts. This is rather difficult to do. But apparently what he did so, was add the operational costs plus the construction costs on the one hand and then scale that against the operational grants on the other hand and perhaps arrived at his particular statistics. I don't know just quite what he did and I would appreciate discussing it with him and I don't propose to try to interpret what he did because I think this is unfair but what I can do is relate the school grants to jurisdictions that are organized and give you some concept, Mr. Speaker, and the house, of the extent of support that is given by way of grant in terms of total amounts of money and to also give you some concept as to the principal of equalization and how it applies. I will also attempt to relate these statistics to the rate of growth in the system, and here's what we see.

If we look at Regina City, between the years 56-63, we see that mill rates have gone down from 44.5 to 39.8, which is a decline of 11.2 per cent. Of course the tax bill hasn't gone down and all members will appreciate this because assessment has been going up at the same time. But in order to be fair, I have figured out the amount of grant applied to the same assessment at the same period of time and interpolated it as a mill rate. In other words, given a particular year, say 1956, when the assessment of Regina was \$70,000,000 and the mill rate was 44.7, the total grants would have meant, if it had been raised by local taxes, would have meant the citizens of Regina would have had to levy an additional 9.6 mills, to raise the total amount of grant. But in 1963, we find mill rates had gone down and the grant had increased from \$447,000 to \$2,117,000. If you work this against the total assessment, you find that you have a mill equivalent of 14.6 mills, so here's the point: 1956, the citizens agreed with this concept and that they are willing to raise the type of provincial monies that are required to give every child in Saskatchewan the opportunities to the minimum level of education that's realistic to

put in 44.7 mills, the provincial department was able to contribute 9.6 mills, but in 1963, the citizens of Saskatchewan contributed 39.8 mills and against the same assessment, the operating grants worked out to 14.6 mills. The mill rate has gone down 11.2 for the taxpayer but for the provincial government it is gone up 51.87 per cent.

If we take Swift Current city, we find here even more favourable result. In 1956, the mill rates that were levied were 41.6 and if you apply the same type of calculation, we find that on the assessment, based on the assessment of '56, we put in 13.7. In 1963, Swift Current citizens were levying 46.7 or an increase of 12½ per cent but we were putting in 43.37 mills, an increase of 215 per cent. And why is this so? Grants are related to the total size of the system, they are related to the total number of children in the system and relate this to the total assessment in the system; which brings in the principal of equalization. The assessment, of course, is indicative of the amount of earning capacity in the system, and the lower the assessment, the lower earning capacity, and therefore, the greater amount of grant can be collected.

For instance, if I refer to the Turtleford School Unit, here's what we see. We have an operating grant in '56 of \$203,000 and in 1963 of \$388,000. In 1956, the mill rate was 35.9 and in 1963 the total average mill rate was 57.52. I'm sorry, that's the grant mill rate. When we look at actual mill rate, it is 26.28, in rural parts, and 30.32 urban. In 1963, it was 31 rural, 35 urban, or an increase of 25 per cent, but the grant calculated against assessment were equivalent to 35 mills in 1956 and equivalent to 57 mills in 1963. So mill rates went up by 25 per cent, school grants went up by 66 per cent.

Let us table the Moosomin School Unit, No. 9, in order that you don't think that the member of Swift Current (Hon. Mr. Wood) is getting an unfair break, or too much of a break. Here's what we see here. In 1956, the citizens of Moosomin levied 14.67 mills; in 1963, they levied 28.64 mills. I'm sorry I've got things switched around. The actual mill rate was, in 1956, rural 25, the urban 30.33. In the 1963, the rural 28, the urban 33, 34, 36 and 37, but the grant was equal to 14.6 mills in 1956 and 28.64 mills in 1963. The actual mill rate that the rate payers paid, went up by 12 per cent and against the same assessment, if you work out the grant, you find an increase of 95 per cent. In other words, these people would have had to increase their own mill rate by an additional 95 per cent, if they had gotten no grants.

Now, I'm sure one of the members may be interested in knowing what's happened to the Eston-Elrose School Unit. Eston-Elrose is one of the areas which has excellent farm land and a very high assessment, and as a result of this, is unable to earn the same level of grants as other areas. We find this that the actual mill rate in Elrose in 1956 rural 21, 22, the urban 23, 26 and this has gone up from 1956 to 1963, it stands at 28 rural and the urban 22, 26, 28 depending on which town you're talking about. The grants worked out a mill equivalent were as only equal to 4.49 mills in 1956 and in 1963, only 11.27 mills.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Will the hon. minister permit a question?

Mr. Turnbull: — Surely,

Mr. Foley: — Could you also include here comparative numbers of rate payers in each unit involved because I think this should be included for amore realistic picture.

Mr. Turnbull: — No, you don't raise money on the basis of rate payers, you raise it on the basis of assessment. Absolutely. The number of rate payers doesn't enter at all, and I'm talking about the total number of amount of money that is raised on the basis of assessment, and this is weighted against the school system, the number of children, and number of teachers, it has nothing to do with the number of rate payers at all.

I have attempted, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps rather poorly to give you some concept of the rise in grants as opposed to the rise in mill rates and at the same time indicate some of the equalization between school areas. And it varies across Saskatchewan from the area that I have the privilege to represent, which has the highest assessment per pupil and therefore gets the lowest grant of anywhere in Saskatchewan to Meadow Lake which has the lowest assessment per pupil and therefore gets the highest grant.

I think it's a credit to the people of Saskatchewan that they

modern times; no matter where they live.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Turnbull: — The total grant monies have increased, yes, to this year to \$41,000,000. Now I would like also to mention briefly something about the university expansion because most of the money for university comes from provincial revenues. The University of Saskatchewan is not a state university as far as academic or administrative policies are concerned because most of the members in these governing bodies of senates and board of governors are not government appointed and therefore we are not subject to this criticism. In terms of revenue, most of the revenue from the university comes out of the provincial revenues of the province, and once again, I think, Mr. Speaker, it's a credit to the people of Saskatchewan that they have seen fit to support their university to the extent that they have done.

In 1953-53, we had 2,947 people enrolled in the university. This has risen in ten years to 9,350 in the year 1963-64. This is a staggering increase in enrolment. It has put tremendous strains in the whole system but still the people have been willing to support this university so that when you compare the fees, you will find that the fees of Saskatchewan are the lowest in all of Canada. I have before me a table of universities; Saskatchewan, British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Toronto, McGill, New Brunswick and Dalhousie. The fees in Saskatchewan range between \$200 for Agriculture, Arts and Science, Education, Home Economics, Nursing, Physical Education to a high of \$425 in Medicine. The graduate studies are \$175. In British Columbia the lowest fee is \$322, with the highest in Medicine of \$527. The fees in British Columbia range from a 19 per cent increase to 40 per cent higher than Saskatchewan.

If you go to Alberta, the lowest fees are \$350 and you have a rate of increase from \$350, \$450 and as you move across this table you find that Manitoba is \$300 to \$400, University of Toronto \$410 to \$650, McGill is the low of \$310 in Agriculture to \$700 in Medicine and New Brunswick is \$475 - \$510.

I don't know how long the university under its present administrative policies will be able to maintain these fees, because of the tremendous pressures that are now being built into the system. We can provide the capital to put up buildings, and I would like to mention some of the buildings that are now being built or being in the various stages of planning which total up to \$39,000,000; at Saskatoon and Regina. They include such things as linear accelerator, which is not totally Saskatchewan financed but also from a National Research Council grant and Saskatchewan people were very fortunate in the aggressive policies of the president and the board of governors to get such a building established here on the campus, to increases in the chemistry building \$3,600,000 and the physics building \$1,300,000. The medicine addition \$1,500,000 in spit of the dire warnings that we wouldn't have any medical students we find we have to put in another \$1,500,000 for these school facilities.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Turnbull: — The College of Education (as you know is being merged with the university of Saskatchewan and we'll be discussing this in the house when the bill comes down on the floor), \$3,500,000 for a building there; addition to the library is \$1,200,000; students services — that is Saskatchewan Hall addition, \$1,500,000; and Physical Education Centre \$1,600,000. To this you must add the capital expenses in Regina, \$7,300,000 for the first project, the library for \$4,500,000 and the Physical Education Centre for \$1,800,000.

