

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Fifteenth Legislature**  
**16th Day**

**Thursday, February 25, 1965**

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

**ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE — UNDER STANDING ORDER 20**

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of Order no. 20, to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of urgent public importance that I refer to is the statement made by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) in this assembly yesterday.

The hon. member for Saskatoon was quoted in the Regina Leader Post this morning as follows:

Montana was described Wednesday as a "fascist" type of state.

Upon checking the official records of this assembly I found the following statement made by the member:

It is to be hoped that if the cultural standards of Saskatchewan are to be raised, they will not be imported from a "fascist" state like Montana.

Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of the government, this statement endangers the good will and friendship between our two neighboring countries. Moreover it could prove directly harmful to the investment climate of the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a point of order in regard to this suggestion by the Premier. I think this is really something new that any speech of any member of the legislature should be raised under Standing Order 20 as a matter of urgent public importance.

This statement was made in the Budget debate which we are engaged in at the present time. There can be no question of urgency whatsoever. I am amazed that the Premier apparently did not hear that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has turned down our request in regard to \$2 wheat and in guaranteeing a price, but he does not raise this question. This other one can be debated as soon as we get a few more minutes to debate it. He has the right to close the debate as Provincial Treasurer, and I would suggest that this is completely out of order and certainly I would have to oppose it.

**Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would suggest to you that this is certainly a matter of public importance. A statement has been made which, in my opinion, jeopardizes not only the people and the state of Montana, but Saskatchewan citizens as well, and citizens of the whole of Canada, and I think that this is a matter that is of immediate public importance and that this House, and every member of it, unless they are prepared to deal with this matter in the pattern that the Premier has suggested. I, for one, have certainly — will not sit in this house unless some action is taken and taken immediately, because, I want to repeat, that it is not only the people of Montana that must be considered, but it is the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada. I honestly believe that many thousands of these people feel that they cannot go along with the statement that the member has made, and I think that this house should deal with it immediately.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst).

**Mr. Fred Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I believe it is quite clear in the rule book that members cannot speak disparagingly of a friendly power. That is correct. The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey) has pointed out that this debate is before the house and can be answered by members in this debate — this debate still goes on until next Wednesday — there is ample time for reply.

Had any member yesterday, at the time the statement was made or you, yourself, Mr. Speaker, had thought of that ruling you could have asked the hon. member to withdraw the statement under the rule — making statements against a friendly power — and these statements are made in debate, and I don't believe the Standing Order was intended to take on part of any member's debate, on either side of the house and make a special debate out of a statement in a member's speech.

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the hon. members point out that we are now engaged in the debate on the budget, and any topic can be brought up and on this I agree. But there are many members, including myself, who have spoken on this debate and who feel very strongly about this disgraceful statement and wish to speak on it and make our thoughts known and wish to speak on it and make our thoughts known and we would be discriminated against if we cannot speak twice in this debate, and I concur in the feelings of the Premier that this is a matter of urgency although those people naturally do not back me up on this type of statement. They don't seem to feel so.

**Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife):** — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to understand how a mere statement in this legislature, made by a member of this legislature, can be a matter of urgent public importance. If this is correct, Mr. Speaker, there was also a matter of urgent public importance last November 24th when the Governor of the State of Montana was invited to Saskatchewan to address a Liberal convention, at which time he very readily engaged in political matters and referred to this province as one that was now completely freed from the Socialist system and had gone to private enterprise. You see it was the hon. members opposite that created this situation, not this side of the house, Mr. Speaker, and certainly a statement made by a member of this legislature in connection with a matter, a political matter, that was introduced and imported into this province by the hon. members opposite, then, Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to understand how it becomes a matter of urgent public importance now, when a member because of this situation, is inclined to get up and make reference to a political situation in this particular state.

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, the point at issue here is not the Governor of Montana. The point at issue is the statement by a member of this legislature referring to the whole state of Montana, as "a fascist state". That is the statement, not anything about the Governor of Montana's political beliefs.

The statement made by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) yesterday, was the whole state of Montana was a "fascist" type of state. This is an aspersion on everybody who lives in the state of Montana and this is why . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — . . . those of us on this side of the house feel very keenly about this and we want an opportunity to have this matter dealt with. Insofar as Standing Order 20 is concerned, subsection 3 thereof, in the whole of Order 20, "a matter of urgent public importance" — we feel that it is a matter of urgent public importance.

Surely we do not have to wait in this house for two or three days, when all the harm is done, when this is broadcast all over the Dominion of Canada, all over the United States, that a responsible member of this legislature makes a statement that the state of Montana is "fascist". Do we have to wait for two or three days until this filters down through the highways and byways of this nation and our neighbors to the south? This is why we feel that this is a matter of urgent public importance and I am going to support the Premier.

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all

is the matter of any importance, let alone urgent public importance? Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the word "fascist" is no more an opprobrious term than the term "communist". That term has been used by gentlemen opposite . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . not only to describe the government that was in office in this province prior to April, but to describe this party, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Montana are just as intelligent as the people of Saskatchewan and they know how much importance to attribute to the use of the words "fascist" or "communist" or the word "Socialist" or any other word that is used in political debate, either in this province or in the State of Montana. This question, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is not only not a matter of urgent public importance, but it is not a matter of any public importance, and the former Leader of the Opposition is up to his old tricks of trying to distract attention from the real issues before the people of Saskatchewan. The Leader of the Liberal party is used to this kind of thing. This trickery doesn't get him anywhere.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I submit that this has no importance, no importance at all, let alone urgent public importance, and I suggest that is the ruling which Your Honor must make, and I know that Your Honor, just as we all have, has used words that are equally opprobrious as the word used by the member for Saskatoon, and I suggest that Your Honor will recognize that this is not a matter of any public importance at all.

**Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, I think the understatement of the year has been made by the member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Walker) especially when he said that a statement that was credited to the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link), yesterday, wherein he referred to a state of the Union, a neighboring state alongside the border of Canada, the longest border between any two countries in the world, and all though the history of these two countries we have never seen a day yet where we had to try and defend the border . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is completely out of order, the question being debated is a point of order, not a debate on the question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am trying to listen to the various points of order as the hon. members present them, and at the same time trying to do a little better on procedure than I did the last time this matter was raised.

Now I am happy to listen to all points of order that all hon. members wish to raise. Who was raising one the last time? I think the gentleman over here.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I was referring to the very malicious statement made by the member for Saskatoon yesterday when he referred to the . . .

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, he is debating the statement rather than the point of order.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I suggest respectfully, that you take it under advisement and . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I thought the member for Regina was about to rise on the point of order . . .

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West):** — I wish to speak on this point of order. I am sorry to see members opposite display so little confidence in the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere) because he is about to take part in this debate now. What we are talking about is whether or not a statement made in

this debate by a previous speaker, is correct or incorrect. It is a question of fact as to whether a particular foreign government is "fascist" or "communist" or "quasi-Fascist" or "quasi-Communist".

Now a question of fact is something which is supremely capable of being resolved by debate if in fact we can resolve anything by debate in this legislature. I am sure that if the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) was incorrect in his statement of fact about this government of a foreign state, and it is important in the progress of this debate to refute that fact, the members who are going to follow, and I think of the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere) — and he is a very fluent, persuasive and analytical speaker — will be able to refute this with a few deft phrases, and there will, therefore, be nothing left of the statement.

I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members of this house, that if a statement of fact is made which is erroneous, the way to correct it is by debate, and not to move that the house be adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance.

I am perfectly prepared to say that the state of Mississippi is a "fascist-like state", and I say it now. You may think I am wrong, but there is every opportunity in a debate such as this to prove that I am wrong, and the fact that I may feel that the government of Montana or Mississippi or Portugal is fascist is surely not concerning something which this house then ought to interrupt its regular progress of business to debate. If it is wrong, members are going to speak and it will be shown to be wrong, and that will end it. It is not something that this house is required to take a stand on, in the sense that our stand is going to affect the future course of events, such as we hoped would happen with respect to the wheat debate which we earlier decided was a matter of urgent public importance. We hoped that this would have an effect that would be relevant to the citizens of Saskatchewan directly.

Now, in this case, as I say, with respect to an error made, however heinous an error, this error can be completely obliterated by someone making a statement to the contrary. And may I say, Mr. Speaker, the statement by an individual member of this house, in no way, and I repeat, in no way, commits the house to adopting the statement; otherwise there would be no point in debate, so all we are talking about is that one individual member has made a statement of fact that others disagree with, and we are in the course of a debate which is specifically designed to elicit statements of fact which others will disagree with. We will, as the debate carries on, decide as a house, which statement of fact we agree with.

There is surely no point whatever in suspending our normal course of debate and our normal course of business so that we may pick out one isolated statement of fact and debate it some more — particularly, when it was quite extraneous to the motion which was under debate.

I, therefore, suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a point on which the house ought to resolve itself into a special debate and interrupt its normal proceedings. It is a matter which can be effectively dealt with in the debate which is currently on and no amount of dividing now, or no amount of adjourning to consider a matter of urgent public business will allow this matter to be debated any more expeditiously and with any more point than can be debated if the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere) carries on with the debate which he has adjourned and refutes, if he believes it ought to be refuted, the statement of the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — May I just say in closing the debate, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am listening to the points of order as they are raised.

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to repeat anything that has been said, but speaking to the point of order, it seems to me that all the gentlemen on the other side of the house were in the house yesterday when the statement, that they feel to be opprobrious, was made.

Now, that was the time, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, when a point of order should have been raised, and to now, at this late stage, raise it as a matter of urgent public importance, when it could have been raised at

that time, seems to me to be completely inapplicable in the rules of the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I thank all the hon. members for their opinions. Standing Order no. 20 of this assembly states as follows:

Leave to make a motion of the adjournment of the assembly (when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance) must be asked after the ordinary daily routine of business has been concluded, and before the orders of the day are entered upon. The member desiring to make such a motion rises in his place, asks leave to move the adjournment of the assembly for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, and states the matter. He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to the Speaker, who, if he thinks it a matter of urgent public importance, read it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the assembly. If objection is taken, Mr. Speaker requests those members who support the motion to rise in their places and if more than fifteen members rise accordingly, Mr. Speaker calls upon the member who has asked for leave.

and then it goes on to say:

if less than fifteen members, but not less than three members rise in their places, the question of the member "is leave to move the adjournment of the assembly" should be put forthwith, without debate, and determined if necessary by division.

