

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Fifteenth Legislature**  
**7th Day**

**Friday, February 12th, 1965.**

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to welcome two groups of students who are in our galleries today. We have thirty grade seven students from Victoria School along with their teacher, Mr. Batchuk. We also have with us a Special Interest group from various schools, along with their teacher Mr. Neil. Their special interest is in leadership, which I think is very commendable. I am sure the house would like to join with me in welcoming them here. I hope that they will find the afternoon enjoyable and profitable.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I should like to draw to the attention of the house a group of high school students from the Carievale High School, which is about as far in the south-east part of the province as you can go. They are here this afternoon with their teacher, Miss Davies, and I welcome them and trust that they will enjoy their stay.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey):** — I would like to express a word of welcome to the students in the gallery from Mistatim School in the Kelsey constituency which is, of course, in the north-east of the province. They have had a trip down here today and I certainly hope they will enjoy their visit here.

**ANNOUNCEMENT RE MR. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition)**

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — I would also like while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, to inform this assembly of a matter in which they will have some interest and concern. Several weeks ago the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) suffered a slipped disc in his back. Some of you will have had some painful familiarity with this ailment. Since that time, the member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) has been undergoing treatment at his home, however, his progress has not been as fast as either he or his doctors had hoped, therefore, he has today entered the University Hospital at Saskatoon for further consultation and treatment.

He asked me to inform you of this and to express his regret and disappointment that he will be further delayed in resuming his seat in this assembly. I know the members on both sides of the house will join with me in wishing the Leader of the Opposition a speedy recovery and return to the assembly.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the house certainly would like to associate ourselves with the remarks of the Acting Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Brockelbank). We do hope the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) will soon recover and return to the house.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — While I am on my feet I, too, would like to welcome a group of students from the town of Riverhurst in the constituency of

Morse. They are with us in the gallery today. I think they have picked a good day to come as the radio debates should be very interesting.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### INQUIRY RE RE-BROADCAST OF RADIO PROCEEDINGS

**Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry):** — May I bring to your attention, Sir, and to the attention of the members on both sides of the house a matter which I feel is of great importance to the members of this legislature, and to the people outside of the legislature. This is in regards to the proceedings of the house of yesterday. Now, normally throughout the week after the newscast of 10 o'clock over the radio station CKCK, Regina, there is a re-broadcast of the radio proceedings. Yesterday, in yesterday's re-broadcast, the hon. Leader of the Conservative Party, Mr. Pederson, and a member for Regina West, Mrs. Cooper were heard. As a matter of fact the hon. member's speech for Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) was only partially re-broadcast. The speech was cut off near the end, then a further re-broadcast was cut off. A few minutes later it was announced that there will be no further re-broadcast of the legislative proceedings.

Now, I am perturbed personally, because I think that the people in the radio wave length are vitally concerned in the proceedings of this legislature, and what is more the re-broadcast comes at a time when people . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the matter that the gentleman is raising is one which would be better discussed on a substantive motion. This cannot be taken into debate in this house save by question put, and if he considers the matter sufficiently important, this would be the correct way to regularize the debate.

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, might I say that I think it is the duty of any member to bring to the attention of the house that apparently the contract for re-broadcast of the debates in the legislature was not carried out and thus some of the members of the legislature, whose debates should have been broadcast at that time, suffered a grave injustice as they were not broadcast. Not a question of debating any question, there is something wrong there.

**Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture, Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, might I suggest that the proper procedure would be for the hon. members to report this to the committee on Radio Broadcasting. I was not aware that this had happened and I agree with the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) that if there had been some technical problem or some other problem that created this difficulty, that it should be rectified and I would think the proper procedure would be for the member to report this to the Committee on Radio Broadcasting and they in all probability would look into the matter and can report back to the house at a later date.

### ANNOUNCEMENT RE BOB PICKERING CURLING RINK

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to bring to the attention of this house the victory of the Bob Pickering rink in winning the southern Saskatchewan Brier playoff championship. I might mention that Bob and his third man, Jack Keys and the Campbell brothers from Avonlea come from the Milestone constituency.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald (Milestone):** — I might also mention that the Campbell brothers from Avonlea brought to the province of Saskatchewan its first McDonald Brier championship back in 1955. I would also like to add that when they proceed with the formality of disposing of the north, this evening or tomorrow afternoon, they will go on to carry on and with another McDonald Brier Championship for the province of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mrs. Merchant (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to draw to the attention of the house and to the attention of the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), that the women in the north are not so easily disposed of, because in curling we have last night seen the Barbara McNiven rink from Delisle win the government championship and go on into the Dominion finals in curling, and though they do not come from the city of Saskatoon, we in Saskatoon feel a close kinship with Delisle, and in terms of sports we sometimes take a great deal of credit for their efforts in Canadian sports and so I would want the members to know that we up in the north are very proud of Mrs. McNiven and to recognize her talented rink there in this legislature.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Guy for an Address-in-Reply, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey) and the proposed sub-amendment thereto by Mr. Walker (Hanley).

**Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, when I resumed my seat last evening after having spoken for a few moments in the Throne Speech debate, I promised the members of this house that we would hear a little more today about the case of Mr. Ray Woollam, who was an employee for some years of the previous government, and who was also under contract to the government at the time we came into office and a man who, I can assure the people of this province, will not be under contract too much longer.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that it was during the course of the remarks made by the Premier in his address on Tuesday, that this matter was first raised. The Premier, at that time, read excerpts from a letter, or I should say a memo that was sent by Mr. Ray Woollam to Mr. T.K. Shoyama, the Hon. T.C. Douglas, the Hon. W.S. Lloyd, and Mr. Perry Brown. Now in case anyone doesn't know who the last gentleman was, he was the Secretary of the CCF Party in the province of Saskatchewan at the time this memo was sent.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier read into the records of this house the three main areas of problems with regard to the handling of Indian votes that were indicated by Mr. Woollam. I would remind you that this letter was written to the leaders of the government of the day, and also to the political organizer of their party by an employee of the provincial government. The three main areas of problems read as follows: Firstly — "the Indian is quite ignorant of any of the predominant differences between the three parties. During the last provincial election I remember listening to a lecture given by a drunken Indian standing on a stool in a cafe at Leoville. At great length he sketched the different viewpoints of the three contesting political parties, the Liberal Party, the Social Welfare Party and the C.P.R. Not too many people laughed at his presentation." I think anyone working among the Indian people who would make such a reference to those people, shouldn't be dealing with Indian people.

Secondly, "the Roman Church wields a particularly strong influence on the Indian vote. On the reserves their tactics are sometimes unbelievably direct." This is a direct charge against one of the largest religious bodies in this province.

Thirdly, "the problem of ice cream cones for votes is a big one. A general program of cash and liquor distribution on reserves would have a large appeal." This was the third problem area that was suggested by our friend, Mr. Woollam.

Then yesterday in his address, the former Attorney General had the nerve to stand up in this house and charge that the Premier had taken sections of the memo out of context and had read the letter completely and he said this was unfair. He stood and read to us what he purported to be the balance of that memo, Mr. Speaker, and after charging the Premier of this province with taking passages out of context in the letter, he proceeded to read into the records of this house a few more sections of that letter but he forgot and left out the most vital part of the letter which came at the close.

I want to read that part today, and I want to make very clear what Mr. Woollam was referring to in the final paragraphs of this letter which I want to remind you was directed to Mr. Shoyama, another employee

of the government, the hon. T.C. Douglas, the Premier of the day, the hon. W.S. Lloyd, the present Premier of the province and Mr. Percy Brown, the Secretary of the CCF Party, now living in the United States.

These are the paragraphs which the former Attorney General forgot to read into the records of this house. The first one was:

Unless I have other advice from you, I will continue to press quietly on issues one and three.

And I would just like to remind you again what issues one and three were: Item one was that "the Indian is quite ignorant" a statement which I regret being made by a representative of any of the three parties. Item three was: "the problem of ice cream cones for votes is a big one, a general program of cash and liquor distribution on reserves would have a large appeal". In this paragraph he indicates that unless he gets other advice, he is going to proceed in those two fields in his work.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — There it is, Mr. Speaker. It is right here in black and white — "Unless I have other advice from you I will continue to press quietly on issues one and three". Quietly — behind the back of the people of this province!

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — . . . you can only expect . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — With the problems one and three, I have read the problems, I have read the part of the memo that the former Attorney General (Mr. Walker) read to this house yesterday. Any man who has held the position in this province that he has, should know better than charge the Premier with reading part of a letter out of context and then proceeding to do exactly the same thing himself by not completing the letter. And then he goes on to finish the letter:

I wonder if you would be inclined to enlist someone's help in researching the possibilities suggested in my second point.

That had to do with one of the larger religious denominations in our province. And the last paragraph states this, and this was an employee of this government. I want to remind my friends opposite that this is the type of person that we have been putting out of the public service of this province to protect the interests of the thousands of civil servants and workers who desire to do a good job and be a credit to the people of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Here is the final paragraph, another one that the former Attorney General (Mr. Walker) failed to read into the records of the house:

Please find attached first draft of suggested NDP platform for Indians.

and this was the man paid by the people of this province to look after the affairs of the Indian people in Saskatchewan.

A lot of careful consideration has gone into these points. I feel they are generally acceptable to Indian people and are realistic, in terms of the kind of services which a federal authority could provide.

Just listen to this. He was preparing a platform not only for his provincial party, but he was busy working in the interests of The NDP party in Canada, preparing a program for them at the cost of the taxpayers of this province. Then as we proceed on, it is not hard to understand why in a

letter of June 15th, 1961, to the hon. T.C. Douglas, the same Mr. Woollam mentioned as the first goal for the improvement of facilities in Sandy Bay in this province that a beer and wine outlet be established by the Liquor Board at Sandy Bay. That was the first suggestion that he made to the Premier of this province for improvement to facilities for the native people in the Sandy Bay area. I say to my friends across the way that they should hang their heads in shame at the record of having a man of this type employed in the public service of this province.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the minister, I think should table the letters he is quoting from because obviously he is quoting parts of them and I would like to see the rest of them. Will the minister table them?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I will table the letter but I will read . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — . . . a lot more of it

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I wonder if the hon. member would say whether these documents are signed. I think he well knows the rules house, which prevent the quotation from documents which are unsigned. I can quote him the references from Beauchesne if he wishes. The members of this house know well that telegrams are not to be quoted, because they are not signed and I would refer you, Mr. Speaker, to Beauchesne, Citation 157, 158 and 159, which prevent members from quoting from unsigned documents.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, I can understand my hon. friend's anxiety at not having any more of these letters read but I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, as has been indicated in this House previously, that these are letters that were taken from the files of a public servant in this province and it was indicated yesterday no carbon copy is ever signed. The carbon copies are not signed but it was indicated quite clearly . . . who sent them and where they went to.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. minister says has nothing to do with the rule of the house. The rule is that the document quoted from, according to, it was given to us by the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) must be a signed document, if it purports to be what somebody else said and these are obviously not signed and, therefore, they can be faked, that is why they shouldn't be quoted from in this house.

**Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture):** — . . . signed . . . sealed . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Well I would point out to the hon. member that the former Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Nollet) the other day gave proof to the letters that one that was read into the records of this house had not been written while Mr. Woollam was a civil servant because he had received one and knew that it hadn't been. So, I think that is evidence enough for everyone in this house and the country that these letters were signed and are legitimate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that the house would like to hear what you have to say in regard to quoting from unsigned documents such as telegrams and other papers.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have no knowledge, and neither could I, of the nature of those particular documents that the hon. member is quoting from. I do not know whether these are letters or whether they are public documents. But if they are public documents, papers which if moved for by return would have to be produced in the house, then he certainly has the right to quote them. If they are letters, then he has to do it on his own responsibility or table them. I think that the hon. member has indi-

cated his desire to table the letters and said he will do so, and there so far as I am concerned the matter ends, providing he tables them.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, even if . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Wasting radio time here . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — On a point of order, even if the purported private letter, which he is quoting from is a private letter, if it is unsigned he is not permitted to quote from it even if he does table it unless he, himself, takes the responsibility for the truth and accuracy of what is said in them. That he makes them his words and I suggest to you that is the import of citations 157, 158 and 159.

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — It is no wonder they don't want these letters quoted because they are pretty incriminating but I would respectfully request that if there are further protests it be done after radio time.

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, now . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, when the house was meeting yesterday my hon. friend did not rise and object as the previous Attorney General, who should know something about rules in this house, rose and quoted from exactly the same letters.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, he was quoting from a tabled document. You are not quoting from a tabled document.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Well, these will be tabled as soon as . . . I read them . . .

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, a request has been made to table the letters, the minister has agreed to table them, and if my hon. friend wants to make a speech in this house why doesn't he await his time and get in his place and make it or sit down and be quiet.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, I will once again state that I am quite prepared to table the letters immediately after I have read the excerpts from them.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — This will not fulfil the requirements of the rules and the Speaker has given his ruling . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Will you sit down? The Speaker has given his ruling.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — The rule is distinct. An unsigned letter should not be read in the house. On the 16th of May, 1928, a member stated during debate that a letter which he had been quoting was not signed. The Speaker said — such a letter . . .

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, you have made a ruling. Now, if my hon. friends opposite do not agree with that ruling, then there is a procedure in this house that can be used and either use that or shut up. One or the other.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I hope that will settle it, Mr. Speaker, and I can proceed with my remarks.

This one is another letter written by Mr. Woollam and after I read the one paragraph, if my friends would like it all read, I would be very pleased to do so.

This was another one that follows, on October 27th, 1961, and I am going to read just one paragraph because it relates to a subject different from the rest of the context of the letter. This is what Mr. Ray Woollam states in this letter:

I have got a number of interesting programs

brewing here in the north west corner of Saskatchewan and I will be pretty well moving myself to the Meadow Lake area for the next six months. Between ourselves this is a step in the direction of Meadow Lake federal seat and toward taking on the shadow cabinet role of "Citizenship and Immigration boy" for Douglas.

I can assure him he would be a great "shadow" because his boy Douglas is never going to have the opportunity to have a "shadow cabinet".

This is a "fly by the seat of the pants" business, and it could fall through at one of several stages. At the moment, however, I am committed to plan it out for at least another five or six months.

Then he proceeded on to say:

You will be interested to know that I have received no correspondence from the B.C. Social Welfare people. There is only one way to handle some of these damn social workers.

This is the type of language from an individual who is conducting the business of the people of this province, and Mr. Speaker, I can well see why my friends that sit across the way do not want to have this type of evidence read into the records here this afternoon.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, and I am not raising a new point of order but simply referring to the ruling which you made in this house a few minutes ago when you said "any document which could properly be produced on motion and tabled in the house, that kind of document then could be quoted from". But I think it is very, very obvious that correspondence such as this, that if we moved a motion for a return asking for this kind of correspondence to be tabled, it would certainly not be tabled. It would be pointed out that this was privileged correspondence, and certainly wouldn't be produced, and if the hon. minister insists on going on, he will run into a situation where he will have to reverse himself in the not far distant future.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have read into the records all I need to at the moment to prove the point that the Premier was trying to make on Tuesday, when he was indicating the type of people that this government is determined to get rid of. I am quite certain that most members in this house will be quite pleased to know that the services of this gentleman will not be continued for very long by the government of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — We have also heard, Mr. Speaker, since last May 22nd a great deal from members of the opposition about the people who have left our civil service since the change of government. I don't wish to delve into comparative figures, unfavourable though a comparison would be for the former administration. I will leave the field of Socialist harassment to the civil service when our friends over there first took office to someone else.

Instead I would like to draw a few comparisons to show quite clearly how the NDP has played with the truth in regard to persons leaving the service and those coming into government work.

I, unlike my hon. friends across the way, have no desire to tar all those leaving with the same brush. Some of those who have left did so for better jobs. These were capable, hard working people, dedicated to the betterment of the province and they will be missed. However, there were others and I would like to refer to a few of them.

One of them, the one over whom most crocodile tears are wept, by our Socialist friends across the way, is a fellow by the name of Cass-Beggs. Mr. Cass-Beggs, our friends over there claim, was an internation-

ally renowned authority on power. Well. Mr. Speaker, for a man of such high stature, it seems somewhat surprising that the best job he could find after he left the "gravy-train" here was a third-rate part-time job at half the -salary.

What really was the case in this regard? After looking into his qualifications, I find he was like thousands of other people in Canada. Before he came to Saskatchewan he held an engineering degree, but there is one difference; he was the only engineer the Socialists could find who also had the important qualification of being a defeated CCF candidate.

What about some of the others who have left? There was one John Burton, a defeated Socialist candidate, A.L.S. Brown, former CCF MP, Oran Reiman, defeated Socialist candidate, C.S. Edy, one time Chairman of the Moose Jaw CCF association, George Elchuk, (inaudible) defeated in his attempt to get a CCF nomination.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . (inaudible) campaign manager, don't forget that.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Then there was Mr. Elkin, that great non-political civil servant who, in a public speech in Saskatoon urged Labor Federation members to support the CCF. Oh, there were others too, like Jack Kinsel, who was so neutral he is now working for the hon. Leader of the Opposition. There was Jim Arnold, former leader of the New Democratic Youth Movement, Maynard Woolard, now working for T.C. Douglas, and then there was Cliff Ashfield, who personally escorted Russ Brown around Last Mountain in an unsuccessful attempt for both to hold their jobs. With that he went down in flames, abandoning his former patrons and choosing, instead to join Mr. Pederson in another lost cause.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I think these few examples give a good indication of the type of men the Socialists felt we should work with. Their main qualification apparently was that they were Socialists, and that, in the mind of those opposite, seemed to qualify them for any job.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, the new government had some different thoughts. They took the view that a government should have men around them who agree with governmental policy and who also have qualifications for the job. As a result we now have men like Ed Oddishaw, B.A. LL.B., Gary Wilson, B.A. LL.B., Ron Parrott, B.A. LL.B. working on a master's degree, Jim Whiteside, working on a master's degree in economics, and Dr. R.G. Murray, whose qualifications for his work with the Medicare Commission cannot be doubted by any fair-minded person.

We have others too, who even the socialists thought were good enough to hold down high ranking posts within the government service and who had waited a long time for a promotion which never came under the previous government. Men were put over them, after they had worked many years in faithful service for the people of this province. Who were some of these men? Ted Walters, who is now Deputy Minister of the Department of Municipal Affairs, had a man brought in from outside the department to take over as Deputy Minister under the previous government, — C.K. Murchison, who is now the Deputy Minister of Labor, promoted through the ranks of public service in this province, — Gerry Williams, a young man again, who has been promoted through the ranks of the civil service and, probably the brightest light of all, in the person of the new Deputy Provincial Treasurer, Art Wakabayashi, who has been appointed to that position since the present government came into office, promoted through the ranks.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I would also like to point out that as well, most of the other leading civil servants who have indicated they are prepared to work with the new government are still in their position and are still working for the people of the province. To them, we must say "thank you." We know that they are dedicated to public service and that they will be loyal and good servants to the new government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!



**Mr. Gardiner:** — I would just like to emphasize as well, Mr. Speaker, another point dealt with by the Premier in his address the other day when he stated that a record was established in settling salary negotiations with the Civil Service by our new government. I am pleased to report that the public service and the employees union have indicated that they are prepared to co-operate in every manner with the new government to carry on the reasonable operations of government. Speaking on behalf of the government of our province, I wish to say "thank you" to them and to the thousands of public servants from one department to the other in this province. It is a difficult period when a new government comes into office, particularly after a long term in government of one political party. I want to say here today that I have appreciated in my own department the loyalty and co-operation that I have had from all my staff and that I feel they are doing a good job and will continue to do a good job for the government and for the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, my time is running out and I just want to take a few moments to deal with other remarks that were made by the previous Attorney General, particularly in regard to the contents of the Throne Speech.

The member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) in his address criticized some of the services that had been reduced or done away with by the new government. He particularly referred, I believe, to construction of public buildings and also to the construction of an addition to the Technical School in Saskatoon and to the construction of two new Technical Institutes.

I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, to the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) that he knows full well that when the previous government went out of office, they gave no indication as to where the two technical schools referred to in the budget were going to be built and that they had made no plans or preparations for their construction, and that they had made no arrangements for staffing these two institutions. All they were was a political dodge and a political gimmick for the election campaign of last spring.

I travelled at that time from one end of this province to the other and I think there were at least fifteen places in Saskatchewan that had been promised by someone that when the election was over they were going to have a new Technical School built in their particular community.

I say here today that the former Attorney General should be ashamed of himself for stating that we haven't taken up the funds that we could receive from the federal government in Ottawa. All he wanted us to do was to take money from the federal government in Ottawa and construct buildings just for the sake of constructing them. Doesn't he want to have proper preparations made for the expenditure of money of this type? Is it a sin to say to the federal government in Ottawa that we are going to be responsible if we are going to spend their money? We are not going to go out and build something just because the federal government will give us \$2,000,000 whether we have the services to provide for it or not.

I say here today that as far as the present government is concerned, whether it happens to be in the field of education, whether it happens to be in building or to provide facilities for our public servants, or whether it happens to be in any field involved in public works, I hope and I believe that the new government are going to see to it that proper plans are made before hasty actions are taken — whether the money is coming from Ottawa or whether it is coming from our own taxpayers.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — There has been a reference made in the past to the possibility of a provincial building in the city of Moose Jaw, and I want to say to the people of Moose Jaw that I can assure them that that they will receive every consideration from this government. When it comes to the question of providing increased office space, they will get equal consideration with all other centres when we have completed our investigations of office facilities in this province.

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City):** — Let's build . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — But we are not flying blind, Mr. Speaker. One of the first actions taken by this government was to undertake an investigation of all office facilities, not only in government departments but in crown corporations from one end of this province to the other, and I can say to my friend, the former minister (Mr. Davies) that there will be no public buildings constructed in this province until that investigation is completed and until there are full recommendations on my desk from the staff of the Department of Public Works.

I have here in my hand a brief which indicates that originally in 1961, when the previous minister (Mr. Davies) brought this matter up that he was told by his department that they didn't require any buildings in Moose Jaw. It was later brought up in June 28, 1963, and another report was asked for. Again they were told that there was no urgency with regard to office space in the city of Moose Jaw.

I have been through every building in Moose Jaw and I want to say to the former minister that in relation to some of the larger cities of this province that I think Moose Jaw probably will be one of the first to receive consideration with regard to office accommodation.