I compliment the people of Saskatchewan in that they are willing to support their university to this extent. But I sometimes speculate, Mr. Speaker, on how far we can continue on our present policy. I should add one more million to this, which will bring it up over \$40,000,000 and that's the million dollars that's in trust with the university for veterinary college which Mr. Nollet has spoken about.

I think the people of Saskatchewan generally want to make entrance to the university as simple as possible and to this end we have increased over the years the student aid fund. We hope to have some other provisions before the house during the course of the debate which will increase the amount further. Members in this house, are generally aware of the fact

that we provide scholarships and loans to students and that the amounts of money that have been given out are rather substantial. There are scholarships given out to people at the grade twelve level and in answer to the gentleman from Milestone (Mr. Erb) who said that "they were rather very inadequately trained" I would like to send him a copy of this chart which lists the provincial government scholarships and is given to people who are graduated from grade 12. The scholarships of \$300 and \$500 designed to get them to institutions of higher learning: and the highest average marks for every zone ranges between 91.7, 93.8, 93.3 and so on and the lowest marks are 87, 76, 75, 80, 81, 80, 79 – excellent students!

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Turnbull: — If we go to the cities, we find the same thing, although the lower marks are a little higher than the rural areas. This has particular significance. If I may just briefly read this across from Estevan, Melville, North Battleford, Regina and so forth across Yorkton, we see a list that goes something like this: 89.8, these are the highest averages, 84, 92, 93, 91, 92 and the lowest in Estevan is 80, Melville 79, North Battleford 75, Regina 82, Saskatoon 83, Weyburn 84, Yorkton 81. An excellent record, a little higher than the rural areas because I believe the cities are able to provide a few more services at a little greater convenience than the rural points.

In other places at other times, Mr. Speaker, I will be dealing more directly and at greater length with vocational training and technical training. I don't wish to burden the house too long with the sound of my voice at this particular time except to let them know that with the concept of vocational training, and on-the-job training, the idea of giving know-how in the world of work have certain dangers that we should look at and assess before we have too hurriedly into the provision of vocational and technical schools in a pell-mell type of fashion. There's a danger if we follow the concept of investment in men, in the same way we follow the concept of investment in resources, as if we're going to invest in men, so that they become productive units in the labour force. And to this end, we should address ourselves to the training which is necessary in providing not only know-how but also in the know-why. It is a known fact, Mr. Speaker, that the men that are now entering various fields of occupations will more than likely have to be retrained two, three and even four times by the time they reach retirement age and the reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is found in the core of rapid change associated with technological development.

I read the other day that my father, certainly my grandfather was closer to the times of the Romans than we are to our grandfathers. And I think there is some truth in it. My father, and I am sure there are members sitting in this house, Mr. Speaker, or certainly their fathers who started farming with a pair of oxen and a walking plow – the same way in which the land was tilled in the times of the Pharaohs and before that, and the mode of transportation was the horse-drawn vehicle; it had changed very little since very, very ancient times. Yet in one generation, we have seen this whole thing revolutionized so that we have gone from ox cart to astronaut, and from walking plow to the modern farms we have today.

And with all this complex and rapid change, goes the very difficult question about training young people and retraining the existing labour force. There is some doubt as to whether we should turn out great quantities of welders, trained in the hand skill of welding when it is a fact that when they will be employed in factories and in enterprises using different types of machines welding. There is some doubt if we should be turning out people with hand skills and machine tools, in spite of the self-discipline that is involved in it, and I think may be a good thing in training the person in how to use a skill machines; when in fact if they will be employed in factories running complex computers that run batteries of machines. They will in fact not be machinists, but operators of an electronic computing system.

Therefore, we have moved with some caution in the question of training, and yet, at the same time over the past five years we have invested between the federal and the provincial governments, some \$16,000,000 in buildings and equipment which is shared federally and provincially 75-25 and before that 50-50. I don't believe that we should emerge with a system of trade schools where we take people out of the high school system and train them to hand skills as quickly as possible, and then drop them into the labour market and catch them again as they bounce out, and try to train them in another school without providing them with a good sound academic basis of the same old skills of reading and writing

and arithmetic that is the basis of all good education.

I say this because when a boy or girl is operating in the world of work they must know how to add, they must know how to spell, they must know how to read directions, they must know how to interpolate and in the trade schools, therefore, there must be a good sound academic component but at the same time I would like this house to know, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the whole of the educational field and I am not now talking of the Minister of Education; the department officials; I am talking about the school board trustees and the teachers and the university people; have been imaginative in designing programs that are being built into the Saskatchewan Vocational Training system. I would like to cite the one example of vocational training in agriculture. It is our belief that we can integrate the educational system closer to the world of work and that we must do this because you no longer, as a young person, get all your training in the field of work at the side of your employer. The way it used to be in the days of the guilds and the handicrafts and this sort of thing.

As we work out a new relationship between training and education, when we consider agriculture, we do not find a centralized industry but a dispersed industry.

Therefore, it seems to me that the training that we provide ought to be in the high school level, and it ought to be related as closely as we can relate it, to the family farm. To this end over the past fifteen years, the Department of Education in Saskatchewan has designed what has become known as the best vocational high school training program of anywhere in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Turnbull: — We have hired an excellent superintendent of the program who has had a number of years of service as an Ag-Rep and was born on a farm and knows something of the problems. The concept of the training program is rather a simple one. The idea is to provide a level of training that is related to the actual work that goes on in the farm. How is this done? quite simply, Mr. Speaker, the core of the program is built around economics, because farming is essentially now a business and if it is not successful in economic terms, then the other subjects that we teach are wasted because the farm that the boy hopes to take over will simply not exist as far as he is concerned.

Following the core subject of economics, we have what we call the lab equivalent, which is the farmer, the student farmer in the high schools must have productive enterprises that he can control right on his farm and if he has to use equipment he rents the equipment, he doesn't borrow it from his dad. If he needs money he goes to the bank and borrows the money or he borrows it in the same way that other members of society borrow it. If he puts in his own labour, he keeps track of it, if he hires labour he pays for it. The lectures are related directly to the work he takes and we try to make it as practical as we can. In this way we think that the 600 students in the 11 school units of this program, are blazing the trail in Saskatchewan that will again, I think place it among the first in the education books of Canada. I am hoping that we will have a number of other school units follow this program in the following year.

Following this example that I have tried to give you, of training with industry in the world of work, we have worked out with the various employers, different training schemes, different methods of training, both in-service and out-of-service training, that is now going on in the vocational and technical schools.

Those of the members, Mr. Speaker, who have gone to Moose Jaw, or Saskatoon, or Prince Albert and seen the schools that have been built, are first impressed by all that they see and they are, like myself, wondering sometimes about the total training program because it is so immense.

If Saskatchewan measures up to the challenge that faces us, we will have to think about investing an additional \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000 in this field of education. We will have to not only put up the plant but we will have to find the people and train them who are going to teach in the plant. This is a tremendously difficult problem. The pressures that are built in the whole educational system from the university, are so tremendous by virtue of the pace the university sets, by the demands

of professional staff (and we are only turning out around 300 to 350 PhD's a year in all of Canada), that the university system is inevitably going to sooner or later start raiding the high school system for professional staff. This is true in Saskatchewan and is equally true in all the rest of Canada excepting that some other provinces have been a more rapidly growing problem than we have. This in turn will place pressures on the whole of the Teaching profession. We are doing a good job of training teachers; we think we have a program coming along that will be a trail-blazer. There will be a new relationship built between the university and the teachers colleges by the merging of these systems, and, by placing the college of education on a trimester basis, by brining in internship by using closed circuit T.V. by building a research center, either here or in the university at Saskatoon with the educational community of that city, we think we can go one or two steps further in unscrambling the rather puzzling trail of just how does a person learn what is the best possible way to spend our money so that we get the best possible value out of the taxpayers dollar, and, the type of subjects that we must build into the system to teach not only know-how but know-why. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that unless we do meet these challenges that Saskatchewan and Canada, and they must be met in all of Canada, will not face up to the full challenges that face this great nation. I am confident that the people of Saskatchewan will bear their share and support the program as described in this progressive and aggressive speech from the throne and I, with them, support the motion in reply wholeheartedly.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. James E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate in the knowledge that today it is possible to assess and evaluate a thirty year history of the politically party now in its twentieth year of power in our province with particular emphasis upon the past four years.