Now, Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms in regard thereto state the following, Citation 100, subsection 2:

The definite matter of urgent public importance to the discussion of which the adjournment of the house may be moved under Standing Order 20 (this is the Standing Order number in Ottawa) must be pressing that public interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention.

subsection 3

The urgency within this rule does not apply to the matter itself but means urgency of debate when the ordinary opportunity as provided by the rules of the house do not permit the subject to be brought on freely enough, and public interest demands discussion take place immediately.

and Beauchesne continues — subsection 6

The Speaker's duty with regard to a motion to adjourn the house for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance under Standing Order 26, is confined to determining as to whether in the first instance a motion so proposed is in order, that is as to form and content, there his responsibility ends. There is a further question as to propriety or desirability in discussing a matter of such grave importance. That is for the house to decide. Mr. Speaker, having found the motion in order, may submit the question — has the hon. member leave to proceed? If objection is taken, the Speaker requests those members who support the motion

to rise in their places. If more than twenty (in this house, it is fifteen) rise in their places to support the motion, the Speaker calls for the hon. member to propose his motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now the motion before the house — I was listening to the points of order a few moments ago — I don't see very well how we can now re-open that discussion. The question which it is sought to have discussed is, if I understand it correctly, the following words which were used yesterday by a member in the house as follows:

It is to be hoped that if the cultural standards of Saskatchewan are to be raised they will not be imported from a "fascist" state like Montana.

Now, Montana is a neighboring state of ours, and a component part of the United States of America, with which country we are presently in amity — that is a friendly power. I listened last night, and I must say with some concern, to the news reports of this statement on television and on radio, and let me say this — that first I find the motion in order as to form and content, but, moreover, in regard to the urgency thereof, if I was a member, or a citizen of the state of Montana, living in a state governed by an elected democratic government, I think I would be furious to be referred to as living in a "fascist" state.

I feel that the case is urgent on those grounds and will, therefore, proceed with the usual routine. I find the motion in order. I find the matter one of urgency for the reasons that I have stated and the members may proceed to the question:

**Mr. Davies** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Wait a minute, now, I have to put the question. Has the hon. member leave to proceed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** — No.

**Mr. Speaker:** — In order for the debate to proceed, fifteen members must rise in their places. There are fifteen rising in their places and the member therefore has leave to proceed.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Thatcher: That this house do now adjourn.

He said: Mr. Speaker, for almost none months this government has been trying to persuade the people of the United States that Saskatchewan is a good place in which to invest their money, to build mines, to build factories, and I am going to suggest to you, Sir, that the statement which the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) made yesterday will greatly hurt the efforts which we are making to get new industries.

Yesterday I was out of the house when the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) spoke in the Budget Debate. However, in the Leader Post this morning, on page 4, I read this account:

Montana was described Wednesday as a "Fascist" type of state.

I immediately asked for the official transcript and from the transcript I would like to quote this specific paragraph:

It is to be hoped that if the cultural

standards of Saskatchewan are to be raised, they will not be imported from a "fascist" state like Montana.

And there were other disparaging remarks about our American friends. Mr. Speaker, I say that this was one of the most shameful speeches ever made in this legislature, or in any other legislature or parliament in Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The relationship which exists between our country and the United States, surely, is one of the bright spots in a world which is troubled almost unendingly by ill-will and by bitterness. No two people in the world are as close, as similar, or as friendly as Canadians and Americans. We cross the border without passports. We speak the same language. We read the same magazines, and the same books. We watch the same television programs. Our service men fought side by side in two world wars. Canada is still absolutely dependent upon the United States for her own defense.

Yet this back-bench Socialist had the audacity to describe the great sovereign state of Montana as a Fascist State. Well, what is a fascist? Fascism means a totalitarian, right-wing dictatorship. A government where there is no democracy. When my hon. friend suggested that Montana has that kind of a government, thousands upon thousands of our citizens can give the lie to that allegation, because they have visited Montana.

Mr. Speaker, the language used by my hon. friend yesterday was the language which has been parroted month after month, year after year, by Communists throughout the world, and by many Socialists throughout the world. A language of hate, a language of bitterness . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Now listen . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . a language of strife and ill-will, a language of anti-Americanism. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is no room in this legislature for that kind of language.

I say that this back-bench member from Saskatoon disgraces our legislature, disgraces our people and disgraces our province, when he talks in that manner.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I say that it would be unthinkable to permit any such irresponsible and vicious remark, such as that which was uttered yesterday to go unchallenged. Those words could damage the relationship that it has taken the people of both our countries a hundred years to build up. Montana is a free state in a nation that has been identified with freedom for many generations. I believe that the people of Montana will be offended by the charge that they are in any way advocates of one of history's most hateful philosophies.

On several occasions this session, Socialist speakers have made disparaging remarks about an invitation which I received a few weeks ago to address the Montana Senate and the Montana Legislature. They have sought to imply that this visit in some way indicated that the government was identifying itself with what they liked to call right-wing Goldwaterism.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Montana is a man called Tim Babcock. I have known him for some years and I think he is a fine gentleman. He is a Republican, but the legislature of Montana . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . Mr. Speaker, is overwhelmingly democrat, and the invitation which I received came for the Speaker of the house and the Majority Leader of the Senate and both of these gentlemen are democrats. I say that I was very honoured as Premier of Saskatchewan to accept that hospitable invitation. Surely in these days of world trouble, visits of parliamentarians, one assembly to another, can promote good will and

understanding. When I was in Helena, I told the people of Montana that America had no better friend than Canada. They in turn told me that Canada had no better friend than America. Everywhere I found good will for Canadians.

There is another very important aspect to this matter, Mr. Speaker, which I think should be drawn to the attention of this legislature and the people of Saskatchewan. It has to do with the role that American capital plays in the development of Saskatchewan. For example, Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that, in recent years, seven new potash mines have located in Saskatchewan, most of them costing \$50,000,000, \$60,000,000, \$70,000,000. Five out of those seven potash mines have been financed by American capital, and at least four of them have located in the area of my hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. Link).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — These mines are employing thousands of people. I say, that when the hon. member for Saskatoon speaks as he did yesterday, he is jeopardizing the employment of many, many of our citizens.

I do not know whether his other hon. friends agree with him. Does the hon. member for Regina East say that Montanians are fascists? Does the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. J.H. Brockelbank) say they are fascists? Does the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) say they are fascists? You know in your heart that that statement was a dastardly lie.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think, no matter with what enthusiasm the Premier is debating this question, when he refers to a statement made by a member in this house, as a 'dastardly lie' he is out of order and he should be made to withdraw those words.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I will be happy to withdraw the words, because I do not want to draw red herring over the issue. But I say that your silence means concurrence with this statement.

This government is determined to take every possible step to safeguard and promote good, sound, understanding relationship between Canada and the United States. Therefore, because we believe that it is in the interests of our citizens, I feel most strongly that the hon. gentleman must apologize publicly to this house and to the people and legislature of the State of Montana.

I believe, also, that his remarks on this subject should be expunged from the records of this house . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . and that, at an appropriate moment, Sir, I shall so move.

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, we have been listening to the Premier carrying on with his usual forensic violence this afternoon, and I must say that I have never been reminded so much in my life of a certain rotund character who used to stand on balconies, somewhere in Italy, during the 1930s, and I think that it ill-becomes the hon. premier to make . . .

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Caesar Augustus!

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . an issue at this time, about the use of words, an art which he has very highly developed. The Premier, in expressing his anxiety about the use of a word by a member of this house, was not himself, able to refrain from attributing, not only socialistic but communistic inclinations, to the members on this side of the house. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is an old saw that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones, and it is a lesson which this Premier has not learned.

The hon. Premier is one of the people who established the



practice in this house of using defamatory words, as he did this afternoon, and trying to, by the sheer force of steam and heat, to overwhelm anyone who might try to resist his use of unparliamentary language.

The hon. Premier is one of these people who just can't stand to reap the whirlwind of his own actions and his own conduct in this assembly. The hon. Premier displays an attitude, which I think, is very intolerant of the very kind of thing which he has done in this house, from this side of the house, for many years. He has called Saskatchewan a socialist, communistically inclined province. He has talked about communistic infiltration in the CCF, and I am not surprised that the hon. Premier is more jealous of the feelings of the governor of an American state than he is of the respect for the province of Saskatchewan.

Most of us, Mr. Speaker, weren't surprised to hear him extoll the virtues of our great and good neighbor to the south, but I never heard him defend the reputation of Saskatchewan when some of his party workers called this province communist-led and socialist-oriented. I never heard him defend Saskatchewan, but now he comes rushing to the defence of the State of Montana.

Well Mr. Speaker, with some of us our memories go back a short while, and some of us remember the very close affinity that exists between the Liberal party and certain big business interests in the United States. Some remember the general elections in Canada in 1962 and 1963. "Big business" did not like the Diefenbaker government's attitude toward nuclear arms in Canada, for example. And "big business" in the United States actually aided and abetted the Liberal party to defeat the Conservative government at that time. It is not surprising that spokesmen of the Liberal party will come rushing to the rescue of every friend of big business in the United States, wherever it may be attacked, whether in Saskatchewan or anywhere else. The leader of the government has shown today, that he is more concerned about the feelings of big business in the United States than he is about the reputation of his own province. This is not new for the Liberal party. The Liberal party has always been on a buddy-buddy basis with American big business interests. He does not need to get up here to prove it again today.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the futility of this whole discussion is illustrated by the fact, that the Premier himself descended to the very kind of conduct which he deprecates. He descended to it here not only by using an unparliamentary term against the member for Saskatoon, but using unparliamentary language to describe the party . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What unparliamentary word, if I may ask?

**Mr. Walker:** — He described this as a lie. A dastardly lie . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It is. It is true.

**An Hon. Member:** — You told the hon. . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — He is persisting in this unparliamentary . . . It does not matter how you defame people who have been elected to this house by the good people of Saskatchewan. You can defame them. You can throw mud in their face, Mr. Speaker, but if you just so much as say an offensive word against the "big business" American friends of the leader of the Liberal party, why, the province is in an uproar. The province's health is in jeopardy. The peace of the world is at stake. Mr. Speaker, I think that this Premier needs to learn that the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to a little bit of respect and a little respectful treatment from him, in accord with their dignity, in accord with their feelings, and their self respect. I suggest that if he would learn that it would be better for all the people of Saskatchewan.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have felt very strongly for years about this conduct of his. I have not protested or complained about it. Now that he makes an issue of it in this house, I cannot let the opportunity pass without saying that he who sows the wind, must reap the whirlwind. The leader of the government has done that here today, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. M.P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a very brief statement in this debate. I might say, Sir, that I am appalled, as I have been since coming to this house, at the intemperate language used by members on both sides of the house, in dealing with the public business.

The statement was made yesterday, and is under discussion, is, in my opinion, one of the most violent abuses of that type of thing, that I have seen. I want to say, Sir, that the people that I represent, and the party that I am a spokesman for, divorce ourselves in every respect from that type of a statement that was made in this house yesterday. I suggest, Sir, that the actions of members on both sides of the house, when they rise in debate, have given rise to this type of intemperate language. I believe that there are members on both sides who are guilty of this type of offence, although the mere standing up and calling each other by names, resolves nothing. An offence has been committed. I agree with the Premier. It should be withdrawn and an apology made. I stand with that statement on behalf, of not only the people I represent, but the party that I speak for.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife):** — It has been suggested by the Premier and the last speaker, that this particular statement ought to be withdrawn. If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, then we will have to ask the hon. Premier and other members opposite to withdraw numerous statements of a similar nature that were made by them constantly regarding the previous government.