When the government feels that that type of construction has reached the priority stage, I want to say to him and to every one in this province, that as long as there is a need for hospitals, as long as there is a need for institutions such as Dales House, and for accommodation to take care of women prisoners, as long as there is a need in those fields then I am quite certain that they will get a priority as far as construction is concerned. The provision of public buildings for office facilities I think must receive a much lower priority than those items I have just referred to.

There is just one other reference I would like to make to my own department, Mr. Speaker, before taking my seat and that is that in 1961, under the previous administration, the government by an Order-In-Council, changed the method of selection of caretakers. Previous to that time caretakers were hired through the ordinary channels of the Public Service Commission. They had to go through the regular channels, and were selected by merit. In 1961 under the previous minister (the hon. Mr. Davies) this was changed. On the recommendation of cabinet and particularly the recommendation of the hon. W.G. Davies (Minister of Public Works) and the hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour and Telephones) . . .

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City):** — I don't want to interrupt the hon. gentleman. First of all, I should point out that it is the rule in this house not to use names of people and I would like to suggest that the section that he is talking about, section 34 of the Public Service Act, does provide for the selection of employees, on the basis of merit and fitness . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — On a point of order, I would just like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that prior to this act being taken, the employees were hired through the normal channels and that the action that was taken, was taken against the advise and wishes of the deputy Minister, who noted at the bottom of the letter sent from the Public Service Commission Chairman, that he did not agree with the action of the minister or the actions of the government of the day. In a second letter . . .

**Mr. Davies:** — On a point of order, may I suggest that the document to which the member is now referring should, as it has been referred to, be filed and tabled in this house.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, I will file the actual document tomorrow. These are copies that were made for me and I will get the actual document . . . and I will file the document at the first opportunity.

**Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City):** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the rule makes it clear that an hon. member must table the document, not tomorrow, but today. I would ask for a ruling on this procedure.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I will table this one then, and I will have the actual copy in my office then. I will table the document from which I am reading.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Table . . .

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — You wouldn't understand it anyway . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — When the new government came into office, on the recommendation of the staff of the department, I returned the employment of caretakers I back to where it was prior to 1961, and this has placed these individuals on the same footing as other members of the public service in the province of Saskatchewan, and not under the hiring will of one individual.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks today I want to indicate that the Department of Public Works is here to give service to the people of this province. I can assure you that actions that will be taken from time to time will be taken from an ideal of providing greater efficiency and service to this province and I can assure you that when the vote is taken on the Speech from the Throne, I will oppose the sub-amendment and the amendment and I will certainly vote for the main motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sam K. Asbell (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, may I also add my congratulations on your elevation in unanimous election to the Speaker of this house at this time. Your office, Sir, is a symbol of great parliamentary traditions. The procedures and principles have been created over 700 years of parliamentary history of Britain, a system of democratic responsible government. Sir, we are happy to place the trust of this house in your care.

May I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. They did a specific, clear cut job, to the point, and they are again to be congratulated, and, of course, the member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) and our lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) did the job admirably.

I would also like to extend congratulations to the new members on the opposition side of the house, as well as our own, and to the lady member (Mrs. Cooper) who represents Regina West.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Asbell:** — Sir, when I entered this house, I did so with trepidation, but I find a long standing friend that I was with in the armed services, none other than the Sergeant-at-Arms (Mr. Ponto). He and I were in service together in the early years of 1940 and it wasn't until I stepped into this house, Sir, that I renewed acquaintance with him.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Asbell:** — I would like to congratulate Jim Hooker, MLA, Notukeu-Willowbunch and George Leith (Elrose) in their presentation on this side of the house. They spoke to the point on matters that concern me as a rural resident, namely agriculture.

I might say to the opposition across the way, very fortunate they are to have a few representatives of the rural population sitting with them in the overload of city representation. We, too, have city representation on our side, but it is a fact that the balance of our membership is definitely rural.

Mr. Speaker, as a newcomer to this legislature, it is not only a desire, but an honored privilege to help formulate policies and programs, as outlined by the businesslike Speech from the Throne, for the betterment of our great province of Saskatchewan, as a member of a new Liberal government under the dynamic leadership of a man trained in business, a man interested in the improvements of the arts and culture of our province, concerned with the health and welfare of our people, and the economic growth of our great province, and a man with full knowledge of the agriculture industry. I, along with my colleagues, both new and of senior service, dedicate ourselves to the upbuilding of a great province, entering a new era of prosperity and advancement in its 60th year of our history.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Asbell:** — I speak as a member of an ethnic group; my folks came to this land as immigrants in the year 1912. They were to sail on the Titanic but bless the Deity, they weren't on that ill-fated ship for the reason that they didn't have enough money to buy passage on the Titanic. They travelled by steerage on another boat and thus landed safely in Canada, and I am one of the first generation of that family. Sir.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Asbell:** — Furthermore, it is indeed an honor to be elected by the rural constituency of Bengough, and to these people I give sincere thanks. Together with the Bengough people and on their behalf, I shall try to build a better constituency along with a greater Saskatchewan. The rural people for the most part, took it upon themselves last April to change a form of unbalanced government of twenty odd years. This was done when the ranks of Bengough joined a new government era under the Liberal party.

Our constituency lies in part along the American boundary on the 49th parallel, along that great unguarded boundary, I might say it also borders the state of Montana, for my friends across the way.

This riding of Bengough is situated, Sir, in its entirety, in the Assiniboia federal riding, a riding that was known nationally when the swords of political gladiators clashed across the great Dominion of ours. It was known to our Premier, and also to a farmer, now inactive, but who will return soon to the political field. My friends across the way know that man. He is Mr. Hazen Argue, a former MP for Assiniboia.

Bengough is a constituency where politics is taken in its merits — taken in its judgments — and taken to further the welfare of the nation. Names that play upon the imagination, Sir, tied together with the history of our province are part and parcel of the Bengough constituency — the Big Muddy badlands that run through the Bengough, Big Beaver, and Coronach area, the Big Buttes and the Little Buttes of the Ogema area, landmarks in the days of the pioneers, the Dirt Hills of the Crane Valley, Old Wives Lake, Mossbank, and the town from where I come, named after an Indian Chief, Assiniboia.

Legend tells us, Sir, that Old Wives Lake, was named in honor of aged Indian women who kept campfires burning throughout the night so that their men and young folk could escape during the night from a large enemy force. In the morning, Sir, when the sun rose, a massacre of the old wives took place. The legend says today, Sir, that the wailing of the old women can be heard on the lake on each and every anniversary of that massacre.

Mr. Speaker, Bengough is a good constituency. We have known good times; we have known bad times; we have built prosperous farms; and prosperous ranches. We have a limited amount of oil production in our constituency, Sir, in the Viceroy-Bengough area, and I think it will increase now that a favorable government is in power.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Asbell:** — Sodium sulphate is mined in the Bishopric-Expanse area. I make it a point, Mr. Speaker, that our people along with the rest of Saskatchewan do not look for full government paternalism. Assiniboia and area districts built the first pioneer village in the province of Saskatchewan under a combination of local, provincial and federal programs. Today nearly 200 of our golden age pioneers live happily in this project. Again Bengough constituency has another first in Saskatchewan when the town of Assiniboia accepted the challenge to construct the first open lagoon system of sewage sanitation. We have, Sir, the world's largest rural credit union in Assiniboia, testifying to the complete co-operation of those who think co-operatively and those that think privately in free enterprise for both.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Asbell:** — Our community, Sir, is built on that. There is no division. We are truly one and all, the private deals with the co-operative and the co-operative deals with the private. Mr. Speaker, I have

mentioned some of the progress of our constituency. However, there is another side of the coin. Until April 22nd last, although a beginning had been made on highway 13, east of Assiniboia, up until that stage not one inch, not one foot, not one mile of road existed in that constituency from the Alberta border to the city of Weyburn. I might add here, Sir, why did oil begin at the city of Weyburn? And with due deference, Sir, to the member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) there is a reason. He knows the reason. Had he had the former premier living in our constituency, possibly we would have had a better share.

However, Sir, be that as it may, the former government did not see fit to put one inch, one foot, one mile of oil on no. 13 highway, nor did they see fit, Sir, to oil highways that meet our American border, the two ports of entry from Bengough constituency, namely, on highway 34 and highway 36. We cry and plead about bringing tourists to our province. They have written and authorized volumes and volumes of literature to bring tourists to our province, but not one mile of oil did they put on those two main entries into our province from Big Beaver Port and from East Poplar Port.

Saskatchewan's strength, Sir, lies and always will be in agriculture, with due respect to industry. The family farm has that strength. The survival of the family farm itself as an economic unit is being challenged today by continuous pressure of falling markets, high cost of equipment, manpower shortage and other factors beyond our people's control.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is a challenge and a must that this government, this new government will and shall take definite action to alleviate these circumstances. The family farm is vital to the health of rural Saskatchewan. It is vital to the villages, to the hamlets, and to the towns and I might say to the cities. We do not want factory farms with large numbers of hired help, nor do we want tiny economic farms where the farm family is consigned to continued poverty. The former government was quite verbose in the commendation of others for the betterment of our people, but I might say that today, Sir, 30,000 farmers in this province of Saskatchewan earn less than \$3,750 gross to equip their farms, maintain their families, and stay alive. This is after twenty years, Sir, of so-called paternal government.

**Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry):** — Federal Liberals . . .

**Mr. Asbell:** — The family farm, Sir, is the most efficient means of production. This is a farm of adequate size, equipped with efficient and adequate machinery where the farmer is able to do the work with a minimum of hired labor and of financing and outside help. Our family farm units are down in numbers, Sir, down today to a mere 85,000 odd, from a figure of twenty years ago of 142,000 farms in this province. A sad state. But what is being done? This government in co-operation with the federal government has taken definite steps. The federal government has taken steps to establish economic farm units. Today the cost of land is high. The original limit of \$20,000 for purchase of farm lands under the Farm Credit Corporation was definitely inadequate. Indeed, in some parts of the province today, land is being sold at \$100 an acre or more, so that the \$20,000 in that case would only buy one single quarter of land, possibly. The increase to a ceiling of \$40,000 under this Farm Credit arrangement will go a long way in providing funds for the establishment of an economic unit. \$15,000 more has been added for the purchase of buildings, equipment and livestock for the farm production plant.

Second, Sir, the federal government has amended the Farm Improvement Loans Act to increase the ceiling of \$7,500 on farm machinery to \$15,000, a very needed improvement, and has been met by this regulation. With the cost of farm implements today, this amendment was necessary to give the owner of the family farm the opportunity to purchase a good line of equipment. I might say, Sir, I take a decided dislike to the inference yesterday, (and I wish he was in his seat) of the former Attorney General, (Mr. Walker). He produced a clipping and slurred the implement dealers of the province of Saskatchewan. I am an implement dealer, who represents one of the 1,350 families that service the farming communities of this province. He took it upon himself, Sir, to slight the Implement Dealers' Association. Why?

Sir, I represent my town on its council, I have been in the armed services, I belong to the Legion. I don't believe I should mention this, but that man has no right to infer with a slur, that the implement industry dealers are a bunch of . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Asbell:** — Now, the provincial government of this day is committed to the strengthening of the farm family. We are committed to authorizing the use of purple gas in farm trucks. It has been debated by the Minister of Agriculture. I see he is not here. I don't know why it is that when a rural constituent member speaks, they disappear. He should be in his seat. He poo-pooed when the indication was made, Sir, that there would be \$4,000,000 possibly in savings to the farmer in purple gas. Now I don't know the figure, and neither does he. But I say this, when a former member of the federal house asked: "What's a million?" that government lost power. What does the hon. member mean when he asks: "What's four million?"