I consider, Mr. Speaker, it is advisable and imperative for the people of our province to consider this record now in view of the imminent election in which the people will pass judgment on the government and in the light of socialist party leaders recent official statements that their party is planning now for a further twenty years of office.

In 1934 the effect of world depression, coupled with prairie drought brought many dissatisfied people of divergent philosophies and views together to form the CCF. The prime movers in my opinion, the real organizers of this group were the socialists. Few in number but highly organized, well trained, exceedingly vocal, and a very highly disciplined group, they were hard boiled, dedicated to the socialist philosophy of complete state control of everything that lived, moved or breathed and to the socialist philosophy of control or destroy. They were expert propagandists and manipulators adept at slipping their supporters quietly into key positions in any available institution having propaganda or control value and were experts in infiltrating and using any other group to obtain their ends and extend their sphere of influence.

Hence, they were willing to go along with the pacifists and social reformers, a labour or an agricultural group as long as these groups could be used to further the end of complete state control by the socialist party. Throughout the history of the party, this group has sought ever to extend and consolidate their own positions advancing on any and every front wherever possible but always prepared to make a strategic retreat to return and attack at a more opportune moment.

This course they faithfully followed through the formative years. With the assumption of office by the CCF in the province of Saskatchewan in 1944, during the confused period inevitable when one government takes over from another long in office, they were able to place socialist supporters in many key positions and were able to extend their influence rapidly until today, in my personal pinion, through a process of encroachment, extensions and consolidation, they stand in a position of supreme party power and in complete control of the government of the province.

In the early years of party formation, drought stricken farmers dissatisfied with intolerable economic conditions, hoped that this would be a western farm party, a reincarnation and rejuvenation of the progressive movement which had swept the prairies in the 1920's achieved many of its primary objectives for the west and then because it was sectional rather than national, had disintegrated.

Through the years this group gradually lost power squeezed out by the socialist party manipulators who were finally willing to sacrifice

farm support for the more glittering wealthier prize of trades union affiliation. In the trades union marriage the socialists thought they could infiltrate control and manipulate the labour movement as they had done so successfully with other but weaker organization. In this move they were ably seconded by socialists who had already infiltrated the movement. The opportunists thought it looked like a good fresh horse to ride on, and the actual workers, as they have now realized, were but pawns in the political power plan and are now joining the ranks of the disillusioned.

In addition to socialists and farmers in founding the party were the pacifists, a group of very sincere, self-sacrificing people with high Christian principles. They believed in the principle that under no circumstances did any man have the right to take human life. They were led by Mr. J.S. Woodsworth and the socialists were quite willing to have him lead the entire party and to use his philosophy of peace as a cloak of respectability, until the outbreak of the second world war, when the pacifist philosophy became highly unpopular and was therefore promptly dropped. Mr. Woodsworth, his health shattered, was replaced, and the pacifist creed became by a memory.

In addition to the groups aforementioned the party had its quota of opportunists in the early years, swelling to a flood by 1944, attracted by the smell of victory. These high-flying free-wheelers and the socialists were willing to compromise and get along together – the one for material gain – the other for political advantage and an increase and consolidation of their power. Sated with wealth many of the opportunists have already left for warmer climates, leaving some of their number, but also leaving the dedicated socialists in complete control of all key positions in the socialist government machine.

Mr. Speaker, shortly after coming to office, the very important field of education, which to a socialist is a fertile field of propaganda, was attacked. The University Act, governing our University of Saskatchewan, which was originally formulated on the principle that a university should be completely and absolutely free of any hint of political control, was replaced in 1946 by a new act. The old act, as did the new, constituted the Board of Governors of the university as the governing body. However, in the old act, the Board of Governors was made up of nine people, six of them elected or appointed by non-government agencies and three appointed by the government.

The new act increased the membership of the board of Governors to fourteen, seven of them elected or appointed from non-political bodies and seven appointed directly by the government. You will find proof of that in the general calendar 1961-62 University of Saskatchewan. The Board of Governors elects its own chairman and therefore, by the very simple expedient of electing from non-socialist ranks a chairman for the board, the seven socialist appointed members of the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan can completely control that board by a vote of seven to six.

With this government's record of patronage and political control, it is reasonable to assume that this board is politically oriented. If anyone doubts that our university is politically motivated, or is being used for political purposes, I would draw your attention to the record of the Centre for Community Studies operating from the university and described in the annual report of the University of Saskatchewan as:

operating under the authority of a Board of Governors representing the University of Saskatchewan and the government of Saskatchewan.

Recently, the center did a study of the town and district of Biggar, Saskatchewan, within the constituency represented by the premier of the province, the hon. W.S. Lloyd. They published their findings in a booklet – I have the booklet here – called “Leadership of Voluntary Organizations in a Saskatchewan Town.” Under the heading of voting participation on page 28, the Centre for Community Studies stated as follows:

The respondents in our 1960 study were asked whether or not they had voted in the most recent town, provincial and federal elections.

and further on, under the heading of party preferences on page 29, the center said further in their report and I quote:

most of the Biggar respondents were kind enough to tell us their preferences at both the provincial and the federal levels.

Table 14 on page 29 showed provincial and federal political party preferences of people designated by the center as: (a) community leaders and (b) non-community leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that any organization receiving grants from the provincial government or operating from the university should be running around the country asking people how they vote and who they vote for. That is their own business.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Snedker: — It is my personal opinion that the Centre for community Studies was conducting a political survey in the seat of the Premier, in order to give him information which would be useful and informative at election time.

It is interesting to note that the report made other further comments, one of them and I quote it as follows:

The report recognized that there are good organizational reasons for concentrating authority in fewer hands.

This statement is right straight down the socialist party line of state control and state socialism. Further on the report stated, in reference to Biggar, that in their opinion no top leader lives in the country. Well that remains to be seen.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is positively imperative that our university, our center of advanced learning should become completely and absolutely free of any form of political control. I believe that the majority of the governing body of our university should be elected by the alumni if they are unwilling or prove unable to administer their alma mater then it has failed to adequately educate its students. The University Act should be amended at once to remove it from political control.

I wish to pay tribute to all those members of the faculty and to the student body who have resisted socialist political indoctrination down through the past years.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Snedker: — In addition to academic reasons there are other and very compelling reasons why the university should be completely free of any hint or connotation of political control. Presently the examination and certification of town and municipal secretaries is under the administration and control of government departments with all the political pressures which that implies. It is my personal opinion which I have repeatedly stated inside this house, and out of it, that examination and certification of all professional people should be done by an absolutely non-political impartial board. In my opinion, the University of Saskatchewan should perform this function but if it is to do so on an absolutely non-political basis, we must first remove political control from our universities.

Socialist political interference in educational matters has led to a teacher exodus and to the recent loss of many of our senior educationalists. Doctor S.W. Steinson, past principal of the Saskatchewan Teachers College, Saskatoon, on leaving the province accused Premier Woodrow S. Lloyd and Minister of Education, O.A. Turnbull of political patronage. Linked with the patronage accusation was the charge that the provincial government was guilty of pushing people around. "This kind of business should not be tolerated in education", Dr. Steinson commented. I want to quote from what he said as reported in the Leader Post of August 25, 1962. Dr. Steinson was reported as saying:

Now I feel that I must speak up. Recently the attitude of the CCF government has been changing, the climate is different, it is obvious that they are closing ranks, now you are either for or against them. As a civil servant you dare not object because if you are fired you lose your superannuation benefits and so your future security is jeopardized. The Minister of Education appears very adept at by-passing the civil service commission by demanding orders-in-council verifying his own requests for personnel.