So, if this statement, made by one member of this house, one lone, single member of this house, is going to seriously disrupt the future economic progress of this province, then the former leader of the Liberal party, who is now the Premier, has done more irreparable harm in the period of time when we were the government of this province, repeating ever and ever, "that as long as there is a socialist government in power we will have no investment in this province".

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a very significant point which sticks out very clearly. An hon. member has the right to make any type of statement that he wishes in this house, and the Premier of this province has no right to say that he is going to get up and make an hon. member of this house, not only withdraw that statement, but apologize to this house, to the people of Saskatchewan, and I assume the people of Montana, for a statement made in this house. This, Mr. Speaker, has all the earmarks of a dictator.

An hon. member has the right to express his opinion. Hon. members opposite have a right to disagree with that opinion. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this whole matter, as a question of urgent public importance was a frivolous sort of thing. The debate we are now carrying on could have just as well been discussed on the Budget Debate, as was usual. There is no matter of urgent public importance. If so, can the hon. Premier tell us how much money we are going to lose in terms of investment in Saskatchewan, because of a mere statement made by a private member of this legislature?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out too that not only has this had no effect, and if it has indeed had any effect, then previous statements made by hon. members who now sit on the government side of this house, that we were not only a socialist government, but that we are a bunch of communists, has done irreparable harm. So they should be asked to withdraw all the statements they made as well. I want to make this point. That if this hon. member on this side of the house, made a statement, he was encouraged to do so because the hon. Premier of this province, is the one that introduced this kind of muck raking into the political life of Saskatchewan. No one else. Let him take the responsibility for the reaction of the hon. private member on this side of the house.

Mr. Speaker, I say it was no matter of urgent public importance. Nothing has been proven, but a whole lot of the usual balderdash that we have been listening to for years in this province. I will oppose any motion that the Premier introduces in this house, in this regard.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to remind the house, before anybody else takes part in the debate, that we are debating a motion that the house do now adjourn. That is the motion.

**Hon. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I am rather amused at the remarks of

the member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet). Now, he is trying to debate whether this matter is of immediate public importance or not. A matter, Sir, that you have ruled on, and I can certainly agree with you. If my hon. friend wants to review the record, I have been here long enough that I think I can review it. The individual, if we want to name names, who started this mockery, which my hon. friend refers to, now sits in the House of Commons in Ottawa, a gentleman who used to be Premier of this province, Tommy Douglas. He is the individual who started this in this legislature and you have continued the same actions as he started here many years ago.

**Mr. Walker:** — On a point of order, is it proper to attack the conduct of a former member of this house who is no longer here to defend himself? Is this proper?

**An Hon. Member:** — It is proper.

**Mr. Walker:** — If it is parliamentary, is it fair?

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I am placing on the record some of the facts that have taken place in this house and my hon. friend, the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) sat here and watched them. He seems to complain about people on this side of the house having referred to some of the gentlemen opposite, as being socialists. Many people on the other side . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — Communists.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — . . . of this house have stood in their place, in this house, and boasted about being socialists. This is their privilege and their prerogative.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — I said communist-tinged socialists. I did not say socialists. My hon. friend knows very well what I said, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, if the hat fits the hon. gentleman, then I think he can wear it. If, as my hon. friends opposite, have stated, the present Premier of the province was such a guilty individual, I wonder how he ever got to be Premier. The people of the province, apparently, do not hold the views of the people who sit opposite.

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . more people voted . . .

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — The people of this province voted out of office, only . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — More people voted for us.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — A few months ago, the people who sit opposite, and voted into power under the present Premier, a new government, and I am very confident that the people of Saskatchewan have every confidence in the present Premier.

I note that the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) is talking about the number of votes he got. Well, he is the only individual in this house, at the moment, who had to take two runs at it to get here.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — He also stated, a moment ago, that the Premier of this province was not going to decide whether the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) would withdraw certain remarks and apologize to this house, or not. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that it is this house that will decide whether the hon. member will withdraw these remarks and what action shall be taken.

**Mr. Nollet:** — It would not matter what the house said.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Surely, this house is in control.

**Mr. Nollet:** — We have got a right . . . Dictatorship. By number.

**Mr. Walker:** — This isn't Louisiana.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Are you finished making your speech, or do you want to make another? Now if you have not got anymore to say then you said a few minutes ago, I would suggest you sit back in your chair . . .

**Mr. Nollet:** — I will make a lot more after you are through.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Then the member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) wanted to know how much money Saskatchewan will lose because this statement has been made. Mr. Speaker, supposing this statement did not cost Saskatchewan a nickel, in dollars and cents, I think that every citizen in Saskatchewan deserves an apology from the member. I think that every citizen in Montana is entitled to an apology from the member.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — I was impressed with the remarks of the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson). I can agree with the statement that he made here a moment ago, that it is not in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada, or us as individual members, to allow this type of thing to continue and not to take actions at as early a date, or as early an hour as possible, to remedy the problem that was created yesterday by the remarks from an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity over my lifetime to deal with and be associated with American people. I suggest to you, that there is little, if any, difference between the people who live in Montana and the people who live in Saskatchewan. I think the people of Montana are opposed to extremism, whether it comes from the right or the left.

The Premier pointed out that the people of Montana have elected a democratic government and a democratic senate in that state. I happen to know the governor of the State and I have certainly found him, on all occasions, to be a gentleman and a business man of the first order. Whether he is a republican or a democrat makes no difference to me. I think that he has given worthwhile leadership to the State of Montana, and incidentally, the State of Montana must agree with me and my thoughts, or he would not be the governor of the State.

One talks about dragging red herrings across the stage. The statements that have been made so far, in this debate, by the gentlemen who sit opposite, without exception, have been red herrings. What are we talking about, Mr. Speaker? We are talking about a charge that was made by a member in this legislature against a friendly State. Nothing else. I for one, feel that this charge has done irreparable harm to Saskatchewan, to Montana, to Canada, and to the United States. I think the statement should be withdrawn, and I think that the individual responsible for having made the statement, should apologize to the government, the State of Montana, and to the people of Montana. If he is not prepared to do that, then I would suggest that this house should request him to do so. I would hope . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — This isn't Louisiana.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — You know, if you would put your feet under the desk, you would not feel so uncomfortable and be so miserable.

**Mr. Walker:** — Not enough room.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I would hope that there are people on both sides of the house, who would feel that it is in the best interest of Saskatchewan that this statement should be withdrawn and an apology sent forth. I sincerely hope that there are people on the other side of the house who feel that way. I do not care whether this statement was made in respect to Montana, Mississippi, or any other part of the world.

**An Hon. Member:** — That statement was made.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Certainly it was. I think that was a disgrace also. You may have your opinions of conditions in Mississippi, but the people of Mississippi may not agree with you. I would suggest that you should keep your nose out of their business.

Now, I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is in the best interests of this legislature and of the people of Saskatchewan to have this statement withdrawn and an apology go forward to the proper authorities. I want to repeat that I sincerely hope that some people on the other side of the house will agree with me. Surely to goodness, if we are not prepared to do this on this occasion, that this is going to happen again, with respect to other States, other provinces, and other areas of the world. This is not in the best interests of this assembly, or in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan, or the area wherever the remarks are brought to bear on. so I hope that the people opposite will reconsider what we are asking to be done and to give us their support so this can be accomplished and so that this house can proceed with the work that it was intended to proceed with.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, I believe the motion before the house, as you said, is that the house do now adjourn. This is what we are discussing. We are not actually discussing the statement made by the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) yesterday. We are discussing, whether or not, at this time, the house should adjourn to further discuss this matter. This is my understanding of the debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am sorry that the standing orders say quite subsequently, and I think I may have led you astray in this regard, which I apologize if I did. But the motion, framed in this way, that the house do now adjourn, is for the purpose of discussing the urgent public matter that was mentioned. I did not want to think that I was limiting anybody in their freedom of expression, by saying what I did to remind the house that that is the motion before the house, because eventually the house is going to have to deal with it.

**Mr. Wood:** — Pardon me, Sir, if I did slightly misinterpret your words. I was thinking that we were discussing whether or not the house should adjourn to deal further with the resolution that the premier has outlined.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, I believe that a good many of the members on this side of the house would not actually, themselves, agree with the statement that was made concerning . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — . . . the state of Montana being "fascist". I think that our relationships with the State of Montana have been good and I am sure that they will continue to be so . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — But I do take strong exception to the attitude that the members opposite are making to this statement. It seems to me that this is not a matter for which the house should be adjourned and that we should be making this fuss over. As members have said this sort of statement has been made here in the past on other occasions, without let or hindrance. I am sure that the province would be better served if this house were not to adjourn at this time, if we were to continue on and go on with our business and carry on in the way in which we should carry on. The people of the province of Saskatchewan have sent us down here to do their business, not to descend to the depths of muckraking and talk as we have been doing in the last few minutes in this house.

It seems to me that it would be much more appropriate at this time, Mr. Speaker, if we were to drop this matter and not adjourn the house, and go back to the debate which we were on in regard to the budget, which is before us, and has been before for the last few days.

**Mr. Fern Larochelle (Shaunavon):** — Mr. Speaker, I happen to represent the constituency that borders the state of Montana for approximately 150 miles. This is the constituency of Shaunavon. The people along that border visit back and forth on a very friendly basis. I believe that statements like those made in the house yesterday by the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) will greatly hinder the relations that have prevailed along the border. I am sure that all people along the border between Montana and Saskatchewan will bear me out on this. These people are friends. Statements like this certainly reflect on all the people of Saskatchewan.

I, for one, cannot agree with statements like that. It is impossible. If we are going to have a house that is free to make statements of this sort which will reflect on us. I am sure that I cannot agree with such things. I believe that the statement that was made yesterday by the hon. member from Saskatoon, should be withdrawn. If it is, I think it would probably stop all the harm before it gets too far.

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — Mr. Speaker, to begin with I think we should go back and try and see what this fuss is all about. This sniping and backbiting was started by the people opposite.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — It started because of a goodwill trip made by the Premier of the province to a friendly, neighboring state. I think this was an honor. The people of Montana, the legislature of Montana, invited the Premier of Saskatchewan to come down. This was an honor not only paid to the Premier of this province, but in fact to the people of Saskatchewan generally.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — I think it has been pointed out that this is noteworthy that the invitation was tendered by the Speaker of the house, who happens to be a democrat by political persuasion, as are the majority of people in that house. But regardless of their politics, these people are democratically elected members of a friendly and neighboring State, and Mr. Speaker, I think this will be a sad day for Saskatchewan and a sad day for Canada, if we lose this type of friendly exchange. This is what should be happening all over the world, if we really want to do more than talk about peace and good will.

Members of the CCF party, the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, profess to feel strongly about good will among nations. They profess to feel strongly against spreading ill will and disunity among people. Yet one of them makes a statement in this house, casting a slur and an insult on a friendly State. I think this was a disgraceful statement . . .

Well, I think unless it is repudiated, it casts a disgrace on this house and on the people that we represent in this house. Our job should be to build good will and better relations with all states and with all countries. I am appalled that this member has been given support by the members of the opposition. They should be apologizing for him, if he is not prepared to do it for himself.