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Asbell:** — I would like to go on, Sir, but my radio time is drawing to a close. If it hadn't been for that continual barrage over there I think I would like to have dealt with one other item, Sir, namely the allocation of grazing leases, and then I will sit down.

I would read, Sir, from page 148 of last year's Journals, Debates and Proceedings, a statement by the former minister, the member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet). 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 I must agree that we do want complete independence and freedom from political pressure from any party whatsoever. We have been endeavoring, Sir, to discharge this responsibility in leases and allocations and have been on the policy. However, Mr. Speaker, as long as the allocation committee comes directly under the minister's department, the minister is bound by the court of the land to the Court of Last Appeal. The former minister was the last Court of Appeal. How did he rate himself to that? He had one man, Sir, that can be described as the Czar of land allocations; this man had under his control . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Asbell:** — . . . 9,000,000 acres of crown land, and one and only one man was the allocation committee. Fair to our public servants? No. Fair to our farmers? Definitely not. This new government has the courage under the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) to establish an independent Appeal Board, one chosen from the Wheat Pool, one chosen from the Dairymen's Association, one chosen from the Livestock Association and one chosen from the Farmers' Union. This is a positive, definite action that this Saskatchewan of ours has needed for years. Sir, I find I cannot support either the amendment or the sub-amendment, and I will support the motion wholeheartedly.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Daniel V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, my first, words must be words of congratulation to you, Sir, upon being elected to your high office. You, I believe, Sir, have had what might be termed, in the last five or six days, somewhat of a Baptism of Fire. You have acquitted yourself nobly and I am sure that you will continue to do so in the days and weeks which lie ahead.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — In rising to take part in this debate, I would associate myself with the other new members of the legislature on both sides and I would assure the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) that he has no monopoly on butterflies, I have a few myself. I would like to congratulate him and the other new members, particularly on the other side of the house, for the way in which they have acquitted themselves in this debate. I have personally congratulated my colleagues on this side who have made their first contribution, but we don't see quite as much out of the house of the hon. members on that side as we do on this side.

I would like to take this opportunity of publicly thanking the

voters of the constituency of Lumsden for giving me this opportunity to represent them in the legislature of Saskatchewan. To be entrusted by one's fellows with the responsibility of representing them in a parliament or a legislature in a free country, is to convey or confer upon him, or her, one of the greatest privileges that free men and women can bestow.

Mr. Speaker, I accept this honor and this responsibility with gratitude and with humility. I express the hope that I may be worthy of the trust imposed in me by them.

On behalf of the people of my constituency I would like to thank my colleague, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gordon Grant) for including in the 1964 highway oiling program, no. 16 highway from White City to Vibank. Prior to the 22nd of May, 1964, and for a short time thereafter, this was a heavily travelled gravelled highway, impassable in wet weather and invisible in dust, dry weather. This is a highway which has been crying for attention for a good many years. My colleague quickly saw the need, he acted, and this highway was oiled and properly marked before the onset of winter. Those of my constituents who live on or near this highway are deeply grateful, as am I.

I would also like to thank my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane) on behalf of the residents of the villages of Marquis, Regina Beach and Pense, for the very great assistance provided to these communities from the Water Assistance Branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs. I should tell my hon. friends opposite that this is one of the programs commenced by you when you were in office in which I concur most wholeheartedly. We are going to extend it and I hope improve it.

I would also like to thank the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane) on behalf of the municipalities of my constituency for grants provided to them for road building. I would also like to thank the Minister of Telephones (Mr. Grant) for the assistance granted to a number of rural telephone companies in my constituency.

My constituents and I look forward with keen anticipation, Mr. Speaker, to this year's highway and grid program, in the confident expectation that our representations will receive careful consideration and that the pressing claims that we have in these areas will be recognized.

Now, before I say anything further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the legislature to the fact that we are honored by the presence here today of Mother J. Francis and her grade 11 and 12 students from St. Mark's school in Marquis, Saskatchewan, who are sitting in the Speaker's Gallery.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — I am very pleased to welcome them on your behalf to the legislature and I hope that they have found the proceedings thus far interesting and that I don't detract too much from the interest which they have expressed so far. I hope that the proceedings will continue to be interesting for the rest of the day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal briefly with a matter which has been raised in this legislature in the last number of days and has been recorded in the press. It is the matter which was in the first instance raised by the Premier and then a statement was made by the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank, Acting Leader of the Opposition) in connection with certain files which at one time were kept in the Government Finance Office.

In my department we are making inquiries with respect to the position of these files. I make no accusations against anyone in this regard. It does appear, however, from our investigation that a large number of files were removed from the Government Finance Office on the 22nd of May, 1964, and were delivered to the office of the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank). I am advised by those who work in the government Finance Office that these were not personal files. These were files belonging to the Government Finance Office and I would draw the attention of hon. members that this whole procedure of disposing of documents, be they ministers' documents or be they public documents, are dealt with in the Archives Act of this province, and the procedure is spelled out loud and clear.

Public documents are defined in this act, and they are listed

in section 2, sub-section 3, — "vouchers, cheques, accounting records, correspondence, maps, photographs, and all other documents created in the administration of the public affairs of Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, these types of documents, being public documents, the procedure for moving them out of an office, or for disposing of them, is very clearly set forth in that act and the normal procedure for moving public documents out of a government office is provided in section 6 of the act. Section 6 states that all public documents shall be preserved by the department, to whose business they belong, until their transfer to the Saskatchewan Archives Board, or their destruction is ordered by the Lieutenant Governor-In-Council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am advised that in this situation, the documents did not go directly from the Government Finance Office to the Archives office. Rather, they went to the office of the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), who at that time was the minister in charge of this office. They went to his office then sometime later, I'm not sure of the exact date, forty-six cardboard cartons were delivered to the Archives office, Mr. Speaker, and I am advised that the cartons which found their way to the Archives office are not the same cartons that left the Government Finance Office.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — There was apparently a repacking. Now, I am not making any accusations as to who did this. I am simply stating the facts as we have discovered them thus far. We do not know whether the documents now in the Archives office, under the name of the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) are the public documents which left the Government Finance Office. Because, Mr. Speaker, in the Archives Act, by section 10, there is provision whereby any member of the public, or any individual, can donate his own private papers to the Archives Board, and the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) and other hon. members who were ministers of the crown, have down through the years donated their papers to the Archives Board. I find that on the 15th of May, 1964, the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) did enter into an agreement with the Archives Board whereby these papers would be stored in the Archives Office.

However, they are his papers. No one else has access to them without his permission or consent. They are closed to consultation, or research for any purpose for a period of twenty years, subject to the provision, of course, that, if he agrees to let anybody see them, he can.

Now, the position, Mr. Speaker, is that we don't know at the moment, whether the files and documents which left the Government Finance Office are in the hon. member's papers in the Archives Board or not. This is something we are looking into. I can assure the house that in due course I will be making a further statement in this regard. If a mistake, or some other thing happened, and some of the papers which belong to the Government Finance Office are in the hon. member's private papers, I am sure that he will advise us and that these papers and these files will be restored to the Government Finance Office, from which they should never have been taken in the first place.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to consideration of the operations of some of the departments for which I have responsibility, and I would first like to deal with the operations of the Public Service Commission. As you will know, the Public Service Commission deals with the employees in all departments of government excepting the various crown corporations. There have been suggestions, Mr. Speaker, both in and out of this chamber, that with the change of government many employees of the government were either dismissed or their resignations were requested. I thought it would be interesting to compare for hon. members two eight month periods. The period from May 2nd, 1964 to January 31st, 1965. That is the first period. The second period is July 15th, 1944 to March 26th, 1945. These periods represent the first eight months in office of this government and the first eight months in office of the previous government.

Mr. Speaker, I lay on the table a document which I will call Exhibit A — it shows the dismissals or termination of appointments for the period May 22nd, 1964 to January 31st, 1965. This document shows that there were eleven persons dismissed or their appointments were terminated



during that period

I would then like to lay on the table Exhibit B — which covers the period July 15th, 1944 to March 26th, 1945 that shows 47 requested resignations and 60 dismissals. A total of 107 during the same period.

**Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Terrible record . . .

**Mr. Heald:** — I would next like to lay on the table, Mr. Speaker, Exhibit X, which shows a comparison of resignations and dismissals. You will note that in the first two documents that I have filed I have made no reference to resignations, voluntary resignations. This next document that I am going to lay on the table, Exhibit X, shows that as of December 31st, 1944, there were 3,616 people in the public service, whereas on December 31st, 1964, there were over 7,600. So the civil service was more than double the size.

This next document that I am going to table shows that in the period, the eight month period in 1944, there were a total of 462 resignations, 42 requested resignations, and 60 dismissals, and we have worked that out into percentage of total staff, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the percentage of total staff of everybody leaving the government during that-period, nearly 13 per cent, 12.8 per cent.

Now I have done the same thing with the first eight months of this government in office, taking all resignations and dismissals and related it to percentage of the staff and it comes to 9.7 per cent, and I am filing Exhibit Y, which shows this. Exhibit Y also shows that the total number of resignations and dismissals in the public service in the eight months we were in office is lower than the average turnover in the public service during the last five years that our hon. friends opposite were in power.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table a document prepared for me by the officials of the Public Service Commission which is a complete breakdown of everybody who left the government service during the period from July, 1944 until December 1946, roughly the first eighteen months our predecessors were in office.

Then I have had an analysis made of the type of people that were dismissed by our predecessors during their first eighteen month period in office and it is an interesting list because we have heard a great deal in this debate, Mr. Speaker, about priorities for people, and that this government picks on poor people, and that my hon. friends opposite are their friends, and I approach this analysis from a point of view to see whether it was the high priced executive type which my hon. friends dismissed, or who it was, and this is what I found. I found for example in the Department of Public Health, the period June, 1944 to December 1946, they dismissed 32 attendants and nurse attendants in the hospitals. These are executive jobs! They dismissed a clerk in Public Works; they dismissed an assistant cook; a first cook; and assistant chef; a fireman; a kitchen assistant; a relief guard; storekeeper; three domestics; grounds constable and guide; and so on. In Social Welfare they dismissed a domestic. In Natural Resources, the meat-axe worked pretty good here. Field Officer, Publicity Clerk, six field officers. Farm Loan Board — seven inspectors. Highways — inspector and clerk. So on down the line.

I would like to file this, Mr. Speaker, as an analysis of the type of people that were dismissed.

**An Hon. Member:** — Shame, Shame.

**An Hon. Member:** — Poor people, poor people.

**Mr. Heald:** — There is more to come, bellows. Mr. Speaker, I would submit that these papers and these documents which I have laid on the table will indicate clearly to this legislature and to the people of this province, that a meat-axe was used alright, but it wasn't used in 1964, it was used in 1944.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — Mr. Speaker, I turn now to a consideration of the operations of the Highway Traffic Board in this province, as I found them in May of 1964. I must tell the house that I was surprised and shocked at some of the procedures and policies that I found in effect upon assuming office.