As a result of these conditions Dr. Steinson resigned and left our province to take a position with the University of British Columbia and the people of the province of Saskatchewan lost one of North America's most outstanding educators. he has since been followed by Dr. Charles Lightbody, who upon leaving to take a position in the University of Manitoba, made this statement, and I quote from the Yorkton Enterprise of July 17, 1963:

The very life blood of the university is academic freedom—freedom to seek new truth instead of mouthing the stale and unrevealing orthodoxies of a past era. Academic freedom cannot be maintained if one lacks the principle and intestinal fortitude to maintain it and one must remember that it can be undermined in subtle ways even though no dismissals take place. Finding ways to achieve academic democracy at the university level posed a great problem and a high turnover of faculty at the University of Saskatchewan, indicted that it was an urgent one.

That's the quotation from Dr. Lightbody. He suggested that a commission might look at the relationship between the provincial government and university institutions together with problems of academic freedom in schools.

In additional to Dr. Lightbody, Dr. J.F. Leddy, academic vice-president of the University of Saskatchewan and the Dean of the College of Arts and Science is leaving to become president of the University of Windsor. Dr. Leddy's educational achievements have received national and international recognition. His departure is indeed a serious loss to our senior educational institutions. Dr. J.T.W. Spinks, president of the University of Saskatchewan is significantly reported in the Leader Post of January 21, 1964, as follows and I quote:

For a province like Saskatchewan, the loss of scientists to other parts of the country and other countries is an acute one and should be minimized. Total social and political climate has a power influence over scientists.

said Dr. Spinks.

In additional to the outstanding and pre-eminent educators which I have just mentioned, many not too well known, but just as important members of the teaching profession have left for other provinces. Fear of socialist domination and control has, in my opinion, been one of the main causes of the numerical deficiency of teachers in the province of Saskatchewan. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this should convince the socialists that you cannot control and impose political conditions on educators unless you surround the province with a "Berlin Wall" and this is impossible, as long as we are protected by a federal government within the frame work of our Canadian constitution, The British North America Act.

Mr. John England, president of the National Union of Teachers of England and Wales, when visiting Saskatchewan recently, expressed the following views as reported in the Saskatchewan Bulletin of March, 1963, the official organ of the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation, as reported by Patricia W. Denhoff and I quote what he had to say for the education of members opposite:

If teachers did not establish a profession capable of setting its own standards, administering its own disciplines and accepting full responsibility for its actions, it would deteriorate simply into an arm of government, and no matter how excellent the government, an education system devised and administered by remote control could not be in the best interests of educating boys and girls.

Here, Mr. England refreshingly dismissed the Communist form of education by pointing out its teachers had become merely servants and spokesmen of a political system. Mr. Speaker, with political interference and domination becoming more rampant in the educational field, it is little wonder that teachers are feeling insecure and that they are requesting

that the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation not the government have control over the teacher's certification and training, similar to the controls that other professions have over members entering their professions.

In this modern world, complete academic and educational freedom is of more importance to the continuation and preservation of the principle of self-government, than at any other period of world history. For today, we live in the age of the astronaut and we stand on the very threshold of interplanetary communication. This is the space age and if the great conception of self-government is to survive and continue to serve the people, it must become a part of this age and it can only do so, if the theory and practice of self-government are taught and emphasized to the greatest possible extent throughout our entire educational system. We cannot expect the socialists, believing as they do in centralization and state control, to be of any assistance in this regard and statements made in their official newspaper support this view. I wish to quote from the Saskatchewan Commonwealth of October 31, 1962, from an article by Charles Beisick, under the heading of "TO THE POINT", this is what he said: "I think the whole way of democracy is a futile losing game." This from the mouthpiece of the socialists and later also in the official mouthpiece of the socialist party of Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Commonwealth of December 25, 1963, in another feature article under the same heading and by the same writer, I quote:

We need many millions of dedicated people who go about with the utmost determination to change, alter, reform and eventually abolish every vestige of the present system".

That's what the official mouthpiece of socialism believes and thinks about democracy. I want to quote again, from an article in Saskatchewan Commonwealth of November 6, 1963, "TO THE POINT" in which the same writer Charles Beisick describes annual civic elections in Manitoba as: -

this annual ritual, without significance

Socialism, state control, don't tell me you don't believe in it, your mouthpiece says so.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Snedker: — And this same writer in the same periodical, on December 18, 1963, described the Berlin Issue as "TRIVIAL".

Trivial, Mr. Speaker, that men would be willing to risk their lives to escape over the wall to freedom. Trivial, this wall between people of which it has been said that enough tears have been shed to wash it away. Trivial, that a boy who tried to jump over that wall was shot and left lying in a pool of his own blood. Trivial, that he should be buried by a state official in an unhallowed grave in an atheist ceremony.

It becomes obvious therefore that those people who believe in the continuation and the extension of self-government as I do, can expect no assistance from the government now in office, and seeking a further 20 years of office. Socialists believe that self-government is old fashioned, out of date, and an anachronism in this modern age. But this is not so, for self-government was made for people, it was made and constructed by people. It is operated by people and therefore adaptable to any set of economic or material circumstances in which people find themselves. It has been argued, I think incorrectly, that urbanization destroys the desire of people for self-government. For urban people, it is said do not have the time to play their rightful part actively in self-government. This, Mr. Speaker, is not correct, and I don't think it ever was, but now automation has increased leisure time for political activity, meeting and other facilities and means of communication are more readily available now than every before. I don't think that urbanization has led to a decrease in the people's ability to play their part in self-government, I don't think that is correct.

Mr. Speaker, the forms and the actual mechanics of self-government have, I believe, been perfected through the centuries. Its techniques well tried, but in this modern age, government and the people have tended to lose touch with each other in this province through government infringement a party too long in office, seeking to promote ignorance in order to perpetuate themselves power. This can only be rectified in the field of education. The classrooms must become the front line in the battle for the retention and the extension of self-government. If we teach the principles of self-government in our schools, if we sow the

seeds of freedom amongst our youth and in our colleges, encouraging students to play their part to the fullest extent in the adventure of self-government., we will not need to worry for the future of this great principle. If we wish to restore freedom to our educational system in order that it may play its rightful role in education our children to take their proper places in a self-governing country, socialism must be defeated and a government too long in office must be swept from power.

Already a movement is afoot to limit the freedom and the scope of investigation of the elected members in the legislature of our province. Propaganda is already being spread abroad with a view to limiting the public accounts committee, the committee where the opposition and the government members alike can question cabinet ministers, senior civil servants and others in regard to the amounts of money that have been spent in the previous year.

Propaganda is already being spread that the throne speech debate should be curtailed or abolished. This is the debate in which any member, be he back bencher, member of the opposition, or government member, may debate and speak on any subject which he sees fit. He may talk about philosophy; he may talk about public accounts; he may talk about small things; he may talk about large things, but it has always been recognized down through the ages that in the throne speech debate, the individual member was granted and guaranteed by parliamentary institutions and traditions the greatest possible latitude and freedom of expression. In this debate the least important member has as much right to speak as the mightiest.

Mr. Speaker, this government to a greater extent than any other, following the custom of the past, has grown arrogant in power, considering itself indispensable and now seeks to perpetuate itself by dictatorial tactics with fear and propaganda in order to prevent or at least delay the corrective process of electoral defeat so richly deserved by all governments too long in office. Today, in the province of Saskatchewan, the vicious might and power of the bureaucratic socialist state machine is ranged against the people in their struggle for freedom and the preservation of individual liberty and democratic rights. If our freedom is to be retained and maintained, socialism must be destroyed.

Infiltration of local groups was strongly urged by the socialists as far back as July, 1948. As reported in the Saskatchewan Commonwealth, Mr. Douglas, speaking to the CCF convention, urged all socialists to get into the co-operatives, trade unions and rural municipal councils. The former and the later defeated Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. J.L. Phelps, urged all socialists to get into the co-operative movement and through it maintain control of the government of the province. Mr. Phelps said at that time it would be impossible to maintain socialist control unless that was done. Now I have always thought that whoever was elected to these boards or positions was strictly the business of the electors or membership and non concern of anybody else. I think that those people who honestly and sincerely believe in the principles of the co-operative movement will agree with me that there should be no political or outside control of the movement. Not long ago, in 1961, the Department of Co-operatives in Regina refused a charter to a proposed seed grain co-operative. The minister in charge of the Department of Co-operatives, at that time, the Honourable O.A. Turnbull, when questioned in this regard, made weak excuses for his refusal. It is my personal opinion that they were refused this charter because they were no socialistically orientated.