Mr. Speaker, this is a black mark on the CCF and if it is not repudiated, it will be a black mark on Saskatchewan. The fact has been stated here they we may trade insults between members of this house in the heat of debate and this is taken for granted. It is one thing what we do say to each other in this house — it is another thing that we condone by your silence across there, and by your support, you are in effect condoning this disgraceful insult to a friendly group of people — a group of people that I might say you attempted to woo, a group of people in the state of Montana where you invested some of our money, Saskatchewan money, in an insurance company. And then someone stands up and calls them a group of

"fascists". I do not know what will happen to the business we have down there, I do not think this will help it any. Mind you, I do not think it is very good anyway, and we should get out just as quickly as we can.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think withdrawing is good enough, I think it should be withdrawn and stricken from the record. We talk about bringing this good will to this province. We have every respect in this party on this side of the house for the people of Saskatchewan. We just want to ensure that they continue to enjoy and command the respect of friendly people in other parts of this nation and in other friendly nations.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a matter of urgency. I think it should be stopped on both sides of the house. I think there should be more of that feeling expressed on that side of the house. It is an urgent matter, we should stop this before it does any more damage, and it has done a great deal of damage already.

**Mr. Wood (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, I said it was not a matter of urgency.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I did not say you did, I said you disassociated yourself with the statement, and for that I think we are all proud of you, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Fred Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this topic at this time. The Premier started off his remarks by saying he was out of the house yesterday, so he was not able to ask the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) to withdraw this statement. The Premier's first duty is to be in the house — he is the Premier. That is his first duty. He was not here. But he has a house leader who was here.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — The house leader who has been appointed by the Premier is the minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) he has his ministers in order of seniority to be leaders of the government. As I said, when we were debating the point of order earlier this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned how this statement could have been dealt with yesterday. I am not saying that I condone the statement that was made by the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link); that is beside the point altogether. It is a different issue at this time, a different issue entirely. The issue is that the government sees that they were getting the worst of the debate which was before this house and they wanted to adjourn the debate, in order for to pick on a single statement that was made by one member yesterday.

**Mr. Allan Guy (Athabasca):** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are not debating the actions of the Premier, or the people on this side of the house yesterday. We are debating the statement of the member from Saskatoon, and if you have not got the courage to debate it, sit down.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Mr. Speaker, as usual the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) — his mouth is bigger than his brains.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Now, the statement that was made in this house yesterday is not a matter of whether we on this side agree with it or don't agree with it. The government has not given any speaker on this side of the house, since the statement was made yesterday, the opportunity to say whether in continuing the debate which was before this house, we agree or disagree. They came into the house today and moved that the house do adjourn to discuss this motion. Had we been able to go on with the debate, this statement could have been dealt with by members from both sides of the house, in the proper manner in which debate should be carried on.

Last fall our Premier, while visiting eastern Canada, made a statement that if Quebec broke away from Confederation, this province should become the fifty-first state of the U.S. that was more of a damaging statement on the people of this province than any other statement I

have ever heard.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — For a man who has assumed the responsibility of this province and became Premier, he was in office less than six months and advocating throughout to the wide winds of the world that Saskatchewan should become a state of the United States.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I must take exception to the statement which the hon. member has made. I wish to state sharply that I advocated no such course . . .

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — That is no point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is an explanation, and he knows as well as I do that he has not got a point of order there. He is trying to interrupt on an explanation . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — It was a party, wasn't it, Ross . . .

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Those are the statements that are far more damaging than the statement made by a back-bencher in opposition, a member who is here the first time in the legislature — a member who was making his maiden speech in this house. And then we see this furore from a man who has had experience in the House of Commons and sat in opposition for a number of years and is now the Premier.

Now, the Premier said he went to Montana on a good will mission, but he ran out at the same time on the representative of Her Royal Highness, the Governor General, to be in Montana the night that the Governor General was in this fair city of ours. I am sure . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, again I must take exception, this is simply not in accordance with the facts.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Well, never mind, you can explain the facts later. He went to Montana when the Governor General was in this province. He, no doubt, had an invitation from Montana, I am not denying that whatsoever, but he knew full well ahead of time when his Excellency was coming to this province. Those dates could have been arranged so that they did not clash.

He point out in his speech that the statement of the member for Saskatoon was wrong, because the government of Montana is a democratic government. By his inference, he left in my mind the thought that Mr. Babcock, himself, because he wasn't a democratic, he was a republican, that the statement would well apply to Babcock but did not apply to congress.

The member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) the Minister of Public Health, said it was an honor for the Premier to be invited to Montana. I agree with the Premier, it was an honor to be invited to Montana, but as I say, and I would like to repeat again, the Premier should have seen to it, as Premier of our province, that he was here when the Governor General was here, and to say that we are self-governing here. That is not the issue right now whether we are condoning or not, but I am protesting the way the government are using their majority to bring stuff into this house to choke off the debate which was on the budget. Arrangements were made for time on the air for a number of their members, and we had to give up our time on the air on the Budget Debate because we don't get a chance to delay the air time and we get shuffled and pushed out of our sequence.

This, to me, Mr. Speaker, is one of the flimsiest guises I have ever seen in the pretence of democracy and fair play.

**Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Just a few words in debating whether this house should consider the motion, and I do not know what we are debating about. I do not even know what fascism . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Just a minute. I think in answer to the question that



is posed, I have endeavoured to allow the widest possible latitude in debate. It is very repugnant to me, at any time, to interfere with anybody's speech, but I would like to read to the house the matter which we are supposed to be debating on the motion to adjourn. This is the statement which was made in debate yesterday by the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link), I will read the statement if the members want me to. That is what we are debating, the statement which was made and anything relevant thereto. Now have I clarified the situation?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You have, Sir . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Are there any extra copies available of the statement that the Premier presented to you, or is he short of them?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I have no cause to have to give you a copy . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — I guess I should not have expected it.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I just wanted to . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — On the point of order, I am not quite sure about this, that is how many copies should be given to members, and whether it is the responsibility of the Chair to see that the correct number are given. I will ask advice in this regard, certainly if hon. members are entitled to a certain number of copies they will get them.

**Hon. D. Heald (Attorney General):** — On the point of order, I think it is very clear in Standing Order 20, sub-section 3. The requirement is that the member making the motion hand the written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker, and, as I understand it, this has been done. A written statement, singular, there is no requirement for copies . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, also, it has been the custom in the eighteen years that I have been in this house, for leaders on both sides to treat the other side with enough courtesy to supply them with a copy of any motion made in this house, and this is one instance of a breach of that courtesy.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to give the hon. member a copy.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Any hon. member who wishes clarification, I think has the right to ask that it be read. If anyone does so, well, let him go ahead.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, it was charged in this debate that somebody called some state a fascist state. I walked into the library to find out what fascism meant, and I find that it is derived from the term — I have it here, "fasces" which means obedience to the law. Now, some people are very proud to be fascists because they think that they are obedient to the law, and the term "fascisti" derived from that particular word. Now, other members opposite may have different interpretations. It is pointed out in this dictionary that it means people who are opposed to radical elements, and if a member in this house is not entitled to use a term which may mean one thing or another, I don't know what the hon. member meant exactly. It has not been defined in this house. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that unless we know what the definition was that he had in mind, this house certainly should not try to impose upon him a certain ruling, something that other people think he should withdraw.

I am in this house because I feel that I can speak freely, that I should not have my hands tied down. I have been insulted in this house on many occasions, Mr. Speaker. As you know, hon. members who were in the opposition at that time, implied that we were communists or something like that. I objected in this house because that is the way I understood it, and I think you ought to remember a certain person in this house did take it back. But until we know what the hon. member meant, this house,

I think, has no right to try to shackle him in any way. That is why I bring to your attention what the meaning of fascist is. It just says in the dictionary that it means those who think that they obey the law.

**Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words on the motion, I regret that certain remarks by the member for Wadena, made me rise on the occasion. I regret that he would place the celebration of our Jubilee in the position that he has, by trying to make political capital out of it. As Vice-Chairman of the Jubilee and Centennial Corporation, I can tell my friend that the dinner that was held on the Saturday evening, was held for the workers who were taking part in the Jubilee and Centennial throughout the province. The official occasion on the week-end was the official opening which took place on Sunday.

My hon. friend knows quite well that the Governor General did not agree to come to the dinner on the Saturday night because it was not in the formal category as the occasion was on the following Sunday. I regret that this has been used before by members sitting on the opposite side of this house. I think it is a very regrettable thing that members would involve the Jubilee and Centennial Corporation in a cheap political manner, in order to try to embarrass the Premier of this province, who was undertaking, in going to Montana, a job for all of us in helping to sell the province of Saskatchewan to the people of the state of Montana. I think that anyone in this province should be proud of the fact that we have in the Premier of this province, the first Premier, I think of a Canadian province who has ever been invited to speak to a legislative body in the United States. I think we should be very proud of the fact that we have a man who would be invited by a body of that type to address them.

There is one other point that has been mentioned by almost every other member that stood up across the way, and it has nothing to do with the subject that we are discussing at the present time. This is in relation to comments that we might make from time to time across the floor of this house, either about each other or about the party the other person represents. This is an altogether different thing — a reference to a state or a country as a whole, and I defy anyone across the floor of this house to state that any member on this side ever called this province, as such, a Socialist or Communist province, or the party that sits opposite in those terms. There is nothing to say in the rules of the house that we should not refer to a party in a way that we feel in our own minds, or the feelings that they represent themselves, but when it comes to indicating an entire people who represent all political beliefs, or an entire state, this is an altogether different matter. I say there today that for you to complain about what we said about you as individuals or as a party, is not an issue in this house at the present time. Neither are the things that you have said about us, or the things that you called us in the past, and I have heard you call us fascists over here. I have heard it from the other side of the house when we sat in opposition, I have been called that myself and I take it. I expect those things once in a while when what you say is going to be misinterpreted, but at the same time I do not think we have the right to condemn an entire people, an entire state, or an entire province, with the opprobrium that might be imputed to any particular party. So, I say here this afternoon, I hope that the hon. gentlemen opposite will not take the advantage that they have to embarrass an organization and a group in this province, which I believe represents all the people, and to try and bring embarrassment on the government of the province, or the Premier, by the use of comments such as were made by the member for Wadena. I regret them very much and I hope that in the future this will not be resorted to.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West):** — Mr. Speaker, I did want to say a few words about this matter because it seems to me that we are being led astray. We are failing to turn our mind to what is really the point of issue.