Under the Vehicles Act, the Highway Traffic Board appointed by Order-In-Council. Under the act a quorum of the board consists of three members, yet under the previous administration it appeared to be common practice that when hearings were held on franchise applications, which are public hearings, instead of having a quorum of members of the board personally present, it had been the practice of the board for one member of the board to go to Assiniboia and different places, to take the evidence on a tape recorder, and to return to Regina and to play the evidence back to one or two other members of the board before a decision was made. Now, the hon. gentleman member (Mr. Blakeney) for Regina West and my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) both of whom are lawyers, know very well that one of the basic fundamental principles of British justice which we have in this province, and this country is, that when you make a determination involving the rights of individuals in society, you should be there when you are acting in a judicial or a quasi judicial capacity, you should be there to hear the evidence.

A great deal depends on the credibility of these witnesses. How he appears, his demeanor in the witness box when he gives evidence. How can anybody sitting on the Highway Traffic Board, listening to a tape record, make a decision from witnesses that he didn't see? He cannot form any opinion whatsoever as to the truth of what they were saying.

Now this is a procedure which I submit, Hr. Speaker, is a very negation of the principles of democracy. This Board for many years had been operating in this fashion. Adjudicating on the rights and the livelihood of many citizens in this province. People applying for franchises; other people opposing them. Is this the way their rights are adjudicated upon and dealt with? Mr. Speaker, this practice was stopped very shortly after we took office.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — Now, when the Highway Traffic Board has a public hearing, it has a quorum present, physically present, at all times, not sitting back in Regina listening to a tape recorder.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, another practice of the Highway Traffic Board which appalled me upon taking office, — you perhaps all know that a few years ago the hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power, passed amendments to The Vehicles Act, making provision for the fact that breathalyzer tests, in cases of persons suspected of impaired or intoxicated driving, were made compulsory in this province, and anyone who refused to take that test left himself open to suspension of his driving privileges. In commenting on this I am not disagreeing with the legislation at all, I am sorry that the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), my predecessor as Attorney General, is not in his seat, because I wanted him to be here when I paid him this compliment for this legislation.

However, a practice has grown up apparently over the years, since this legislation was implemented, to the effect that if the police reported that a man had refused to take the test, his license was automatically suspended by the Board without giving him an opportunity to be heard first. When the police reported to the Highway Traffic Board that a man had refused to take the test, that written statement, nothing under oath, not facing his accuser at all, that was taken by the Highway Traffic Board as gospel. In other words, a man is guilty until proven innocent. He wasn't given an opportunity to come into the office of the Traffic Board and say that the police weren't right, that he didn't refuse to take the breathalyzer test. But that is not the way the Highway Traffic Board operated. They said — "we believe the police, you are guilty. You come in and try and persuade us that we are wrong." Now is this British justice, Mr. Speaker? This is Iron-Curtain justice.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — This is Star-Chamber justice. This is not the type of thing that should go on in a democracy, and I need not say, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that that practice has been stopped. The procedure now is the Highway Traffic Board have been instructed that when they receive a report from the police that someone has refused to take the test, they advise the member of the public — he has an opportunity to come in — he has an opportunity to be heard — he has an opportunity to face his accuser who may be a member of a police force, and say: " I didn't refuse to take the breath test", and then the Board makes a determination after hearing both sides. This is the way the Highway Traffic Board were dealing with the rights and privileges and liberties of the people of this province every day, and this is the way they have been dealt with in the past number of years. We have been spending a great deal of time in the Highway Traffic Board in trying to rectify and remedy some of those travesties, these miscarriages of justice.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the operations of the Department of the Provincial Secretary, for which I have responsibility. This is a small department, employing only roughly a dozen persons, yet the work of the department has doubled in the last number of years and I find that there has been very little extra money spent on this department. I think of some of the things that we found in this department, that are probably caused, not by negligence so much as by the fact that the department simply didn't have enough money and enough staff to do the job properly. We found, for example, Mr. Speaker, that in the cemeteries' branch, the Cemeteries' Act deals with commercial cemeteries, also with other cemeteries in this province, and five of those cemeteries are in very poor financial condition.

Now, my hon. friends opposite, during the years have permitted these cemeteries to go out and sell pre-need markers, lots, opening and closing of graves, and so on, and in many, many cases they have received from the people of this province cash payment of \$400 or \$500 for the whole deal to take care of bereavements in the family — the opening and closing of the grave, perpetual care and so on. Now, what do we find? We find that these companies were only required to deposit 15 per cent of the money which they received from the public in a trust account to protect the public so that when they needed this service the money would be available. Now that is not enough. The experience of chartered accountants and officials in this regard indicates that it should be about 50 per cent. In other words, when you pay or one of your constituents pay to a cemetery company \$500 for pre-need, roughly 50 per cent of that should be deposited in a trust account to make sure that when your loved ones pass on, or you pass on, the money is there to ensure the perpetual care. Now this hasn't been done and I say, Mr. Speaker, that this situation is approaching the proportions of a provincial scandal as far as I am concerned.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — I would like to read you, Mr. Speaker, and I will table this letter, since there has been a great to do about tabling letters. This is a letter which was addressed to the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan, which was transferred to me, and it reads as follows:

I would like to know who is in charge of cemetery regulation in Saskatchewan. Please forward this to whoever is in charge. I've had business with a man named Harris, who was in charge of Sunset Memorial Gardens in Moosomin in 1963. I paid \$349 for a bronze plaque to be laid at my father's grave in these gardens. I have a receipt to show I paid cash in 1963.

— this was written February 1st of this year —

and to date there is still no plaque on my father's grave, there is not even a post of identification. Only acres of grass as if he were a cow buried in someone's pasture. Was this man Harris not bonded in order to

carry on such business? I know he's been convicted and sent to jail but is there no protection for people who invest their money in such business. My father was buried on a lot that was fully paid for. I can understand poor attention of lots being bought on time and are not being paid for, but this is no way to treat the grave of any human being. I think it is time the government of Saskatchewan investigated.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the government of Saskatchewan is investigating and it is doing more than that, it is going to legislate very shortly, to correct an injustice and a very poor situation which has been existing in this province for a number of years. There should have been legislation a number of years ago to prove that these people, when they take this cash from the public, must put at least fifty per cent in a trust account and it is there when the people need these graves. This is something that this government is going to correct and you are going to be asked shortly to vote in favor of that type of legislation . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — . . . and you cannot say, Mr. Speaker, (and I am sorry again that the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) is not in this seat) you cannot say that you weren't warned, weren't advised, because in 1956, you had a brief, the hon. member had a brief presented to him by the Embalmers Association warning you against this happening and again in 1961 a brief was presented by the Embalmers Association to the Attorney General at that time, drawing to his attention the fact that there was a loophole in the legislation, permitting these people to see pre-need care without having to put up a sufficient amount of money to make sure that the service which the people paid for, would be provided.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another area that falls in much the same category, I suggest, as cemeteries, is the matter of Commercial Agents, and I have indicated that there will be new legislation with respect to Commercial Agents, these people who go from door to door. These are perhaps best described as direct sellers. This, Mr. Speaker, has been going on for years now. The members opposite, when they were the government of this province did introduce a Commercial Agents Act, and did introduce a measure of control. However, it became apparent three or four years ago that this act was inadequate. Both the legislation and the enforcement thereof were inadequate, and there are many letters in the files of the Department of the Provincial Secretary which bear this out. Here is one written in 1961 to Premier Douglas:

I'm writing you a line to ask if you could do anything with the company which has taken over Miropak Wear. I ordered goods through Miropak and paid \$75 for the goods, they made arrangements I could have my kettle, and pay \$5 a month, and they didn't produce the goods.

I am going to table the letter, but here is an interesting part:

They said they were put in by the Saskatchewan government to run this. They also said they would not guarantee to give me the goods if I continued to pay by the month. You call this a fair deal? I don't. I've received nothing for my \$75, I can't get an answer from this company. We are people of poor financial state, our hospital tax is not paid, and I don't know when it will be, and we have a tax debt on our farm. I think if you are fair and square,

1961, March — to Premier Douglas

you can see that either I get my money or goods to its value. If there's nothing you can do about it, I shall feel free to turn these letters over to the other political party and let them know what goes on in this company put in by the government, but I

would, I would not like to do this, as I don't like causing trouble or hard feelings and feel our land has enough trouble now.

I say Amen to that, Mr. Speaker. This is the type of letter and I have a number of them, and I don't want to weary the house with them. But this Commercial Agents Act which was introduced by this government a number of years ago has broker down because people are coming into this province who are selling without being bonded and, in some cases, they are bonded, and there is misrepresentation and the present legislation is inadequate. You cannot get at the bond, and our people are being defrauded day in and day out and this didn't just start in May. It started many years ago, and of these letters that I have here, a number of them were written since 1960, and they are pretty pitiful letters. They are not from the managers of mortgage companies or the managers of banks. Our hon. friends seem to think that the gentlemen I have just mentioned are our special friends. These are rank and file everyday people from all over this province, very pitiful letters. A lady eighty-eight old who couldn't hear, they promised to sell her a hearing aid, guaranteed she would have perfect hearing. They took a couple of hundred dollars from her and then flew the coop. Nothing to be done. This Act broke down four or five years ago, but what did you do about it? You did nothing. The friends of the small people. I don't like this business of small people. People are people and you failed in your duty to the people of this province in not doing something about the Commercial Agents Act and the Cemetery Act as I have indicated.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that I have spoken long enough. I think you will detect from the tenor of my remarks that I am not prepared to support the sub-amendment or the amendment, that I will support the motion because I believe that the Speech from the Throne is an imaginative document. It forecasts in expanding economy for this province. It is the type of Speech from the Throne that we need in this province after twenty years of government from people who do not believe in expansion, who believe in retrenchment, who believe we should look over our shoulder all the time and should live in the past. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the Throne Speech debate during this, the first session of the fifteenth legislature I do so with pride, with humility and with a degree of gratitude also. I am, Mr. Speaker, most grateful to have the opportunity to again represent the constituency of Moose Jaw in this house and particularly when I recall the efforts by the Moose Jaw Liberals in their efforts to effect a saw-off and their subsequent antics in the encouragement of their own Liberal people to vote for the Conservative candidate so I suggest that as in view of these antics I am indeed gratified to have the opportunity of serving the constituency of Moose Jaw again, in the company of my friend and colleague who also represents Moose Jaw in this legislature.

So from this new perspective on your left, Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to offer to you my sincere congratulations on your appointment as Speaker of this legislative assembly. I am sure that you are aware of the honor that has been bestowed upon you and I trust that you are equally aware of the responsibilities that are involved.

As a matter of form, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should also congratulate the mover of the Address-In-Reply. I believe that he established a new record in this house in the dispensing of venom. The seconder, the lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) did a very commendable job, I suggest, in keeping with the parliamentary tradition which is expected from those who are given the high honor of moving or seconding the Address-In-Reply.

I expect also, Mr. Speaker, that the time is appropriate for me to express regrets that some members of the previous legislature are not with us on this occasion. I am sure that members from both sides of the legislature would want to express our deep appreciation for the contribution which has been made by these men and women over the years.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — The result of election campaigns have been sometimes described as the fortunes of war, and I am sure that after some future contest, a number of these same people will again be present in this legislature. I wish also at this time, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate all members who were elected in the general election of April last, and more especially I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) on his recent outstanding and conclusive victory in that by-election.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Events in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and the problems facing a new Liberal administration were apparently taken note of from a distance, and I noted that, in the November 27th issue of the Montreal Star, Grant Maxwell commented on the rather restrained nature of the victory celebration in Saskatoon. The article is entitled: "Liberals meet Saskatchewan's strains," and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote only a brief paragraph from the article. The article says:

Loaders and delegates were very much aware of the challenges awaiting the Thatcher government just outside the convention hall. Added to these worries, the delegates came to the victory convention painfully conscious of some visible signs of strain between the federal and provincial branches of the Liberal party.