As time goes on, the hand of the socialist and the writing becomes clearer. I wish to quote from the Leader Post of January 20, 1964 in an article entitled "N.D.P. Link Advocated for Labour". Doctor Frank Coburn, Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Saskatchewan said in speaking at the Saskatchewan Labour council banquet after the annual meeting, that labour must become involved in the co-operative movement. He went on to say and I quote:

That there are 10,000 labour people in Saskatoon and they should dominate and control the co-operative movement.

Now, I feel quite sure that the majority of the people in this province and particularly those of us who saw the beginning of the co-operative movement and saw the sacrifices which many people made to get the show on the road, don't agree with this. We started the co-operative movement for the benefit of everybody, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the membership and not for the benefit of some political group or political

party. I think that statement which Mr. Coburn just made was one of the most astounding things that I have ever heard. It was so astounding that the Western Producer saw fit to comment on it editorially. I think they wrote a good editorial and I'm going to quote from the Western Producer February 6, 1964.

The surest way to wreck the movement is for one group, be it social, political, or anything else, to seek to control or dominate the co-operative organizations to which they belong, to the extent of exclusion of the interest of the rest of the membership. Co-op's won't work can't work under such conditions.

A little later on the same Dr. Coburn, urging support of the NDP stated that Saskatchewan has the best labour legislation anywhere in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with this I most definitely disagree. I have read the Trades Union Act of the province of Saskatchewan from cover to cover and nowhere in that act, nowhere at all, could I find on single sentence or word which guarantees to the workers the complete democratic control of their own unions through secret nomination and secret election of officers. I am quite convinced in my own mind that all the lawlessness which we have read about, all the racketeering which has occurred has done so because the rank and file of the workers did not have or had lost control of their union. I am convinced that any union completely controlled by the rank and file membership will not be subject of or a party to any form of lawlessness. I am equally convinced that a union which is not controlled by the rank and file membership will be an easy prey to high pressure, labour union bosses. It will be made their tool, it will become lawless and will bring the entire labour movement into disrepute.

The following article appeared in the Leader Post on February 6, 1964:

Ottawa — A former university professor who now is research director of a Canadian Trade Union has advanced a new blueprint aimed at making unions in Canada more democratic as well as more Canadian. Harry S. Crowe, research officer for the 35,000 member Canadian Brotherhood of Railways, transport and general workers, contends that the typical trade union in Canada hasn't got enough democratic characteristics or techniques to qualify as a democracy. It is an oligarchy, not a democracy.

Well, be that as it may, I personally consider it is high time that the Trade Union Act of the province of Saskatchewan was amended in such a form and in such a manner as to completely and absolutely guarantee to the rank and file of union membership their complete and absolute control by democratic processes of the union of their choice. Union lawlessness has been recently rampant. The Longshoremen's strikes, the I.W.A. in Newfoundland, the Seamen's International Union and closer to home, the Tritchler Report on the recent strike at Brandon Packers, indicted gangster methods . . .

Mrs. M.J. Batten (Humboldt): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't blame the hon. members opposite from holding their own private debate. I understand they're finding the words of the hon. member (Mr. Snedker) uncomfortable, but it's distracting to the rest of us who want to listen to him, and I would beg you to keep order with those hon. members.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Snedker: — Oh well, Mr. Speaker, never mind, I can speak a little louder and anyway I'm trying to beat the clock.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that industrialization in our province will expand, but we must recognize the fact that increased industrialization will bring with it attendant labour problems. I consider that these problems must be met and coped with promptly, fearlessly, effectively not sectionally or politically, but with the best interests of the rank and file of all the workers of industry and of all the people of the province at heart, with the future of our province the prime consideration, rather than the welfare of trade union bosses, their socialist pals and supporters seeking to perpetuate themselves in power and make sure of their

stranglehold on the province through trade union manipulation.

Mr. Speaker, the socialist drive toward centralization and bureaucratic administration is exemplified in the Medical Care Insurance Act which is administered by a politically appointed and therefore, politically controlled commission, in all of the province of Saskatchewan with the exception of the Swift current Health Region. In this area, an 18-year-old, highly successful, self-administered regional health plan, after a long drawn out struggle between the people's board of the region of the government, was finally allowed to continue in existence. In Swift Current now the medical care plan is administered by a board of the people. In the rest of Saskatchewan it is administered by a board of government, a political board. In Swift Current the people's own board deals with doctors and public alike, and because doctors in Swift Current are dealing with people not politicians, the conditions are much more pleasant and mutually satisfactory.

Throughout the entire debate, when the Medical Care Act was before the house, and at every other opportunity that presented itself, I advocated that medical care insurance should be administered regionally by locally elected boards of the people. Had this course been followed, I feel sure that we would have avoided all the ill-feeling and confusion that attended the inception of this plan. The cost to the people would certainly have been no more, it is no more in Swift Current now where the method of local administration is being carried out. I believe that the cost in Swift current will eventually be much less for local administration is always more efficient and more economical than centralized government administration.

I wish to quote from a speech made by Mr. T.C. Douglas at the special session of the house of 1961 in which this legislation was passed. This is what Mr. Douglas said:

I have always believed in the principle of subsidiary, which is the principle, I am told, that you should never have a function discharged by a smaller organization as efficiently. This is true. The closer you can keep any administration to the people then the better it is – closer because they have a chance to register their complaints so somebody close at home. The people who are administering on a day-to-day contract can see what the problems and difficulties are, and therefore there is much to be said for having this administered on a regional basis. I come back, Mr. Speaker, to the point that I agree in principle with this idea of regional administration.

That is the end of the quotation made by Mr. Douglas in this house. This was what Mr. Douglas believed and he is on record as saying so, but he was leaving and the star of socialist power was rising in the government and I believe that he was over-ruled by the socialists in favour of complete socialist state control of medicine. He was either over-ruled or he was a darn hypocrite. Now I believe that the administration of the entire health plan should become regional, administered by the people, and I am proud of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution supporting the regional administration of medical care insurance was passed at our convention in the provincial constituency of Saltcoats.

The resolution then went forward to the provincial convention held in Regina where it was unanimously passed and adopted by one of the largest conventions ever held in our province. Representative of people from all walks of life, and all parts of the province of Saskatchewan, freely debating with no limitations either on time or words, the problems that confront people of our province. The following is the resolution that they passed:

Resolved, That we would co-operate to the fullest extent with any health region which desired to operate a medical care insurance program on the basis of the present Swift Current Health Region.

If our people wish for the continuation of the successful Swift Current Health Plan, if the people wish to control their own health insurance, if the people wish to take politics out of medical care, then they must turn the socialists out of office.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Snedker: — Socialists have ever sought to extend their influence and control to the field of public health, the Saskatchewan hospital survey and master plan of 1961, part one, printed by the Department of Public health in February in 1963, had this to say on page 15, subsection 20:

Provincial responsibility for both the short term and long-term active-care hospital needs of the population, should be centralized in the Department of Public Health.

Indicating a move for complete state control of all hospitals. I don't need to say that I oppose it. On page 49, they have the following to say:

The standard of patient services and care in many of the small hospital units is not considered adequate.

With this statement, I entirely and completely disagree. I think that our smaller hospitals have played a great part in the past history of our province. I think that they can fill a more useful function and play a still greater role in the future. Small hospitals are of the utmost importance for emergency cases and, for those who have received all the treatment that is possible at some medical center. When everything has been done for them, that can possibly be done, and when people are in need of terminal care, there is no better place for them to receive this care than in the small local hospital where they are amongst relatives and among friends in the twilight of their days. I think when a person knows jolly well that he is going to slip over the bar, friends and friendship mean more than medicine, pills or anything else.

Here is a list of the hospitals the socialists are proposing to close. They served their people and they served them well and still can. It's a crime that the government should even consider closing them. Centralized socialist government control of hospitals would mean that absolutely everybody working therein whether nurse or ward aid, kitchen help or laundry assistant, would be a civil servant under the lash of the socialist dictatorship. I am absolutely and completely opposed to the control of hospitals as a direct line from the Department of Health. I believe that they should be controlled by boards elected by the people in their own local areas.