The member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) has made certain remarks, and I, for my part, would not agree with his remarks, I think they are in error . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . they are statements of fact, which I do not happen

to agree with, but members opposite are in some way endeavouring to force him to make a withdrawal of a statement of fact, which he presumably believes to be true, which I do not happen to believe to be true. Now, here is the place where Voltaire's old adage is very, very applicable:

I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death, your right to say it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I happen to disagree with what the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) has to say, but I propose to defend his right to say it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, then, the only reason why we could properly abridge the rights of a member to make some statement which he believes to be a fact, is that there is some urgent reason why he should not make errors of fact and state them in this house, if indeed they are errors of fact. Ordinarily a member can say what he likes in this house and he can't even be sued for libel for it. You know the historic customs which have arisen around our parliament, which say that this parliament and every other British parliament cannot operate unless members are free to say things which they cannot say on the street. Now for some reason, we have decided as a people that the right to make statements in parliament, even though they may be wrong, even though they may be libellous, even though they may be wrong, even though they may be libellous, even though they may be defamatory, is necessary in order that our parliamentary system work. I accept that, I believe that it is sound. Now, there may be reasons why certain extreme statements ought not to be permitted.

There are rules in this house which prevent a number of statements from being made. I am not enabled to defame the sovereign merely because I stand in this legislature. I am not able to make highly derogatory remarks about a friendly power. And so it goes — there are rules. But the Premier says that in this case we must abridge the rights of this member for two reasons — one, that if we don't do so our relations with the United States will be endangered, and secondly, if we don't do so, American investment in Saskatchewan will be endangered.

Well, the second one I reject out of hand, simply because a great number of statements which are made in this house, it might be argued would affect investment . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — . . . have done . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . yes, and people would differ as to what statements might affect investment and the investment climate. And people might well differ as to the value of maintaining an investment climate. Be that as it may, it is, I think, entirely inappropriate to suggest that statements ought not to be made in this house if they happen to endanger the investment climate. And when members think about that statement they will realize that it just won't wash. We cannot limit our debate in this house because certain statements might endanger investment, be it originating in Great Britain, or United States, or in the Soviet Union, or wherever the money might come from. So I reject that out of hand.

Second, that it might endanger relations between the two countries. Now, I really think that this is rather remarkable. I doubt whether the relations between these two great nations of Canada and the United States are so fragile that any statement by any single member in any legislature of this country, is likely to endanger us . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Those are your words, not ours.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — They are indeed my words, I am standing in my place and I am speaking my words . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . and if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, this house would be rather better organized and better operated if members would

confine their words to when they were standing up in their place.

Now, I say this: members in political movements in Canada have gone back and forth across Canada and made many, many statements, which people have interpreted to be un-American. And I do not pick out anyone in particular, but I know that members of the Liberal party have frequently said that statements of the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker were anti-American in their approach. This may be true, I am not here to argue this, but I am here to defend the right of the hon. Mr. Diefenbaker to make those statements, if he felt that his political duty required him to make them.

Now, therefore, I just reject out of hand this preposition that we in Canada are not to be allowed to make statements in the course of our political activity which might, in the opinion of some, endanger relationships between Canada and the United States, because almost any comment, might well, in the eyes of some, endanger relationships between Canada and the United States. I happen to believe that when a large segment of the population in any particular area are denied the vote by the use of oppressive laws that this makes this state, in my mind, fascist-like, or semi-fascist. I, therefore, happen to believe that the state of Alabama, or the state of Mississippi, falls into this category.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Saskatoon may have been wrong, I do not know this. We all make our own judgment of fact. But he was elected by his constituents to state his point of view, and possibly theirs, and I would suggest to this house, that few members have earned their right to speak, and speak as they like on public affairs, more than the member for Saskatoon.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, you may object to what he says, but what you are trying to do is to say that he ought not to have said it. That his right to speak be abridged, that he should be stopped from making such statements.

**Mr. Stuart:** — . . . nobody said that . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . a red herring . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . withdraw it . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Ah, the request was not for a withdrawal, the request was that the member apologize.

Now, then I want to say this, I wonder how this came to be stated in this house. Well, I would be perfectly prepared to argue that to state that somebody was a fascist is not particularly derogatory. After all, a quick reading of the definition of fascist, suggests that it is a patriotic and anti-communist movement organized in Italy, and these are the very words of the Concise Oxford Dictionary which I have here. However, we all know that it is meant to be a term which is not one of endearment on this side of the world anyway. But I suggest, that the member for Saskatoon fell into the trap of using language which is appropriate to the rough and tumble of politics. Now, I, Mr. Speaker, in my political career have been called a communist. I didn't object to this. I thought it was inappropriate, but I knew that this is what befalls one, when he enters the political arena. I know that if I had protested, someone would have said "well, if you don't want to get wet, don't go near the water".

Now then, how did this member happen to fall into this trap? I suggest to you that he fell into this trap because — not the state of Montana, but the Governor of the State of Montana has been injected into the partisan political activity of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — He came here to speak, not

to this legislature, not at the request of Mr. Speaker, but at a Liberal rally. Now, he spoke at a Liberal convention and I know, from the reports in the paper, that he spoke in glowing terms of the Liberal party and its platform. Surely that is his right. He spoke in terms which did not suggest that he approved of socialism and social democracy. That is his right, but once he gets into the political arena of Saskatchewan, he should not be surprised if he is met with the same brick-bats that everybody is the recipient of, when they are in the political arena.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, I am sorry, I am sorry that the member for Saskatoon related the Governor of Montana with the people of Montana, I am sorry for that and I think it was an error, because the remark as quoted suggested that the people of Montana were of this particular stamp — "The State of Montana". All right, "the State of Montana", is rather easier to have heard people say that this is a Liberal province. Notwithstanding the fact that they only got forty per cent of the vote, people still identify the province with the leader. I say the member from Saskatoon may have fallen into this trap. But I can see how he fell into this trap. He fell into this trap because, I believe, for the first time in Canadian history — another first for Saskatchewan — a Governor of an American state was injected into the partisan political activity of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It is a matter of very great regret. The governor of the state of Montana, however, allowed himself to be brought into this. He allowed himself to become involved in the politics of Saskatchewan and he, therefore, cannot now plead that he ought to be immune from the criticism which befalls one who enters into parties and politics.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — He is not . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — No, he is indeed not pleading. I could suggest that there are reasons why someone may have opinions about the Governor of Montana, as opposed to the state of Montana, which might suggest that the term used by the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) was at least not wholly erroneous. A man who refuses to declare the United Nations Day because he believes this organization hasn't proved itself, is a man who, in my views, adopts a position which is not in keeping with my standards of democracy. He is entitled to these views but he has these views and he has this public record, he comes up to Saskatchewan, he comes into this province at a time when it is in political turmoil, he takes a stand on behalf of one political party and he gets shot at by the other political party. Now what is news about that. Now I am sorry, as I say, I am sorry that this has meant that the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) has, in error, attributed to the people of Montana attributes which he, I feel sure, meant to attribute to the Governor of Montana. But it is a natural error and it is an error which would follow once the Premier of the province and the Liberal party brought into this province the Governor of Montana and put him into the political arena of this province.

This was the original error. This was the mistake which if our relations with the United States are to be endangered, is the mistake which will produce the danger. This is the error which, in my view, this house ought to be censuring. This is a matter for great regret. And all of this sequence of events which we are seeing, stem directly from this move to call in aid of the party in power, the Governor of the state of Montana.

I think that the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) has every right to express erroneous opinions in this house. I do not believe that the opinions which he expressed either endanger investment in this province or endanger our relations with the United States in any appreciable degree, and I say that if this error is in fact attributed to the member for Saskatoon, (Mr. Line) . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Let him withdraw it, and we can get on with the business. If he is in error, let him withdraw it.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I say this, that if the

**Hon. D. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few observations in this debate, I hope that I can generate more light than heat, I think we have had enough heat this afternoon. I would like to comment briefly on some of the remarks that the hon. member who has just taken his seat has made. First of all, he spent most of the time that he was on his feet making the point that he would defend to his death the right of the hon. member for Saskatoon to make this statement.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — To that I would say amen and I agree but I would like to make this additional observation. This is hardly the point. What we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that this was an irresponsible statement. He should not have made it and we are inviting him to withdraw for the reasons that have been mentioned by the other members who have spoken on this side of the house, and also by the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson). Now the other point that the hon. member for Regina West has made, is that he brought in a red herring of course, and this is a trick of lawyers when you have a weak case. Try and get their eyes off the ball.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — Just a minute, just a minute, when you have a weak case, get the eyes of the court or whoever it happens to be, off the ball and that is what the member for Regina West just tried to succeed in doing. He did not talk about the statement at all. The statement does not say anything about Governor Babcock or the statement we are complaining of. Here is the statement as quoted in the Leader Post:

I believe the people of Saskatchewan would hang their heads in shame, if they knew the kind of Goldwater-type friends, not the Governor —

friends, our Premier associates with.

That is who you think he meant. He hasn't said anything yet. Let him speak for himself.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — That is not in the statement at all.

**Mr. Heald:** — It is in the press report.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, this is it.

**Mr. Heald:** — Very well, then I will go on and I will read the rest of this:

It is to be hoped that if the cultural standards of Saskatchewan are to be raised, it will not be imported from a "fascist" state like Montana.

Nothing about the Governor of Montana at all. My friend wants to talk about the Governor of Montana. Why doesn't he talk about the legislature of Montana? Do my friends say that the democrats in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the state of Montana are "fascists"? These are the people who invited the Premier to come to Montana, not the Governor. These are the people who are fascist? Now my friend from Regina West talks about the Governor. This is not the point here at all. The point is that the state legislature and the people of Montana have been defamed by this statement made by the member for Saskatoon yesterday.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe that this is the latest and I think the worst example of the type of statements which have been made by hon. members opposite since this house commenced deliberations. Of course this has not gone unnoticed, because the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, which my friends take to their bosoms from time to time, commented on this yesterday in an editorial and the heading of the editorial in the Star Phoenix says: "Dealers in Destruction". and if my hon. friends have not read this editorial, I commend it to you for bed-time reading this evening. I am going to read one or two paragraphs only this afternoon, and perhaps

you can treat it as a continuous story and read the balance tonight. Here is what the editorial says:

The CCF-NDP opposition in Saskatchewan has been accused even by some of its own former supporters of bitterness and disgruntlement over its defeat at the polls last April. These feelings have been offered as excuses for remarks which have been uttered in extreme language by some of its members. But it almost seems that members of the opposition may actually be following a deliberate policy of demoralization in their criticism of the government and everything the government tried to do. Charges made in a heated debate are one thing, their repetition at a later date is another.

Then they go on and deal with the statements of the member from Watrous about A.M.A. and with the statement of the member for Saskatoon who was at one time minister of Social Welfare and then they make this comment:

What decent man or institution . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, what is the motion we are discussing and is what the member is reading any relation to the motion at all?

**Mr. Heald:** — If the hon. gentleman would be patient, I will relate it very shortly.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Well I am not that patient.

**Mr. Heald:** — The last comment is:

What decent man or institution, one wonders, will it be next.

And this is a very prophetic editorial, Mr. Speaker, because presumably this editorial was composed yesterday afternoon at approximately the same time as . . .