As one supporter put it:

Pearson is a liberal Liberal, Thatcher is a conservative Liberal, and that's a big difference.

Now no doubt, Mr. Speaker, it was hoped that the voters in Hanley would be influenced by timely reports coming in on the eve of an election to the effect that the government had been successful in making arrangements for the re-opening of a copper mine. It was said also, that the companies involved had taken up additional claims, 114 additional claims, I believe, and all due of course, Mr. Speaker, to the favourable climate which had been created by a new Liberal government. It wasn't mentioned of course, that these decisions were made at a time prior to the new government coming into office. It was evidently hoped, Mr. Speaker, that: truth would not have enough time to catch up to fiction.

Mr. Speaker, with the inventive ingenuity which the Premier seems to possess, it is rather surprising to me that a number of other new industries didn't appear at that time. For example, I suggest it would have been a relatively easy matter for the government to encourage the establishment of the enterprising new company for the purpose of importing purple dye for sale to the government of Saskatchewan, at a handsome profit, thus creating a favorable climate for industry at the taxpayers expense. With the experience which Liberals have had in this field in the past, it is rather surprising that this opportunity was overlooked.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate members opposite on the miraculous manner in which they have discarded their stagnation spectacles. Prior to April last, Mr. Speaker, Liberals in this province both in and out of the house, were unable to see anything but stagnation, although our progress and our development was widely recognized in other parts of Canada and a variety of national publications hailed Saskatchewan's success in bringing about a diversified economy with over half of our wealth coming from non-agricultural sources.

Rational people, Mr. Speaker, who have not been wearing these stagnation spectacles and who have not been blinded by the political bias, were aware of the generous assistance offered to industry in terms of financial assistance, technical assistance and a general attitude of close co-operation between the various departments of government and the industries wishing the kind of help which has been offered by the Department of Industry and Information, and more recently under the terms of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the firm foundation which was laid by a CCF government, the economy of Saskatchewan has become diversi-

fied beyond the expectations of most, who remember Saskatchewan as an agricultural province of two decades ago, a province whose fortunes rose and fell in relation to the abundance of wheat and the generosity of mother nature. Those whose vision has not been hampered, Mr. Speaker, will recall the rather spectacular growth of Saskatchewan's publicly owned power corporation at a rate unequalled in Canada. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of the Liberals can be seen in this connection when we view their record prior to 1944. We see, Mr. Speaker, that the Power Commission from its inception until 1944 had a total investment of only \$7,000,000, and serviced only 137 farm customers. The expansion of this publicly owned utility since 1944, is once again a matter of record, and its success, I suggest, can be attributed in a very large measure to the capable guidance and direction of Mr. David Cass-Beggs who was . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — . . . who was found, Mr. Speaker, to be unacceptable to the new Liberal government, primarily because of his views respecting the growth and the development of this utility, and because he was a firm believer in the theory that an enterprise of such scope and such magnitude and playing such a profound role in the development of our province, should be guided and directed and owned by the public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, an abundance of power and natural gas has played a real and a profound role in the development of our province in conjunction with the other agencies of government which I have mentioned. Oil production had reached an all time high and retail sales during 1963 and 1964 had surpassed the billion dollar mark. And due to the efforts, Mr. Speaker, of the previous administration and despite opposition from liberals, both in this house and on the hustings, we saw the first steel plant west of Ontario coming into being in the province of Saskatchewan . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — . . . bringing with it, Mr. Speaker, associated industries and providing more jobs than any other single manufacturing industry in the province. Those people who are not wearing these stagnation spectacles, Mr. Speaker, saw Regina and Saskatoon become the third and fourth fastest growing cities in the whole of Canada. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that these things and many more too numerous to mention were all accomplished without selling our heritage to the Liberals' industrial friends, without six year royalty free tax holidays and without allowing our forest resources to be slaughtered.

It is reported, Mr. Speaker, that a lumbering industry, Dumont, I believe, is to come into Saskatchewan in order to help develop our timber resources. The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) is for one reason or another rather reluctant to table the documents in connection with the agreement that the government of Saskatchewan has reached with Dumont. But may I remind hon. members that if it had not been for a CCF government, that there would have been no lumber in this province for Dumont or anybody else to develop. I think members will recall that Premier Patterson in 1944, said that at the prevailing rate of depletion, Saskatchewan's timber resources would be exhausted completely in another ten years. The CCF government, Mr. Speaker, reversed this trend. A government agency, the Saskatchewan Timber Board, introduced conservation practices and as a result, Mr. Speaker, we have timber which will last in perpetuity, if properly regulated. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan people under CCF government enjoyed services which they never enjoyed prior to 1944. While wearing these stagnation spectacles, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals seemed to have missed entirely the multi-million dollar potash development in our province. Esterhazy has already become known as the potash capital of the world. The mines at Unity and at Lanigan were accomplished facts before this administration took office. Construction of the Potash plant at Belle Plain began almost a year before the new government came into being. And yet, Mr. Speaker, according to a report in the Moose Jaw Times Herald, of September 30th, 1964, when this plant was opened on September 29th, 1964, Premier Thatcher referred to the employment by Kalium Chemicals of some 225 persons directly and another 275 depending on the operation. And so, said Premier Thatcher, this amounts to 500 out of the 80,000 jobs we promised in our election platform.

**Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife):** — We gave them to you free.

**Mr. Snyder:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, it must

be plainly evident, that these statements are just tailored for the consumption of those who do not think and I suggest to you quite sincerely that it would have been just as realistic for the Premier to take all the employees of the cement company or the steel company or any number of other recent industries and total them all up and deduct them from the 80,000 jobs which he promised during the April election campaign.

Unfortunately for the government, Mr. Speaker, it is not that easy to throw dust in the eyes of Saskatchewan's people or the voters of Hanley constituency, for that matter. In the Leader Post of December 18, 1964, appeared an editorial which I think a paragraph of which is worth quoting to the house:

The Thatcher government devoted too much of its energies to boasting about what it intended to accomplish, instead of waiting patiently to permit actual accomplishments to speak for themselves.

The Hanley outcome indicates that this was resented by some of the electors. The Hanley election has placed the government on its metal to demonstrate by actual results the superiority of its alternatives to the policies of the preceding government with greater humility and a minimum of fuss, fury, and thunder.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is extremely sage and sound advice but I am afraid it would be difficult for the government to accept it, because it would then deprive them of the principal ingredient of their program. They would then be obliged, Mr. Speaker, to prove their thesis that the more favors we bestow on special interests, the more we feather the nests of the more affluent members of our society and the more prosperous we will all become. If this were true, Mr. Speaker, I think we might be inclined also to accept the theory that tax evasion by large corporations should then be regarded as blessings in disguise and should be encouraged.

However, Mr. Speaker, the experience of millions of people over the past two hundred years proved that this simply is not so. The wealth of Asia, Africa and Latin America has been systematically exploited over the years by oil, fruit, sugar and mining interests, because these countries, Mr. Speaker, have provided a favourable climate for investment, and at the same time the vast majority of these people continued to suffer from poverty, illiteracy and disease. I expect quite sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that if less money had been taken from these countries in the form of corporate profits, the need for foreign aid to the underprivileged areas would have been reduced or diminished considerably. Recently, Mr. Speaker, we have seen an outstanding example of the provision of a favourable climate for industry. I refer to the free trade pact which was signed a short while ago on automobiles between Prime Minister Pearson and President Johnson.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the forgiveness of this 17 1/2 per cent tariff will in effect represent a visitation from Santa Claus to the automobile industry, a gift of some \$50,000,000 annually, and the industry has made it quite plain that this will in no way reflect upon the prices of the commodity which they produce, namely automobiles and farm trucks. Now I want to suggest, while on this topic, Mr. Speaker, that what has been described as a favourable climate for industry, carries with it no guarantee that any of the money taken out of our economy, out of our natural resources, out of the pockets of the producer, the wage earner, or the consumer, will be re-invested in order to provide more jobs for Saskatchewan and Canadian people. Undoubtedly some of this money will be used to purchase automation equipment which will further reduce the labor force. Some of this money may be used to build pipe lines that will have a similar effect in reducing the labor force. Some of this money, Mr. Speaker, will undoubtedly find its way to some shadow land tax haven in the Bahamas which the Premier visited only a short while ago, that haven and refuge, Mr. Speaker, "where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt and the tax collector does not break in and steal."

Mr. Speaker, some of this money may be invested too, I suggest in some of the under developed areas of the world in order to take advantage of cheap raw materials and cheap native labor. Lest I be misunder-



stood, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that this foreign investment to which I refer, cannot be regarded as the milk of human kindness flowing in the form of foreign aid to needy people. I think the record speaks for itself.

According to the New York Times of November 19, 1964, the chairman of the executive committee of Continental Oil stated that:

American oil companies from 1957 to 1962, invested \$4.2 billion in foreign nations and they brought home earnings of \$7.6 billion.

According to a survey of current business which is published by the United States Department of Commerce, America corporations extracted from foreign nations some \$17.4 billion more than they invested in these foreign nations and at the same time, they added some 28.8 billion dollars to their foreign holdings. It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that the art of becoming wealthy is the art of maintaining the maximum inequality in your own favor. Now, in addition to all this, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the result of foreign investments return again and again to haunt the men and women whose brain and brawn made these profits and the original investment possible. Cheap goods, Mr. Speaker, produced with cheap native labor and cheap raw materials compete in the market place and frequently we find that labor at home is told that they have priced themselves out of the world market. I suggest to you, quite sincerely that if, as a result of public ownership or co-operative endeavor this money had remained at home, in the pockets of the producer, in the pockets of the wage earner and consumer, that it would have been spent on consumer commodities and would thus have stimulated the economy rather than depressing it.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the Premier attempts to perpetuate the myth that people can become prosperous by making wealthy corporations more prosperous. His generosity to oil companies, during his short term in office, has never been equalled by the neighbouring provinces to the east or to the west. His willingness, Mr. Speaker, to donate the natural resources of this province to his industrial friends has been a matter of real concern to the intellectually mature who regard the resources of the province of Saskatchewan as the property of Saskatchewan people and their children, not to be freely given without the proper concern for those who whom they belong.

Now, according to a press report, Mr. Speaker, the present Minister of Finance in Ottawa, has been described as being stupid and short-sighted by our Premier because he did not choose to thrust additional gifts and concessions up on a potash industry which is presently located in our province, and is doing quite well, operating quite successfully. It may be, in analysing the situation, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Gordon may not be a conservative liberal.