Through the past history of this province, local boards together with private organizations have built every hospital in the province with the exception of one. They made the original decisions to build them and they built them well. Decisions to close hospitals should be made by hospital boards only. In regard – the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Nicholson) can sit and snicker if he likes – in regard to centralized control of hospitals, the socialist propaganda machine has already gone into orbit.

The Saskatchewan Federation of Labour in a brief to Health Minister Blakeney, made the following suggestion:

That hospitals be placed under the administration of the provincial government until such time as the government is assured the hospitals can again be operated by local authorities.

Now just who the heck said they couldn't operate them? I ask you since when has this government ever relinquished any control of anything of which they gained control?

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER! It is now 5:30 and I shall now leave the chair until 7:30.

The Assembly took recess at 5:30 p.m. until 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Snedker: — Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned for supper I had been discussing the question of hospitals in the province of Saskatchewan and the indication that the socialists desire to close some of them. I think that the last thing that I said was to ask when has this government ever relinquished any control of anything over which they have obtained control. I continue. Once our hospitals fall under the control of the provincial socialists they will remain under their control for ever or until the socialists are defeated.

Mr. Speaker, with the recent socialist domination of government, the ever-present, but until then slumbering war on local self-government was stepped up. After the election of 1960 it became hot with a definite drive to liquidate the rural municipalities and replace them by counties, of course, to be in their turn later liquidated and replaced by centralized socialist control.

The most revealing statement in this regard was made by the present Provincial Treasurer. The member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) made the following statement and I quote from the Leader Post December 20, 1960:

Ineffective local government groups were a nuisance and a trouble to the government at all times.

In their efforts to destroy local self government, the socialists were stopped cold in their tracks by an aroused and an enraged populace and they had to execute one of their strategic retreats.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I never said that.

Mr. Snedker: — Well you were reported in the press as having said so.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, I never said that. I never said that.

Mr. Snedker: — You were reported in the press and I have quoted it in this house before; this is the third occasion I have done so. It stands on the records of the house.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I don't care if this is the fortieth occasion, this is the first time I have heard of them . . .

Mr. Snedker: — Somewhere in this stack I have the clipping . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Will the hon. member sit down while I present my point of privilege? This is the first time that I have noted the remarks that were supposed to be made by me. I don't ever remember seeing it in the paper, and certainly I never said anything like the member read out here.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the hon. member has to accept the minister's statement on that.

Mr. Snedker: — Mr. Speaker, I have the clippings and he can say what he pleases . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: — I don't believe everything that is in the Leader Post . . .

Mr. Snedker: — I don't believe everything you say either.

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Snedker: — Well, never mind, Mr. Speaker, in their efforts to destroy local self government, the socialists were stopped cold in their tracks by an aroused and an enraged populace and they had to execute one of their many strategic retreats to return to the attack at a more opportune moment, and naturally they would consider the moment opportune if the people were ever so foolish as to return them to office.

Throughout the ages man has to a greater or lesser extent been governed sometime poorly, sometimes well, but governed none the less by his own fellow men, sometimes in the interests of his own welfare, but very often not. In the past people have been governed mostly by one form or another of dictatorship but at times and latterly to an increasing

extent and happily, in Canada, by a process of self government whereby the people select and elect their own governors. This privilege has been won for us by our ancestors through centuries of struggle by dedicated self-sacrifice and upon a thousand battlefields. For its preservation, no sacrifice is too great for if we lose it, no sacrifice will be great enough to regain it.

In days gone by when tyrannies became too oppressive the people destroyed them with sticks and stones, because dictatorships can be replaced only by force. But today, this would be impossible, for today's dictators hold within their hairy paw as the hellish weapons of atomic bombs, which they wouldn't hesitate to sue and before which the people, however strong, numerically would be helpless.

I am convinced that self government, be it provincial, federal, or world government must be based upon the most extensive and comprehensive local self government which gives education, experience, understanding and responsibility to governors and governed alike.

The would-be dictator who wins the battle for the destruction of local self government and destroys it in any country has only a few minor skirmishes left to destroy all self government be it provincial or federal and so secure his dictatorship. But if local self government be not abolished it will perpetually haunt and eventually destroy most mighty of despots. It is inconceivable to me that man made in the image of God should be ruled by tyrants or despots or any form of dictatorship which imposes the will of the few and the mighty upon the unwilling many. Only the extension of local self government guarantees the protection and the preservation of all self government at all levels.

The destruction of local self government greases the already slippery path to dictatorship. A centralized government and a proliferating bureaucracy inevitably seeks the destruction of self government in order to enhance bureaucratic power for bureaucrats are the arch foes of freedom.

In socialist Saskatchewan we have a provincial government with an excess of 14,000 employees controlled and dominated, I believe, by an elite corps, a socialist bureaucracy, of determined, well-equipped arrogant, high-living individuals determined to maintain their positions of pride, privilege, and power at all costs, interested not in serving our people and improving their welfare, but in multiplying themselves, increasing their own numbers, and extending their own autocracy by invading municipal government, hospital boards, school boards and every possible public body.

Bureaucracy is the arch enemy of freedom and self government. Bureaucrats are the enslavers alike of electors and elected. In the battle against socialist regimentation, centralization bureaucracy and dictatorship, local government in Saskatchewan has borne the brunt of vicious, socialist attacks and is in the forefront of the people's battle for the preservation of their freedoms. I now quote from the report of the local government continuing committee as follows:

This is what they said:

The history of provincial local relations in Saskatchewan is one of persistent erosion in local government autonomy.

The committee also stated:

The form of local government and its responsibilities are exclusively a matter of provincial jurisdiction.

With this I disagree. The statement of this government appointed body means they consider local government authority is derived solely from the provincial government rather than being a right of the people. Socialists believe in centralization and regimentation of people but I believe in liberty for people. Socialism believes in power at the center but I believe in power distributed among the people. Socialists would give absolute sovereignty to a centralized government; I would give sovereignty absolutely to the people for I believe it resides in the people. Socialists believe in firm efficient control from above; I believe that good government is not a substitute for self government and that eventually self government will be a better government than any centralized government or bureaucracy will ever be.

I want to quote, Mr. Speaker, from the writings of that great

democratic constitutionalist, Thomas Jefferson. this is what Thomas Jefferson wrote – I quote:

I believe in the principle that the will of the majority should prevail but if the will of the majority is to prevail, that will be rightful must be reasonable and minority rights must always be respected for the minority possess their equal rights which equal laws must protect and to violate which would be oppression. Minorities have no better protectors than their own elected officials of local government who, being close to people, are more conscious of their rights.

and I agree with every word of it.

I wish to pay tribute to all our reeves, mayors, councillors, school trustees, members of hospital boards and all the elected local representatives of the people who have, through the past years of attempted centralization and petty harassment by socialist bureaucrats maintained their sturdy independence in defiance of social dictation. Theirs is a grand battle in a great cause for theirs is the cause of freedom.

If freedom is to live, grow and flourish in our province a socialist government too long in office must be swept from power by the people before they lose the power to do so.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Snedker: — Immediately after the victory of 1944, the socialists proceeded to put into effect their dream of industrial control. They started up a blanket mill, a boot factory, a tannery, took over a box factory and other enterprises which, under competition from the rest of Canada, shortly went out of business at a staggering loss to the taxpayers.

Past Saskatchewan and world history shows that socialist motivated and dominated business enterprises cannot compete in a free world and can only continue if they are either complete monopolies with a captive market, have special government concessions, or are operated within the framework of a political dictatorship.

After the initial debacle of the crown corporations, the socialists concentrated on the extension of those monopolies of which they held control – the power corporation, the Saskatchewan government telephones and government insurance, etc. building these through the years into what I believe have now become machines and vehicles of socialist control.