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, to read an editorial that way and to try and use it as the hon. minister is doing, that is one man's opinion from outside of this legislation. The rules make it quite clear that you cannot take out such opinion to be matters of fact in this house. The minister knows quite well that he cannot proceed in that manner.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, I think if the member gives the date in the newspaper, that he is quoting from, he has the right to do so. Other members have done it. I noticed the deputy leader of the opposition quoting copiously in the Throne Debate.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Only, Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt you with your permission, if he assumes responsibility for the statements.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, it is a well known fact that you do not have to assume responsibility of printed statements in the paper. You do have to say what paper they are from and give the date. Anybody can go to the newspaper and get the same information.

**Mr. Heald:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — In regards to statements that have been made, it is in regard to letters which the member doesn't wish to table, or to correspondence which he doesn't wish to table.

**Mr. Heald:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, the

point of issue here is really to look at the statement in itself, and the motivation. This is the type of statement which is born of bitterness, bitterness perhaps for the defeat of the hon. members opposite on the 22nd of April of last year, bitterness that the people of Saskatchewan would have the audacity to dare to oppose them after twenty years in office. These people almost assumed the divine right to rule this province. Bitterness at the thought of spending many years in the opposition, possibly forever. The thought of walking the long lonely road to political oblivion with fewer and fewer companions along the way. These are also statements born of frustration, frustration because of the budget, and the high degree of public acceptance and acclaim for it by the people of Saskatchewan. Frustration because of the tremendous industrial . . .

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order again. In Beauchesne on page 132, citation 157, sub-section 3, you will see that it is out of order to read extracts in a debate if they refer to other debates during the same session. The editorial which the Attorney General read, referred to other debates in this session, because we have now adjourned the house to discuss another matter. When he refers to statements made by the member for Watrous, or another member for Saskatoon he is referring to statements made in another debate and he is definitely out of order, in my opinion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the member is quoting statements that were made in another debate in the house, I do agree that they are out of order.

**Mr. Heald:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will observe that ruling of course. This running fire of interjections from the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, is good training for a new member and I am indebted to them for helping me in improving my training as we go along.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . we don't . . .

**Mr. Heald:** — Of course, here again, interjections are designed sometimes, and I am not saying that that is the case here, but interjections sometimes are designed to sort of take your eye off the ball, as I indicated earlier.

Now, I can appreciate the embarrassment of the hon. gentlemen opposite and their desire to change the subject from the great industrial development of this province, potash, heavy water and so . . .

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — The hon. member is now proceeding to debate the budget, which is the thing we thought should have been debated in the first place. But it is quite out of order in this debate, Mr. Speaker, to start talking about tax reductions, industrial development, Mr. Speaker. Surely . . .

**Mr. Heald:** — I appreciate the sensitivity of the hon. gentleman, I will try to refrain from irritating him unduly. I did refer a minute ago to two ingredients into the motivation of this statement that I think are perhaps interesting. One of the ingredients, Mr. Speaker, is bitterness and the other ingredient would perhaps be frustration.

Now, if you take bitterness plus frustration, what do you have sometimes? I suggest that you have hatred and what is the by-product of hatred? Personal vilification and abuse is the by-product of hatred. Attack persons, not parties, attack individuals, not ideas, attack states or counties, attack anything and everything so long as you keep the red herring before the eyes of the public. That is the trick.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — Try to divert the attention of the public from the most exciting chapter in the development of any province in Canada, and that is what you are trying to do. You do not want to talk about these things. You want to talk about fascism in Montana or fascism in Mississippi, or fascism in Alabama.

**An Hon. Member:** — Talk about today . . .

**Mr. Heald:** — Mr. Speaker, I suggest that



because of these things, because my hon. friends opposite can see in the crystal ball only political annihilation and defeat as their future and their destiny so the hon. member from Saskatoon has made this type of attack, irresponsibly and indiscriminately on anything and everything that is in sight. I don't say that he has not got the right to say it. I say that he should withdraw, perhaps he uttered it in the heat of the debate. He should withdraw, we should do everything in our power in this legislature to take every corrective action possible in our effort to attempt to repair the damage which may have been caused by the hon. member's speech. This is all we say. We say that he should not have said it. We are inviting him to agree with us that he should not have said it. We are inviting each and every one of you, as some of you have already done, to agree that he should not have said it. I think it will be interesting to see how many of the hon. gentlemen opposite do rise before this debate is over and either associate themselves with these remarks or disassociate themselves with them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Would the hon. member just tell me what he understands by the word fascism?

**Mr. Heald:** — Yes, I would be glad to tell you what I understand. I probably understand what the hon. member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) understands because he and I were in the Royal Canadian Air Force. I am pleased to learn today that we were in the Royal Canadian Air Force and we are now in the forces on both sides of this house. There are servicemen on both sides of this house. We did not get our definition of fascism or Nazism out of a dictionary.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — We got it from experience. And I know what the hon. gentleman meant by fascism when he used it yesterday. It is my same definition. It does not matter what the dictionary says, it is the common usage, it is what the people, the majority of the people in this province, and in Canada, and in the United States, take from this meaning.

**Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):** — Yet we like to joke, but this afternoon let us bear in mind that we are taking after a man who was decorated in the last world war, and do a little thinking along that line. That is all I am going to say just now.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would not want this house or anybody in it to think that anyone is taking after a man. It is a statement that we would like to erase from the record.

**An Hon. Member:** — That is not a point of order.

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — It is, you wouldn't know what is.

**Mr. Thibault:** — I can cite you several instances which I thought of from the time this debate started where people should have been censured. I can think of the instance when the now Premier was kicking in the doors. Something should have been done, but we left it there. I can think of one instance when one person counselled violence during the K.O.D. episode in this province. Nothing was done. You know as well as I do, you would like me to name the person. Sure, you can refer to the newspapers anyway. We had the case of digging in the waste paper basket, trying to find something personal, and then, after finding something, quoting it out of context to leave the wrong impression with the people of this province. No censure was made about that. If my child had pulled a stunt like that with me, he would have been punished, but this is all right, the Premier was doing it.

**An Hon. Member:** — He got away with it.

**Mr. Thibault:** — Now he also suggested that we join the U.S.A. Something should have been done about that. But the people are going to deal with that behavior when the time comes.

**An Hon. Member:** — Well Hanley explains that all right.

**Mr. Thibault:** — I am going to tell you another thing. This type of behavior like we had over the air. I was talking with people from my constituency today. They asked, "Is this the price you have to pay to become a politician?" I don't think it is worth it. You sit here and hear this type of childish behavior of twisting and warping of facts for one reason alone. For what reason? To become elected. Well if I cannot get elected by telling my people exactly what I think, I do not want to be elected to this house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — And I am not scared to put this in the press either, and I do not come into this house with a written speech, like we had a while ago by the Attorney General. It looked as if it was already written up.

**An Hon. Member:** — It was yesterday.

**Mr. Thibault:** — Yesterday, this is no good.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . what have you got in that paper?

**Mr. Thibault:** — I wrote this out on an envelope when I was sitting down here. Notes, and that is all they are and I can hand them in and I doubt that you will be able to read them.

Although I may not agree with a lot of things that were said, I want to go along with the member for Regina, Mr. Blakeney, that I will defend his right to say what he believes, that is what he is elected for, and when I am going to speak in this house, I will say what I think, and I think I should be defended in that same way. This is why I think this whole matter is just a bunch of hogwash, excuse the expression. It is not parliamentary but that is the way I speak out.

So with that, I will terminate my remarks.

Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, I regret very much the fact that this debate had to take place today but I believe with many members on both sides of the house, that it should be cleared up today and not left for three or four more days to fester as a wound between the people of the United States and the people of Canada.

I am going to say very briefly that I believe that the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) does not mean to say the state of Montana is a fascist state, because to me and I think to him too, fascism is a term used with particular loathing and contempt to describe the kind of government that was employed to assist the Axis powers in the Second World War, and that it is associated in my mind and I think in the minds of most of the people in this house and in the minds of the people of the western world, with a particular contemptible kind of government organization designed for one particular purpose and used with no discretion or human value at all. I rise in my place to ask the member for Saskatoon to withdraw the word "fascist" because it has that particular connotation, I think, for all of us. All of us have been intemperate in this house. I know that often I have used the word "socialist", I have used the word "communist" and, to me, they do not particularly have any stigma and many people in the world today are communists and many people are socialists, but fascists are different and the member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) realized the difference full well and I rise with great hope that the member for Saskatoon will see fit

to withdraw the word "fascist" from the records of this house, with no political advantages to gain for either side. I think that if he considers the word "fascist" with the loathing and contempt that I have for it, that he will not let it remain on the records of the house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — Mr. Speaker, . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Sorry, the chap at the far end.

**Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon):** — Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to participate in this debate but I think there are one or two comments that I would like to make with respect to it. I agree to some extent with the hon. member from Elrose (Mr. Leith), but I will say this that I do think as far as I am concerned, there is just as much stigma attached to the word communist as there is to fascist. This word has been used against me from time to time and I categorically deny that I have ever had any association with this sort of thing. I believe the statement made by my colleague from Saskatoon, (Mr. Link) was an intemperate statement. I think in the heat of the debate that perhaps this is why it occurred. I do not believe Montana is a fascist state but that does not deny the fact that there could be people in Montana who are fascist-minded. Also I think this could be true in the province of Saskatchewan. I have visited Montana on many occasions and I have found them a very friendly people and very similar to our own. I note that the member from Melville, the hon. minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) took exception to the statement of the hon. member from Wadena with respect to the Premier being out of the province. Well surely the members of this house know that the Premier does not require any assistance in bringing embarrassment upon himself.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — Some comments have been made with respect to the number of trips that the Premier makes to Montana. I do not care how many trips he makes to Montana, in fact I really would be quite happy if he would stay there!

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon):** — Mr. Speaker, as one of the five members for Saskatoon city, I would like to just make a few observations in this discussion. The gentleman that preceded me, one of the members from Saskatoon city, made some of my points. However, I think the charge has been made here that a great deal of harm has been done to another state by a remark that originated in this chamber.

I think the man that made the charge, is a man who has gone up and down this province, and up and down this country, and who has done more to undermine the confidence of investment people in this province than anyone else in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon):** — I suggest, in addition, Mr. Speaker, that the charge has been substantiated that Governor Babcock injected himself into the political atmosphere of this province, and, as such, he is subject to the brick bats of the political scene in this province.

Governor Babcock has already brushed aside these remarks as being of no significance to him or his state and I heard him. This, Mr. Speaker, appears to me to be a well planned manoeuvre, a Liberal manoeuvre.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon):** — A short while ago, Mr. Speaker, the business of this house was adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public concern. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier has not got over it yet, and that was the discussion of wheat. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, the wheat situation arose again, last night to be exact, when the federal Minister of Trade and Commerce stood and denied the very thing that we were trying to persuade the federal government to do. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if there are any red herrings in this legislature, they were used by the

Premier in an attempt to draw the attention of the people away from the wheat question.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon):** — Mr. Speaker, as another member from Saskatoon, I too want to defend the right of my colleague to speak in this legislature. The hon. member yesterday stated he was the first representative of a minority group to represent Saskatchewan's fastest growing city in this legislature. The member for Regina West, mentioned that he distinguished himself during World War II. The member for Saskatoon is of German origin. In his early years he found that the best that this province could offer him was \$5 a month working long hours on a farm. When war broke out, the taxpayers of Canada were able to find \$30,000.