The farmers in western Canada, Mr. Speaker, have learned from bitter experience that it was to their advantage to get the line elevators and the Winnipeg Grain Exchange off their backs, although they were told at that time that, they could not produce or market grain without them. Farmers have since learned that it is to their advantage to have their own products marketed and handled at cost with no profit accruing to any one. The farmers of western Canada will never again be persuaded to provide the favorable climate which these companies once enjoyed.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this explains the expansion in our province of consumer co-ops whose very existence seemed to worry these people who identify themselves with the Equitable Income Tax Foundation. I would just suggest, before I leave this subject, Mr. Speaker, that if these people wish to experience the same tax considerations and conditions as apply to co-operatives, that the remedy for them is exceedingly simple. All they have to do is to distribute their profits among their customers.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I think reasonable people will agree, that similar conditions should not be made to apply for those who play the game by different rules. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have witnessed the efforts of this present administration to provide what they refer to as a favourable climate for industry, while retreating into the past and crating a climate which I suggest to you does not agree with the large segment of our population. Over the past number of years, both in this house and on the hustings, we have heard repeated declarations by Liberals to the effect that "We Liberals are not anti-labour". More recently, during the 1964 election campaign, the present Premier, stated from public platforms and reiterated after taking office, that the members

of the civil service of Saskatchewan had nothing to fear from the new administration, that their personal lives and their political independence was not to be interfered with in any way. On the heels of this very pious announcement came a proclamation from the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, who, incidentally is no longer with us. This warning, Mr. Speaker, was, in effect, a naked threat to government employees, some of whom feel that it is their right, it is their duty indeed their responsibility, to take an active role in the political life of Saskatchewan and to make a contribution in the way in which they see fit during their own free time. I think this fact was recognized by the previous government. This basic civil right was extended . . .

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — As long as they were CCF.

**Mr. Snyder:** — . . . to Paul Dojack. He was given ample consideration by the previous administration, and I might mention at the same time, perhaps, the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy).

Subsequent events, Mr. Speaker, involved the discharge of an employee of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, who was tried, convicted and sentenced in a manner which has become foreign in this province since 1944. Now, Mr. Speaker, if further evidence is needed to indicate that an unfavourable climate has been created within the ranks of the civil service, I want to draw to your attention and suggest to you, as recommended reading, a document which I have on my desk. It is entitled 'Government Proposals, Mental Hospital Agreement 1964-1965 Negotiations'. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a document which contains proposal after proposal, all of which represent a retreat into the past for the members of Saskatchewan Civil Service who work within Saskatchewan's, mental institutions. Proposal no. 1 involves a long list of personnel who are presently included in the collective bargaining agreement that the government now proposes should be excluded. I want for a moment to read to you the list in the first proposal by this government:

Proposal no. 1 — Amend the list of excluded personnel to include all psychiatric social workers, pharmacists, adjunctive therapists 1 and 2, community nurses, patient activity supervisors, nursing supervisors, assistant supervisors, chef, head gardener, laboratory technicians 3, laundry manager, senior heating and power plant engineer, principal account clerks, automotive mechanic supervisor, administrative officer 2, maintenance supervisors and public relations officer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the indication is quite clear that it is the intention of the government to exclude as the thin edge of the wedge, a large list of personnel who have previously enjoyed consideration as members of the collective bargaining agreement.

Another proposal, Mr. Speaker, relates to appointment and promotion of personnel within these institutions, other than nurses. This proposal suggests, Mr. Speaker, that management, which of course is the government in this particular instance, should be in a position to make an arbitrary judgment in the filling of vacancies or in the arranging of promotions, and this article suggests that seniority should play an insignificant role in the making of these decisions. I want to quote the working paragraph to the house:

Position advancements of employees, other than nurses, shall be applied on the principle that if possible when a vacancy occurs, the employee, judged by management to possess the greatest merit and ability from the unit where the vacancy arises shall be appointed to the position. Seniority will be a deciding factor when difference in merit and ability are insignificant.

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — What would you say?

**Mr. Snyder:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this proposal leaves little doubt as to the intention of the government. It seems clear that it is their wish to throw into the discard the basic principle of seniority and length of service, as a basis for filling vacancies or affecting

promotions.

**Mr. I. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — This is not a railroad.

**Mr. Snyder:** — Judging, Mr. Speaker, from the experiences of twenty years ago, during the heyday of Liberal rule in Saskatchewan, it seems clear that if the employees of mental institutions were to accept this proposal that the filling of vacancies and promotions would be decided upon the basis of allegiance to the political storm troopers who would be making these decisions.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Another proposal, Mr. Speaker, refers to T. B. compensation, and I think some members may be aware of the fact that the employees of Saskatchewan's mental institutions are required, on a good many cases, to work within close proximity of patients suffering from T. B. For this reason, an employee who is stricken with T.B. is covered by workmen's compensation in these instances. It is the government's proposal, Mr. Speaker, that the pertinent article relating to T.B. compensation in the collective agreement be deleted in its entirety.

Now another proposal, Mr. Speaker, which relates to workmen's compensation generally, suggests that the working article no. 26, the pertinent article, should be deleted in its entirety. This would mean, Mr. Speaker, that privileges which have been gained by this group of employees over the years, as a result of collective bargaining, often accepted in lieu of wages, would be reduced very substantially.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, because there is article after article in this proposal by the government, which suggests a retreat into the past for the employees of Saskatchewan's mental institutions and I recommend it to members opposite as a document which should be read by all of them.

These employees, Mr. Speaker, employees of these mental institutions, are people, Mr. Speaker, a number of whom I have to come to know rather well over the years. My respect for this group — for their sensitivity — for their dedication — for their diligence and for their willingness to go the extra mile — is real and profound. These are employees, Mr. Speaker, who have taken an intense pride in the kind of work that they are doing. They are aware of the fact that Saskatchewan's mental health program is the finest in the whole of North America, and it is an example for all other jurisdictions. How long this remains a fact, Mr. Speaker, will be determined by the people who guide and direct this program. The attitude of employees, I suggest to the hon. minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) will be decided, also, by the attitude of government to these employees — employees who deserve the respect of government for the contribution which they are making, rather than the contempt which is indicated in this article, Mr. Speaker.

May I say a few words also, Mr. Speaker, in respect to the climate which has been created in recent months for those people who have been unfortunate enough to have emotionally disturbed children, who have found it necessary to rely upon the services formerly offered at Embury House, which was closed a short while ago during the government's axe swinging economy binge. I speak with intimate knowledge of one case only, but they tell me that there are numerous others of a similar nature. The case to which I refer involves an emotionally disturbed boy of 12 years of age, who had worries which were abnormal to children his age, which disturbed his sleep and his school work and made it impossible for him to adjust to his environment and to assume a normal role in society. Now this youngster, Mr. Speaker, after a full year of intensive care at Embury House, was returned to his parents only a short while before Embury House was closed and the change in this youngster was so outstanding, so pronounced, Mr. Speaker, that it is difficult to imagine that this happy youngster ever had an emotional problem at all. His parents are so grateful that they find it difficult to express their appreciation to the people at Embury House who made this transformation possible.

The reluctance, Mr. Speaker, of this government to spend a fractional part of one per cent of a budget well in excess of \$200,000,000, I suggest to you, represents a most damning and most callous attitude in this, a so-called civilized society.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Now, add to this, add to this, Mr. Speaker, the willingness of those people who sit on your right to give generous handouts to their industrial friends, while chiselling or attempting to chisel on social aid food costs, and increasing medical care and hospitalization. I think you will observe the principal components that went into the rather outstanding victory for the member who now represents Hanley constituency (Mr. Walker) in this house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — These Scroogian policies, Mr. Speaker, cannot be pawned off on the people of Saskatchewan under the guise of financial wisdom. These are policies, Mr. Speaker, which require neither statesmanship or business ability. The path of Canadian history, Mr. Speaker, is strewn with examples of giveaways to big business by free enterprise governments, where the advantages have never trickled down to the point where they have benefited the ordinary citizen. This process did not, end, Mr. Speaker, when a Liberal government in Ottawa gave away one of the most valued power sites, Beauharnois, to a group of people who have been described as the worst set of buccaneers to ever disgrace the public life of Canada. It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the end is not yet.

Ever since Sir John A. MacDonald introduced his national policy, big business has never objected to accepting all the welfare which comes their way. But at the same time they have earned the reputation for opposing what they call the welfare state. They have opposed increased taxes for hospitalization, for unemployment insurance, for education, for medical care, and so on, Mr. Speaker. It is not very likely that there will be an opposition from these groups to any of the picayune measures adopted by those people opposite in an attempt to save money regardless of the social consequence.

I submit, in closing, Mr. Speaker, that the true greatness of the nation or a province is measured by scales more delicate than those which measure military might or industrial skyscrapers. The true greatness, Mr. Speaker, of a nation or province is measured by the degree to which it provides a climate for all its citizens, a climate in which there is freedom from fear and freedom from want, dignity, and self respect, educational opportunities for all, health care for the sick and care for the aged. Now even a Goldwater mentality, Mr. Speaker, or a conservative Liberal, should be able to recognize that these objectives will never be reached by cutting services with a meat axe.

Because the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, gives no indication that this present administration has an inclination to travel in the direction of which I have referred, it will be my obligation, Mr. Speaker, to vote against the motion. I will be supporting the amendment and the sub-amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure, at this time to rise and take part in this debate. There has been some discussion in regard to the way that the Throne Speech was written this year. It has been complimented on the basis of it being terse and concise. Personally, I think it had all the literary value and literary style of a shopping list. It is possible that this may have been in order, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that by the time the people of Saskatchewan read this Speech from the Throne, they must have felt that the cupboard was pretty bare compared with the promises that were made by the Liberal party during the last provincial election. May I say, aside from the style of the list, the style of the Speech, pardon me, Sir, I do assume that the much more important thing is what the Speech contained rather than the style in which it was written. I may say, Sir, that some of the things which are in the Speech from the Throne, I must concur with. There are, however, a good many others with which I do not concur.

I would like to mention, if I may, to the minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) that there appeared to be some possibility of some extension of the university of Saskatchewan and I have noted that some representations have been made by some of the organizations of Swift Current for consideration of that locality. I would very much like at this time, to

add my voice to theirs. Swift Current is an up and coming community, the fifth city in the province and one to which we would be very glad to welcome such an institution.

I would also like to compliment the minister of public works (Mr. Gardiner) on some words he said this afternoon, regarding the necessity of priority for hospitals. Several organizations at Swift Current, the Chamber of Commerce, the City Council themselves and I, personally, have been endeavoring for some time to obtain a Saskatchewan type mental institution for Swift Current, much along the lines of the type that was built and opened at Yorkton recently. We are very glad to hear these words from him that he does feel that this is an important type of construction and we would like Swift Current to be considered.

Another thing I note in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, is the setting up of an Indian and Metis Branch. Now, I would like to have something to say on this, but I do believe, Sir, that the better time would be when the bill, which is on the order paper, is under discussion in the house and I will not say anything further on that, at this time.

However, I would like to compliment the government opposite on their interest in Indian and Metis affairs. I can assure them that the members on this side of the house are prepared to support anything that is really worthwhile in the interests Indian and Metis people and they will not find any opposition on this side of the house . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — . . . to anything worthwhile that they are endeavouring to do. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that, during our term of office, we also had what we considered to be some very good programs for the Indian and Metis people which we were endeavoring to press, for the benefit of these people, and I may say, Sir, that this was not entirely without success. I might mention very briefly some of these programs but time does not allow me to go into these with any detail. One is the hospitalization program which was a real benefit to the native people of this province. I would like to point out also that our department of Natural Resources spent over \$1,000,000 in developing the fishing industry, and spent some \$300,000 in regard to the support price of fish. These actions were of value to not only the Metis people who are more or less under the jurisdiction of the Saskatchewan government, but also to Treaty Indians as well.