The Saskatchewan Power Corporation, I am firmly convinced, has now become the propaganda mill for socialism. Its propagandists, the pampered, petted darlings of the socialist state, living high on the hog in marble halls and ivory towers while those who do the actual job of keeping the power corporation in operation, serving the people with power and with natural gas, they are the forgotten men. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation has a board of directors but a board of directors very unlike any other board of directors. Shareholder elected boards of directors who make policy decisions and who guide and manage private companies are concerned primarily with giving service to the public in order to make their company successful and profitable and thereby, their own positions secure. Elected boards of co-operatives are similarly moved to give public service and through service maintain their positions. Not so the politically pointed, patronage-ridden management of government enterprises who seek rather to protect their own positions by perpetuating in power the government and the party which made their appointments. Government enterprises therefore become a prey to bureaucracy. Their executive employees multiply at an accelerating pace depending on the political necessity of creating soft, well-paid jobs complete with expense accounts for the party faithful. Government corporations do not have to give service to survive by only to maintain the political framework in which they were born.

Hence, in a socialist state, honest field workers maintain and give service while the pampered, petted propagandists of government live high on the hog in grandiose, prestige buildings. If the people wish better government, if they wish above all things to strengthen self government, they must reduce the power and the centralization of big government,

for big government is bad government. The boards of directors of all crown corporations, these havens for ineffectives and propagandists must be transformed into effective governing bodies with the widest possible representation not from politicians but from people.

I believe that through a short transitional period they should direct our public services towards complete control by the people through directly elected boards. If the people want more efficient power, cheaper power, then they must reduce the power of government and increase the power of the people. The crown corporations, Mr. Speaker, were built by the people, paid for by the people; they belong to the people; they should be directly controlled by the people and they should not be allowed to become an instrument of control or propaganda for the socialist or any political party.

If this idea is acted upon it will bring responsibility closer to the people and the people themselves will be provided with wider scope to run their own affairs. This will restore to democracy an essential element it has lost with the burgeoning might of government and will go a long way to rousing the interest of the people in the conduct of their own affairs.

It cannot possible be argued that people lack the ability to control and operate through elected representatives all the crown corporations presently in Saskatchewan. The people of these prairie plains built under conditions of the most intense competition and in the worst climatic period that these western plains of ours have ever seen, the largest and most efficient grain handling organizations that the world has ever known. They were build by people, operated by people and are controlled today by the people not by the government. A people that occult build the co-operative movement to its present size in all its branches including the credit unions, surely have the ability to operate crown corporations, a power corporation, a telephone company and an insurance company or any other enterprise more efficiently and more economically than any government.

Mr. Speaker, undertaking this vast program of government decentralization, would once again restore political liberty to the civil servants of this province, it would cut out patronage in the civil service and finally would insure that the freedom of the people of this province was safe from government encroachment.

I wish to quote from the Saskatchewan Commonwealth of July 31, 1963, reporting the New Democratic Party convention. One of the resolutions reported reads as follows:-

Resolved, That civil servants and employees of Crown Corporations be fully informed of the aims and objects of the government program in order that they may carry out these ideals in their daily duties and contact with public.

In other words a brainwashing spree. And here is another one from the Commonwealth of August 9, 1962, another resolution from an NDP convention:

There are too many employees in the public service that do not believe in the philosophies and policies of the government.

(Well, I am happy to hear that). Since the passing of this resolution it is my personal opinion that high-salaried, political commissars, in the civil service have instituted a reign of terror among the rank and file of government employees. This will inevitably and eventually cause a serious deterioration of service, loss of morale, and loss of valuable personnel, from the civil service. The government for the last three years have almost needed a dispatcher to keep track of some of their deputy ministers and high personnel who have been leaving the province.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Snedker: — I have another resolution here passed at the NDP convention on July 31, 1963:

Resolved, that the provincial government exert stronger control over the civil servants in Departments of Municipal Affairs and Agriculture in order that the policies and aims of officials in their departments be brought into line with declared CCF policy.

In other words, they were going to crack the whip.

I believe that this vicious attack by the NDP on sincere government employees was no more or less than sheer spite, because the people had rejected the county system. This implies the most arrogant socialist regimentation of civil servants and can only lead to a serious loss of honest and sincere government employees, and their replacement by supine, servile “yes” men.

Mr. Speaker, the rank and file of the CCF in the early days, the people who did the actual work, who sold the memberships, collected the money and did a thousand political chores, never thought that their dream of a co-operative commonwealth, would turn into the Frankenstein of state socialism and centralization. And incidentally they deserved better than this. You can sit there and laugh but you know it.

I just want to quote, Mr. Speaker, from a statement that was made way back in 1925. On January 30, 1925, speaking in the Albert Hall at London, the Rt. Honourable David Lloyd-George said this: There was time when I didn't believe him but I believe him now, and this is what he said:

You cannot trust the battle of freedom to socialism; socialism has no interest in liberty; socialism is the negation of liberty. Socialism means the community enchained. If you establish a socialist community it means the most comprehensive, universal and persuasive tyranny that his country has ever seen. It is like the sands of the desert. It gets into your food, your clothes, your machinery, and in the very air you breathe. The collectivist idea is all gritty with regulations, orders, rules and decrees, and that is what socialism means.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Snedker: — Mr. Speaker, in conclusion there is an old saying “by the words of your own mouth shall you be condemned.” And I am going to quote from the Saskatchewan Commonwealth of December 25, 1963, from an article entitled “The roads are varied and deep” by Ivor Dent, C.C.-P.h.D. President of Alberta N.D.P. this is what he wrote:

Others attribute our beginnings to the rise of Marx, Engels and a host of lesser, albeit still noble writers.

Perhaps that may help to resolve some of the arguments I have heard around here as to whether the government is a Marxian or some other kind of socialist government.

I quote further from the Winnipeg Free Press of October 14, 1963 headed “Delegates Clash on Meaning of Socialism”.

Delegates clashed on the floor of the N.D.P. convention before adoption of a news statement of party objectives and principles. R.J. McLean, a Windsor, Ontario delegate provided a break in the debate by demanding that the resolution be re-drafted to include mention of the existence of God and man's dependence on him.

His proposal was overwhelmingly rejected on a show of hands. And I repeat as I have said many times before, that socialism is a foreign ideology and an alien creed which seeks to replace the Christian principles of love, compassion and mercy with the brass faced materialism of the state.

I want to quote from the Saskatchewan Commonwealth of November 14, 1962 from a feature article by a person called Valerie Smith, styled as a supporter of the NDP; this is what she wrote:

I think the charge that Cuba is a threat to the western hemisphere, because of Soviet missile bases on her soil is absurd.

A little later on by the same writer, in the same paper, December 26, 1962.

The future of all the Cuban people is so promising it fills you with a feeling akin to the envy.

February 17, 1964

and from the Saskatchewan Commonwealth of December 19, 1962 – an article headed “To the Point” described Mr. Kennedy’s action in regard to Cuba as “Fool-hardy act of brinkmanship”. The same writer called the Berlin issue “trivial”.

I quote also from the Saskatchewan Commonwealth of February 12, 1964 from an article by I.V. Macklin; this is what he said; this is what he wrote:

Let all Canadians hope that the Republicans party of the United States does not win in this year’s election.

Well, there might be some other people join him in that hope but why? Why did he hope this? Why? this is what he wrote:

The former republican vice-president Richard M. Nixon, in the January Reader’s Digest declares our goal must be a free Cuba, a free Eastern Europe, a free Russia, a free China.

That’s why he thought Mr. Nixon should be defeated because he wanted freedom for the peoples of the world.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I place these statements on the record – let the people be judge and jury. But while they are being judge and jury let them not forget that the NDP is the most politically ambidextrous party that the world has ever seen. In one hand they would carry the cap of St. Peter, in the other the keys of St. Paul, but is my personal opinion that etched on the heart of every one of them, is the Marxian socialist philosophy of complete state control of everything.

Mr. Speaker, because there is no indication in the speech from the throne of any change from past government policy of centralization and state control of people, I shall not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation): — Mr. Speaker, I understand that over the supper hour members on both sides of the house developed a togetherness regarding the length of the evening sitting. It was suggested that I should have a lower and an upper limit and I heard a voice from behind saying I would get the “hook” if I went beyond the lower limit and I’ll try to avoid that development.