**An Hon. Member:** — \$30,000?

**Mr. Nicholson:** — \$30,000 to train him as an air gunner. As the member for Regina West said, and as the Deputy Premier will agree, the percentage of air gunners who survived is very small. The Premier of this province, in recommending that Saskatchewan should be handed over to United States as the next state of the union, and inviting the Governor of Montana to make history, to be the only elected member of any party on either side of the border to interfere politically in another friendly state, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these actions were responsible for the gallant member for Saskatoon, (Mr. Link) feeling very strongly about the prospect of his province coming under the domination of one like the Governor of Montana.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Nicholson:** — And I am confident that the member for Saskatoon will be prepared to meet the electors of that city and justify what he said and what he has done in the house and out of the house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the comments of both sides of the house this afternoon, and I have come to the conclusion that perhaps the real issue is lost.

The opposition is attempting to defend the right to speak. Mr. Speaker, freedom is not license. The rules of this house state that there are certain subjects which cannot be brought up in the house. One, a criticism against Her Majesty, the Queen, and two, highly derogatory remarks against a foreign power. Mr. Speaker, if the accusation of fascism is not highly derogatory, I would like to know what is.

**An Hon. Member:** — Is Montana a foreign power?

**Mr. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, it is a foreign state. It is a state outside the boundaries of this dominion.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that any imputation, no matter on what level, whether it be on the streets, in the cafes, in the hotels, in the newspaper, on television that reflects upon the good relationships between Canada and the United States of America is a matter of concern to me.

But, Mr. Speaker, when it is given by a member of this assembly, while speaking in this assembly, it is a matter of far greater concern to me, and, Mr. Speaker, of far greater significance to refer to the people of Montana and the state of Montana as a fascist state, because it could have far reaching effects, not only on the relationship between Saskatchewan and Montana, but I would suggest that by tonight, after the statements of the Governor of Montana this morning, that this issue will have gone right across the Dominion of Canada, and that it will have gone across every state in the United States. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are many governments and many countries in the world today that have attempted to heap ridicule on the United States of America, to imply imperialistic motives to every action that they have undertaken on behalf of freedom, and that these countries and the communist nations of the world will soon pick it up and, if we on the Canadian side, the neighbors of this country,

are going to impute to our friends across the border this kind of an imputation that could well spread across the world, then I suggest that it should be withdrawn. Mr. Speaker, it amazes me to hear one member after another stand up and say they disagree with the statement, that it should not have been made, that it was indiscriminate, and yet they object to the withdrawal of that statement. Now I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this debate could be ended and finalized at this time.

**Mr. Kramer:** — The request for withdrawal was never made in this house in the regular session. These people had the opportunity to ask for withdrawal yesterday.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald (Milestone):** — The point of the idea of yesterday and today brings in another subject. Yesterday this statement was made in this house and in this assembly. It was passed over very quickly. No one had any realization of the impact, and I would suggest that if you listened to the news this morning, that this statement had far different effect this morning than it had yesterday afternoon. I would also like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we permit this statement to remain in the records of this house, it will establish a precedent that perhaps could be expanded upon in the future. I also want to point out that I think in all fairness, that this junior member has made this statement, not because of inspiration from his own mind, but because of actions and statements of senior members of the opposition.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I heard the voice of anti-sectarianism stand up and take a vicious personal attack against the member of the cloth in this province. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that long after this member has passed into oblivion because of the insignificance and infantile statements that he has made, that the man that he attacked will be remembered for his contribution to the youth and to the education of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, this province as a whole is beginning to be critical of statements that have been made in the first fifteen days of this house, and I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we permit this statement to stand, if we condone it, and if we endorse it, we are only asking for it to happen, not only again, but we are giving it public approval of all the people of Canada, and this I object to.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to repeat what has been said here this afternoon from this side of the house. I am going to try and stick as close as I can to original comments which I do not think have been made to this time. I do want to say though what may seem apparent to many people on this side of the house, if not on the other.

Yesterday when the remarks that we are discussing were made, there was not one objection from the other side of the house. Following the remarks of the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link), the member from Regina South arose and spoke for some time. After he had finished speaking, the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere), the Minister for Natural Resources, rose in his place and spoke until he adjourned the debate and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, he was due this afternoon at 3.45 to rise in his place . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — At 2:45.

**Mr. Davies:** — . . . at 2.45, I beg your pardon, and at that time he could have made a full development of all the arguments that were advanced by the hon. Premier this afternoon, and by other members of his government. This he did not choose to do. And if I may say so, in expressing my own opinion, the whole of this afternoon has the atmosphere of a distasteful political kind of tactics which I do not think needed to have taken place. The member for Elrose (Mr. Leith), a few minutes ago made a quite moderate statement. I suggest to the members on the other side of the house, that had the Premier risen in his place and pointed out to the member from

Saskatoon (Mr. Link) in a temperate way what has been said, that this whole debate might have had a different tone and tenor this afternoon. I must say I do regret what has taken place. I want to associate myself with the remarks of my seatmate, the member from Regina West. I think that he has got the debate back on the track that it should have started on in the first place. There is no doubt about it, that the remarks of the member from Saskatoon were made because of the earlier visit of the Governor of Montana to the Liberal party convention. I do not think there is the slightest doubt about this point of view. Some remarks were made about investment being hurt because of the remarks by the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link). Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that if one put together all the statements that have been made by the hon. Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), about the stagnation and doom in Saskatchewan, then one could truly charge that his remarks have hurt investment in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — I do not think that, Mr. Speaker, that the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) was accurately expressing the opinions of members of this party. I personally think that he was in error, I do agree with other members who have spoken, however, that he was entitled to speak his mind. I do think that what he did say was actuated completely because of what had happened earlier and was sparked by the visit of the Governor of Montana to the province of Saskatchewan.

May I say too, while I am on my feet, something about the remarks of the hon. Attorney General in this discussion. He spoke about a "running fire of interjection" from this side of the house. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity during the last few days of examining the records of the house, the debates of the house, and I may say, and I am trying to be as dispassionate as I can in this judgement, that at least two-thirds of all the interjections that were made as they are recorded in the debates of the house, came from members of the other side of the house when they were in opposition in this house. I think they are on very poor ground indeed to make that kind of a charge. He also made some statement about the Star Phoenix editorial and a reference about us taking that paper to our bosoms on some occasions. I can only say that would be the last newspaper that I would take to my bosom. I do not think it applies to any other member of this side of the house either.

I do want to say this, and I will be quite frank about it, that to my mind the editors of the Star Phoenix especially over the course of the last six or eight months, have not distinguished themselves for fairness and impartiality. Their editorials I think have been almost completely one-sided. The particular editorial, to which the Attorney General has made reference, was an example of this kind of writing. The numerous situations that he has neglected to point out in his editorials, that could be ascribed to members of this house on the other side, it seems to me, points up the remarks that I make now about the partiality and the one-sidedness of these editorials.

Now, I do not, Mr. Speaker, want to repeat what has already been said. I do want to say again though that, if the advice of the member for Elrose had been followed, I think that we might have seen a completely different course and tenor in this particular debate this afternoon.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to add a few words to the unpleasant situation which has developed within this legislature this afternoon, I felt obligated to rise in my seat and say a few words.

I will agree with those who have already participated in the debate. I do not concur with the words expressed by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link), however, in a democratic country, one is entitled to think as he chooses and according to our Bill of Rights, which gives the people of Canada the right to say what they think. Editorials have been injected into this debate. When the two major papers in this province, The Saskatoon Star Phoenix, and the Regina Leader Post, begin to say something complimentary about me, I am going to start worrying. Yes I am going to begin worrying, when these two dailies begin writing something complimentary about me, or about the political movement which I represent.

Democracy, as we understand it has been established for centuries

beginning with the Magna Carta in 1215. It took two world wars and a great sacrifice of human resources, and economic wealth to fight and preserve democracy as we know it. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that if this house proposes to force the hon. member for Saskatoon to withdraw his statement, our democracy will suffer for our action.

Mention has been made, Mr. Speaker, of my reference in the course of the Budget Debate to the stand taken by two church members. I was very reluctant to bring out the name of one individual although it was almost forced upon me. I do recognize that this esteemed member of the church has contributed, as the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) stated to the welfare of education in this province. The hon. member's remarks were not made in the heat of debate. If I have offended the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) in making reference in the Budget Debate, I am sorry. I used the words which were used by the venerable member of the Catholic church. No doubt the members of the government will make use of the statement made by the hon. member from Saskatoon in the same way as they did with my statement.

Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — I rise to take part in this debate because there are one or two things which have not as yet been said. I know this is hard to believe this afternoon, because there have been a great many words spoken in the last two and a half hours.

I think myself that the whole subject has been inflated and that we have made a mountain out of a mole hill for various purposes. I do not want to describe the motives for the government. My ideas as to why they brought this in, if I would repeat it here, probably would be ruled out of order. I want to say that the reason for saying that this is some which has been blown out of all proportion comes about because of something I heard over T.V. last night. One of the T.V. people phoned the Governor of Montana. In the telephone conversation, the latter said that he was not concerned about the statement which was made here yesterday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, since I was the only one who seemed to be thinking about the Governor's remarks, I thought probably, for a while this afternoon, that I had been dreaming about this, but since one of the hon. members from Saskatoon (Mr. Brockelbank) mentioned that he heard the Governor's remarks over the air, expressing disconcert, then I say that we have in this legislature, built this from a mole hill into a mountain.

I want to say too that I looked at this morning's edition quite carefully at the start of this debate, and no where in that issue — this morning's issue of the Leader Post — was I able to find any reference to what the Governor of Montana said. I do not know why this was left out. There is no doubt that the Leader Post knows just as well as I do, just as well as the T.V. people do, that the Governor was contacted. They did not see fit to publish his comment, by design or neglect, I do not know. If this question could be answered, Mr. Speaker, we probably have another reason why this debate arose today. The last observation I wish to make is that for years the great Liberal party here in Canada and in Great Britain also, has stood, Mr. Speaker, for free speech. They seemed to have come down considerably since those days, now they are still for freedom but it seems to be more for freedom of enterprise, Mr. Speaker, rather than freedom of speech.

Now I think that I would agree with the member for Regina West, when he quoted Voltaire's comment:

I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death, your right to say it.

But the Liberal party, Mr. Speaker, certainly has come a long way from this. They do not believe that a person has a right to say what he thinks and here in this legislature of all places, Mr. Speaker, they have objected to a person's right to speak as he thinks.

Mr. Speaker, today is a sad occasion for Liberalism. Today a disgraceful low has been achieved for Liberalism, and this, Mr. Speaker, is what I had risen to say. I assure you that I do not know whether I would have made the statement which the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) made, but I will defend his right to say it and I will defend his right to say it in this legislature of all places. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.M. Cuelenaere (Shellbrook):** — Mr. Speaker, I had no intentions when I came here today to take part in this particular debate. I came here expecting to speak on another subject but what has been said just recently impels me to say a few words.