Another thing which we did, was the setting up of a federal-provincial co-ordinating committee in this province. This we did a year or so ago when the community development branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs was under my direction. We were able to set up a committee thereby the officials from the Indian Affairs Branch of the federal government and the people from our department and other departments in the government which were interested in Indian matters, could meet and discuss these affairs. Now I think that this was a good step. It was my understanding that the federal government has now requested all the provinces of Canada to endeavor to set up committees of the same kind. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you will find that this was another first for Saskatchewan, which is being advocated and copied throughout the dominion.

There is another field in which I think we were very successful. This was in the field of education. The federal department did much to endeavor to desegregate schools and to try to get the children of Indian ancestry at schools with the white children in the area and our department worked with them in this. I think we had considerable success.

Now, on this, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to read a short extract, I would like to read a short extract — this is a big book but I won't read too much — a speech by Mr. L.M. Marion, MLA for Athabaska, who was speaking in the budget debate in the legislature on March 4, 1952. He said:

The first thing I have to do, whether I want to or not, Sir, is compliment the minister of Education, hon. Mr. Lloyd, again, this year as I did last year. Last Sunday, I took a trip home and of course, I may be off the beam when I say that, and I may be right, but I met one of our school teachers up there and the first thing she said to me, she calls me 'Uncle' by the way, I didn't think I looked that old, 'Uncle, you did a lot for us. We got a \$300

raise.' Well, I did not want to admit that I was ignorant of the fact but I said, 'you leave it to your old uncle and he will look after you'.

We have five school teachers up there, five school rooms so I hope they will all get a \$300 raise whether it comes from the revenue tax or not.

However, I can say truthfully, that there has been no other Minister of Education, Sir, who has done as much for the north as the present one today.

We have, as I said before, five school rooms and 180 school age children, so we haven't any too much room. We intend to put up another one this year and as the uncle of the school teacher, I will have to see the Minister of Education for a few more desks for that school room.

However, I do not think I need to worry too much.

This is from the speech of the member of the legislature for Athabaska at that time.

We are very interested, as I said earlier, in continuing the help and continuing to help this sort of thing that is of value to the Indian people of this province.

In this context, I cannot help but wonder about the statement which was made by the present hon. member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy), in his speech the other day, to the effect that the provincial government Metis and Indian conference held last summer was a success, in spite of the attempts to hinder it by some civil servants. Now, I am quite interested in knowing, Mr. Speaker, who these people were and just in which way they hindered . . .

**Mr. Guy (Athabasca):** — They are not with us anymore.

**Mr. Wood:** — . . . because we are not interested in having people who are trying to hinder this sort of thing. I think he also owes it to the civil service, the staff, to clear up this matter, as to just who these people were and what they did to hinder the progress of the Indian-Metis conference in Saskatoon last summer.

We are interested in co-operation but this could not be said for the former opposition. The opposition, the Liberal party, when they sat in these benches, did everything they could in this legislature, to talk against the work that was being done by the government Saskatchewan for Indian and Metis people and it was not only the legislature, but out in the field they endeavoured their outmost to sow seeds of misunderstanding among these people so that they would not go along with what the government was trying to do. I think a good deal of the trouble in our Indian Affairs today is because of this sowing of discord and endeavouring to misinterpret government programs to the Indian and Metis people themselves.

Now, one man who saw this very clearly was . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Woollam . . .

**Mr. Wood:** — . . . was the hon. member for Athabaska whose speech I just read. I am reading from the Saskatchewan Leader Post of February 7, 1952. Mr. L.M. Marion — I may say it is rather a poor copy. They ran it off rather hastily just before it got down to the library. No, it is not signed. It is a newspaper clipping:

Mr. Marion, elected in 1948 as Independent, but regarded as Liberal, said Wednesday evening he will cross the floor of the Saskatchewan legislature to sit with the

government as an Independent.

**Mr. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — Who regarded him as a Liberal?

**Mr. Wood:** — Well, he . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. It is now my duty under Standing Order 30(2) to interrupt proceedings and put the question on the sub-amendment. It has been moved by the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), seconded by the member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet):

That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the following words:

And this assembly also regrets that no action as proposed to put into effect the promise of the government party to include the supplying of drugs with medical care benefits.

Question before the house is on the sub-amendment.

The question being put on the sub-amendment it was negatived on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 21

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Whelan	Brotten
Cooper (Mrs.)	Nicholson	Larson
Wood	Dewhurst	Robbins
Nollet	Berezowsky	Brockelbank (Saskatoon)
Blakeney	Michayluk	Pepper
Davies	Smishek	
Thibault	Baker	
Willis	Snyder	

#### Nays — 31

Thatcher	MacDougall	Romuld
Howes	Gardiner	Weatherald
McFarlane	Coderre	MacLennan
Boldt	McIsaac	Larochelle
Cameron	Trapp	Asbell
McDonald (Moosomin)	Grant	Hooker
Steuart	McDonald (Milestone)	Radloff
Heald	Gallagher	Coupland
Guy	Breker	Pederson
Merchant (Mrs.)	Leith	
Loken	Bjarnason	

**Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current):** — Before the vote was taken, I was asked as to who said that Mr. Marion was a Liberal. Well as the man said, I am glad you asked that question. I believe it was our hon. member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) the other day who said that the only time since the seat had been set up, the only time it was not represented by a Liberal was in the period between 1956 and 1960, so I take it on his statement . . .

**Mr. Guy (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that was not the statement that was made at all, I said that this seat was not represented by the CCF party at any time other than those four years.

**Mr. Wood:** — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, if I misunderstood his remarks. I think his remarks could easily be interpreted the way that I had said, but at any rate, this man did cross the floor from the Liberal side of the house over to the government side of the house because he was not able to put up with what was being said on this side in regard to government pro-

grams. I have a clipping here in regard to that which I was reading when the bell rang. I have proceeded so far. 'In a brief statement the member for Athabaska (Mr. Marion) said he intended to sit as an independent supporter of the government on all measures he considers for the benefit for the province as a whole'. I understand that one of the main reasons was because of the criticism of government programs in the north.

Now I find that our hon. friends are still in the business. This is shown by the statement which was made by the Premier last Tuesday, in which he was endeavouring to represent that Mr. Woollam was recommending to then Premier of the province, that our government deal in liquor for Indians. I know it would be out of order, Mr. Speaker, at this time, if I indicated that the hon. Premier knowingly endeavored to mislead the house. But when you take into consideration . . .

**Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg):** — What proof do you want?

**Mr. Wood:** — . . . but when you take into consideration that his name was one of the names in this document, saying that this matter had been discussed with him personally, and he knew that Mr. Woollam was endeavouring to work out some agreement, some work in which this sort of nefarious business could be choked off, well I will leave it to the house to draw their own conclusions and to phrase their own phrases.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — Now in regard to Mr. Woollam, I do say that a man must be loyal to the people who work for him, just as well as he must expect loyalty from the people who work for him. I feel that as a minister, that any minister, must be loyal to the people who have worked for him, and I do not think that I would want at this time to endeavor to blacken Mr. Woollam in order to make some point in the legislature. But I will say this, and I think that the hon. members of this house will agree with me, after hearing some of the letters that have been read, more than once in the house from him, they will agree that his approach to public affairs as a civil servant was somewhat unorthodox.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Some Hon. Members:** — Understatement.

**Mr. Wood:** — Well I am not trying to blacken the man. When I was the minister for Municipal Affairs in charge of the community development branch, Mr. Woollam and I did not see eye to eye and his resignation was requested and received in regard to his work with the Indians in this province. This was in the latter part of 1962, and the earlier part, of 1963. He left our employ, went to Alberta and set up with a number of associates 'The Groups Resources Consulting Services'. Now if I may digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something here about our Hutterite program.

In some provinces there has been some very hard legislation passed in regard to Hutterites and in some states in the Union as well. Here in Saskatchewan, we did not feel that we could do this. We felt that the best way we could approach this rather hard and difficult problem was by way of agreement with the Hutterites themselves. In 1958, agreement had been reached with Lehrer Leut group of the Hutterites that they would not come into Saskatchewan to set up a farming operation without first consulting the minority group committee of the government. Now we have never been able to get an agreement from the Darius Leut group, which was another large group of Hutterites. The five year agreement with the Lehrer Leut group was running out at this time. We did not have a better man, we felt, to put on this job. Mr. Woollam did have a good deal of acquaintance with the Hutterite people and we felt that the best thing that we could do was to engage him and his group to work with the Hutterites to endeavor to obtain this agreement with them, a continuation of an extension for another five years. We took out a contract with them for one year. I believe that the papers on this are dated from February 28th 1963, a one year agreement. During that year, he was able to complete an agreement with Lehrer Leut group but at the end of it he had not yet been able to complete an agreement with the Darius Leut group. He asked for a six month extension, that he might be able to do this. We did grant the extension of six months and we sent a man up to Alberta to work with him, that he might become acquainted with the Hutterite people



and their ways and the way in which they should be dealt with, and so that we might have someone to put in place of Mr. Woollam when this contract was up. Now this six months contract has since expired, I believe, and if Mr. Woollam is still in the employ of the Saskatchewan government I am afraid it is not I who is responsible, Mr. Speaker. It would be the present Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — May I ask the member a question here, if he would permit one? Who signed the contract engaging these Resources Consultants, of which Mr. Woollam was the head of the management. Who signed on behalf of the province, the department or the government — this agreement with him by which you negotiated this agreement on the behalf of the Hutterites?

**Mr. Wood:** — Do you mean the agreement with the Group Consultants?

**Mr. Cameron** — Yes, who?

**Mr. Wood:** — I believe I was the one who signed it.

**Mr. Cameron** — Thank you. You signed it.

**Mr. Wood:** — That is right, I think I did, in fact I am quite sure that I did. I was the minister in charge of the department. I think it was my duty to sign it. Insofar as any alleged political activity of Mr. Woollam, as alleged to have been in this alleged letter, if I may say, Mr. Speaker, I do have to say that at least a great deal of this letter certainly was not of any political nature, but if there is political matter in it, I can only sincerely say, Mr. Speaker, that it was certainly not requested, and it was certainly not encouraged by myself or the members of our department. No program which we have ever carried forward in this province has asked or expected that sort of thing from their civil servants. I would like to make this point very clearly at this time if I might.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to possibly have a few more things to say, but I think it is agreed that I should give time to the other members of the house and I would like to say at this time that I will support the amendment, but I will not support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, before I deliver my address to the house, I should first like to congratulate you on your appointment to the high office of Speaker of the legislative assembly. For the past four years, Mr. Speaker was my seatmate, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, we are going to miss your very colorful discourses and descriptions liberally sprinkled with adjectives, countless adjectives, which made many of the former government members squirm and made them irate. He has brought many a cabinet minister to his feet in protest. However, now your role will be one of policing, of trying to maintain law and order in here and I am sure, of all the people on this side of the house, you have those qualifications and you will discharge your office with justice and impartiality. As a matter of fact, we saw that on the second day of this legislature and while I may not have agreed with everything, I realize that you will be certainly impartial.

The member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) who just sat down, I must congratulate for his honesty. I have always considered him one of the real honest members . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDougall:** — . . . he may get himself in trouble with his own people, certainly we find him very honest on this side.

**An Hon. Member:** — Yes, we appreciate honesty here as well and this is one member who doesn't sit on your side of the house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDougall:** — Mr. Speaker, I understand there are some items of business that the house leader would like to take up before the house adjourns for today and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

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