But first of all I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder. I have heard a great many speeches in the House of Commons and in the legislature over the years, and these two members established a very high record and they are to be congratulated.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — I would also like to say that I share the views expressed about those who are retiring this year. The senior member for Saskatoon (Mr. Stone) and the members opposite have never had the good fortune to be defeated in a legislative election. The Minister of Labour was defeated in his first bid and you have missed something if you have gone through life without being defeated at the polls, and I was hoping that some of the members opposite would stay around long enough in 1964 to have that experience. Their leader suggested that quite a number of them wouldn’t be here after the next election but I am sure that those who are dropping out have made a contribution to the public life of this province, and the record of this assembly, will be a better record as a result of their having been here.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — The member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) hasn’t spoken quite an hour, but he has said more than most people can say in two hours, and I am not going to comment on the issues which might be discussed, but near the end he did refer to the attitude of this government towards civil servants, and I think the record should be put straight. I think the

member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) would be the first to agree that this government has done what no other government in Canada has ever done, amended the legislation after an election to permit a civil servant to take his seat in the legislature.

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabaska): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I was not a civil servant at any time, I have never been a civil servant for this government and I can assure you I never would be.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

An. Hon. Member: — He should get his facts straight. He should sit down and quite making these allegations.

Mr. Nicholson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll take the hon. member's word if he says he was not a civil servant, but his cheques were paid by the government of Saskatchewan on a regular basis, and no . . .

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, my cheques were not paid by the Department of Education, they were paid by the Northern Educational Committee, and that is not a part of the Department of Education. It is signed by the local school board.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't say they were paid by the Department of Education. I said his cheques were paid by the government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — No, I said they were paid monthly by the government of Saskatchewan, and I repeat again there is no province in Canada where any person who is receiving a monthly cheque from the government in office, would be a candidate running against that particular party in the election. I was a member here and I take no objection to what was done, but I think the record should be kept straight. I should also say that as far as I know, nowhere in Canada would a civil servant who is on the payroll of the government, be a candidate in a provincial election. I have in mind sir, Mr. Paul Dojack, who is a candidate in Regina east . . .

Mr. Ed Whelan (Regina City): — . . . patronage . . .

Mr. Nicholson: — this is what is called patronage and I would be surprised if Mr. Dojack would say that he has been asked to have a card in the CCF or has been asked to make a contribution to the CCF at any time. This matter was brought to my attention before he was nominated through the regular channels. I said that his is one of his rights; and I am sure Mr. Dojack will be the last one to say that the Department of Social Welfare of the Public Service of Saskatchewan did not give him every consideration in the many years that he has been with the public service and the Department of Social Welfare.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — And I want also to say since I became the Minister of Social Welfare, a daughter of a Liberal candidate has joined my staff and I will be surprised if she ever says that she was asked to make a contribution to the CCF or that her father was asked to make a contribution to the CCF. I want to say that although this person is well known and her father is well known, no one in our party, no one anywhere else for that matter, has raised any question about the propriety of this government employing a distinguished graduate of the University of Saskatchewan to do a job for which she is by personality and training exceptionally well qualified.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — and, so I ask hon. members to be fair, and to accept the fact that this government has been in office for twenty years nearly and as far as I know there isn't any one who is suggesting seriously that they have been embarrassed during these twenty years by being asked how they are going to vote and how they did vote and I will have something more to say about that tomorrow.

There is one of our programs that still requires a good deal of public interpretation. I refer to our public assistance program. This is one of our major spending programs and I think that by and large this program is very well accepted by people of Saskatchewan. Let me review very briefly aid to dependent families, supplemental allowances, old age assistance, disable persons allowances and blind person allowances. All three programs are shared by the federal and provincial governments. The provincial government is required to administer the programs. The federal government maintain auditors on a continual basis in each province to make sure that the interests of the Canadian citizens generally are being observed and that the rules are observed by the particular province.

Then we have the supplemental allowance that is paid to a diminishing group who did qualify prior to April 1, 1961, but their assets are in excess of what they should have to qualify now, but they haven't been cut off, and their allowances are paid entirely by the province. Then you have the social aid program which is shared by three levels of government. The municipality, the province, and the federal government, roughly on a percentage basis of 7 per cent by the municipality, 38 per cent by the federal and 55 per cent by the provincial government.

This, I say again, is a shared program. The senior levels of government pay the major cost but the municipalities are responsible for the day-go-day decisions that must be made and the operating of the program and let me say again that we happen to have on either side of the house, members who when they are not here, are involved in this program and I want to say to their credit, and to the credit of the program, that no one in either constituency has ever complained that the particular member had used his position improperly.

I think that in a democracy we should recognize these things occasionally and I think that no one can attack the administration of social aid without attacking the day to day work of 800 representatives of municipal governments. There are 800 municipalities, town, cities, R.M.'s and L.I.D.s in the province. They don't all have social aid case loads but if they are spending money on social aid and wish to be reimbursed by senior governments they must have an agreement with our department and we must take responsibility for seeing that the administration of social aid, the spending of public funds is carried out on a day-to-day basis according to the rules and regulations that have been approved by the three levels of government.

The federal government is spending nearly \$5,000,000 a year in the province of Saskatchewan in social aid. And no one can attack social aid in the province of Saskatchewan without raising questions in Ottawa regarding the administration of this program, and I want to say something tomorrow about some of these charges that are made, but I won't have as much time tomorrow as I have now but I want to emphasize again that the day-to-day decisions everywhere in Saskatchewan as to who is eligible, who is not eligible is made by the welfare officer who is usually the secretary or the town clerk of the smaller municipalities. Every municipality must have a local appeal committee to whom the citizen can turn if he is not satisfied with the decision made by the welfare official. And if after the municipal appeal committee has made a decision, he still is not satisfied, he can appeal to a provincial appeal board, comprised of a representative of SUMA, SARM, the public at large and our department. For the last twelve months, 36 appeals went to this provincial appeal board. In 29 cases the decision made by the municipal welfare official initially was upheld. In seven cases these appeals were reversed, and these welfare officials in addition to their very heavy duties in connection with the work of the municipality are involved with some very difficult problems.

I have a case before me. This case involves a girl who was married and by the time she was 17, she had her second child and had been deserted during her second pregnancy. She wasn't eligible for the aid to dependent families until she was 18, and so she turned to the municipal welfare official of the municipality for social aid. This girl had grade 10, she is being assisted to go to school to train to be a secretary. Again a municipal welfare official, a councillor and a reeve and teachers have all become involved in a most exciting rehabilitation case. And I want to say a society that has a busy welfare official and his local councillors and the teachers and people of the community who are anxious that this girl and her children, should have the best possible that these children should not be punished, because the father has walked off and hasn't been found, and so I want to pay tribute to the 800 municipal welfare officers, their reeves and their councillors for the outstanding work they are doing in this particular field.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Nicholson: — Before concluding, I would like to say one word about our child welfare program. Since we met a year ago the municipalities have been relieved of the responsibility of providing reimbursement for the children from their municipality. As you know for many, many years when children were taken into care, the local council was required to pay \$3.50 per week. In some cases there might be a large family taken at one time. This was a heavy load for small municipalities, and I am happy to say that commencing June 1st of 1963, municipalities were no longer required to make a contribution to this program.

I must report that this still continues to be one of our difficult problems. The number of children is increasing. A very high percentage of these children are of Metis and Indian origin, and although we are very critical of some countries in the world we aren't providing the adoption homes that might be looked for, for this very interesting group of children. I'm sorry we can't give the sort of publicity that many of these stories deserve. There is an internationally known radio and T.V. commentator who was left as a baby in a basket in Saskatchewan many years ago. He has been trying all these years to find out about his parents and why had been abandoned. We are hoping he will come back to Saskatchewan sometime to be available to tell us something of the very interesting work that he has done.

In one of our regions we had a little lad who was born without arms. I met him this summer and found that he is a born leader with his peers. He plays the ukulele very well with his toes. He is very skillful with his toes and with his feet. When I was thanking the foster parents for making such a wonderful home available, they said "Don't thank us, this has been the most challenging experience of a lifetime". I am sure that this is going to be a remarkable case history at some time and I wish more people would realize the possibilities of taking children who are wards of the Department of Social Welfare into their homes, and giving them the privilege of knowing something about family life.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the deputy leader of this party told me of plans over the dinner hour and I am sure you all will be glad to know that there is an hour's more material here that you won't have to listen to tonight. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 8:14 p.m.