The matter of urgency that is before the house now, is not what people have been calling one another in this house and outside of this house for some time. What the matter of urgency is which is being debated, is what a friendly neighboring state has been called. Mr. Speaker, that is the matter that is reprehensible and I think that is the matter which is the matter of urgency.

Now, much has been said this afternoon on the subject of freedom of speech. I think that everybody in this house takes exactly the same stand that we would defend freedom of speech even unto death. But, Mr. Speaker, while we in this country, in the United States, and elsewhere, do enjoy very wide freedom of speech, that does not include, in civil law, or even in criminal law, the right to make defamatory statements and, Mr. Speaker, . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — . . . if a person outside of the house makes a defamatory statement he is subject to an action for libel or slander.

Now an immunity is granted to members who make statements in the house, either in the House of Commons or in this house, or in any legislature under our system of democracy. But, Mr. Speaker, that immunity has always been given and granted to members in the house because it has always been traditional for the house to impose upon itself a certain degree of self-discipline and it seems to me what the real issue confronting the house is, "should we impose that degree of self-discipline upon ourselves against what the government considers to be a defamatory statement against a friendly foreign state?" I submit that the matter could have been quite easily resolved if the member from Saskatoon had stood up and made a statement that he made this statement in the heat of debate, that he had told the house very simply that he did not mean to imply that the state of Montana was a state to which you could impose the connotation of fascism as it is known, and I submit that the matter could have been easily resolved and we could have gone on with the debate before the house.

It seems to me that the real issue right now goes somewhat beyond the individuals concerned. It seems to me it goes beyond what has been said. I think that when the real issue here is, "is there going to be no limit whatsoever upon what is said, or are we going to impose some degree of self-discipline upon what is said?" Are we going to impose that degree of self discipline against ourselves making statements against persons who are not here and cannot defend themselves?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that practically all members of the opposition have disassociated themselves from the statement that was made by the member for Saskatoon. It seems to me that it would have been a very simple matter for them to have requested him to withdraw that statement. I submit that that is what he should do now, and that we should end the debate on that correct note so that the people, not only in Saskatchewan, but the people of Montana and elsewhere, will know that he and no one else in this house associate themselves with the statement of calling these people fascists. I think that would be a quick and a simple solution.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Will the hon. member permit a question before he sits down?

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — Yes.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — When was the hon. member asked to withdraw his statement or what chance has he had, the way this debate was brought in?

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — Mr. Speaker, I assume that he could take part in this debate like everyone else. He was entitled to get up and make a statement and offer the explanation after the Premier has spoken and



after it was decided by the Speaker that it was a matter of urgency.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Did the house not then adjourn for a different business after the Premier spoke?

**Mr. Walker:** — Would the hon. member permit a question. He referred to defamatory statements and he said there was a distinction between the statements made outside the house and inside the house. Now as a lawyer, would the hon. member say that this statement if made outside the house would have been defamatory

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — I am just talking about the general purposes of freedom of speech that statements made outside the house, that we can make inside the house, not against one another, which would not be defamatory and I submit that if the same statement is made outside, it would be. Now in this particular case of course, if it was said outside the house, the state of Montana would probably not take action, but it is in our rules and regulations that you do not make statements against defamatory or derogatory to the crown, you do not make statements derogatory to a foreign friendly power and that is the point I am trying to make, that it should be withdrawn.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak at this time. I thought enough had been said until my good friend the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) the member for Shellbrook got up to speak.

Now he has stated that he was busy with his homework yesterday. He possibly did not notice what was going on. But I suggest that the hon. member for Saskatoon has not had an opportunity to correct his statement.

If you people had not been sound asleep on the other side of the house, you would have done your duty yesterday and got up in your places and demanded withdrawal then instead of cooking up something in the back room that you think is going to gain you some political advantage.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Chairman, I object to these tactics, I think they are wholly unbecoming of this house and, as far as I am concerned, I have reservations right now on what the hon. member should do and certainly I leave it up to him. But I maintain that he had no opportunity to clarify his position due to the unfair manner in which the Premier brought in this motion. If he had wanted to take an honorable approach, he could have politely suggested that due to the publicity this statement was given that the hon. member should withdraw the statement. He could have done this without all this unnecessary histrionics and stage play. Mr. Speaker, I object to this.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, may I close the debate. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am amazed after a whole afternoon to see that the hon. member for Saskatoon, who made this statement, sit steadily in his seat, and on his seat, and refuse to retract the statement which he made.

**Mr. Kramer:** — He has never been asked.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We have certainly asked him repeatedly. This debate could have stopped two hours ago, had he retracted. He has had every opportunity. I will say, that I am indeed pleased to hear numerous members on the other side agree that these remarks were not appropriate. They didn't agree with them, but they say they defend his right to say them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, there is no member in the house who disagrees that a member should have freedom of speech. Nevertheless, there are certain things which should not be said. I certainly for one, would

never want to be lectured by an socialist about freedom. Because if there is one subject they don't know very much about it is freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a debate for two hours and a half. The debate has been on whether or not we should adjourn to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. Since we have debated it for two hours and a half, I do not suppose there is very much to be accomplished now to adjourn the house. I say again, I can hardly believe that the hon. member for Saskatoon could sit in the chamber knowing the feelings of his own group, knowing the feelings of this group, knowing the feelings of the people of Saskatchewan, and not withdraw.

However, if he has the extremely bad taste to be persistent in this matter, that is his privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw the adjournment motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member has asked leave to withdraw the adjournment motion. Is leave given?

Motion is withdrawn.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Before we proceed with this debate any further, there are just a few things I would like to bring to the attention of all the hon. members in the chamber.

I think that all hon. members know my very great reluctance to limit debate under any circumstances, but I wish to draw to your attention that there are restrictions in the matter of debate and for the benefit of all members, and for their future guidance, I wish to quote some of them. I quote from Beauchesne's Parliamentary Guide, Chapter 3, Citation 140. This is going to take a little time and I am happy that I am able to do this off air time, so that I do not have to interfere with anybody's air time. Probably I should have done this before if it hadn't been for that.

**Mr. Walker:** — Did you say 14 . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I said Citation 140 in regard to personal reflections.

Subsection 1. The rule relating to personal reflections occurring in debate, may be stated thus, namely: that it is double disorderly for any member, in speaking, to digress from the question before the house, and to attack any other member, by means of opprobrious language, applied to his person and character, or to his conduct, either in general, or in some particular occasion, and tending to bring him into ridicule, contempt, or hatred, with his fellow-members, or to create ill blood in the house.

Subsection 2. The whole law of Parliament on this subject is admirably summed up and expressed in the following Standing Order of the Lords: "to prevent misunderstanding, and for avoiding offensive speeches, when matters are debated, either in the house, or in committees, it is for honour's sake thought fit, and so ordered, that all personal, sharp, or taxing speeches be forborne; and whoever answereth another man's speech shall apply his answer to the matter without wrong to the person; and as nothing offensive is to be spoken, so nothing is to be ill taken, if the party that speaks it shall presently make a fair exposition, or clear denial, of the words that might bear any ill construction; and if any offence be given in that kind, as the house itself will be very sensible thereof, so it will sharply censure the offender, and give the party offended a fit reparation, and full satisfaction."

I proceed to Citation 154, subsection 1, also in Beauchesne's Parliamentary guide:

Threatening language is also unparliamentary.

When a member has intimated that he would move the adjournment unless certain explanations were given, the Speaker has interposed and called him to order for using language menacing to the house.

Subsection 2: Words may not be used hypothetically, or conditionally, if they are plainly intended to convey a direct imputation. Putting a hypothetical case is not the way to evade what would be in itself disorderly.

Subsection 3: The imputation of bad motives, or motives different from those acknowledged, misrepresenting the language of another, or accusing him, in his turn, of misrepresentation, charging him with falsehood, or deceit; or contemptuous or insulting language of any kind; all these are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference.

It is not out of order to say that a member has obstructed the business of the house, or that a speech is an abuse of the rules of the house.

It is not unparliamentary, to say that a statement is untrue, but it is unparliamentary to say that it was untrue, to the knowledge of the member addressing the house.

Subsection 6: The words "purchased by legislation" applied to a member of the house are unparliamentary.

It is a well-known principle that a statement made in this house cannot be contradicted by a statement made by a person who is not a member of the house.

Citation 155, Subsection 1:

It will be useful to give examples here of expressions which are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference. These may be classified as follows:

- (1) The imputation of false or unavowed motives.
- (2) The misrepresentation of the language of another and the accusation of misrepresentation.
- (3) Charges of uttering a deliberate falsehood. The word "calumnious" has generally been held to be in order.
- (4) Abusive and insulting language, e.g.: "Villains", "impertinence", "rude remarks", "gross calumny", "impudence", "ruffianism", "hypocrites", "Pharisees", "murderer", "hooligan", "blackguard", "traitor", "charges of treason", "That member ought to have been imprisoned for high treason", "alleging that a member's statements were not 'consonant with personal honour'", "malignant slander", "scurrilous", "dishonest", "vicious and vulgar", "criminal", "corrupt", "That a member has been detected in the grossest practice of corruption", alleging "that a member was returned by the refuse of a large constituency", "cad or caddishness", "insulting dog", "description of a member's speech as 'blather', 'lie down, dog', 'behaving like a jackass', 'swine', 'cheat', 'stool-pigeons'".

These are all matters which are considered to be unparliamentary. Now, I draw these restrictions to the attention of all members and to myself, in the very sincere hope that we will be guided thereby in the future.

## BUDGET DEBATE

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thatcher, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Blakeney, and the proposed sub-amendment thereto

by Mr. Michayluk.

**Hon. J.M. Cuelenaere (Shellbrook):** — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last evening, I was pointing out, while discussing matters relating to parks and recreation that with the prospects of leisure and a tremendous growth of tourism, this government is dedicated to the further expansion and improvement of our provincial parks, our campsites, our historic sites, for the benefit of both our people and for the promotion of the tourist industry.

To this end, the budget makes substantial provisions for both maintenance and capital expenditure. More will have to be spent in future years when plans, now underway, have graduated from architects and park planner's drawing boards. Some of the main expenditures provided in the budget are almost \$200,000, an increase of nearly \$14,000 for park planning; \$732,600, and increase of nearly \$50,000 for park operation and maintenance; \$1,600,000, a little over, representing an increase of over \$130,000 for capital construction in our parks. A total of \$324,000 will be spent this year on campsites, picnic sites and historic sites. Nearly \$200,000, an increase of some \$70,000 will be spent in grants to regional parks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking about parks, I might just mention here that, for the first time, there will be some depreciation grants made to the regional parks and legislation will be brought down to give effect to that item.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the matter of forestry. In that connection, I want to inform the house, that a new agreement with Dumont Forest Industries and their associates has been entered into and I am now prepared to lay on the table all agreements entered into with the Dumonts.

Before going into details of the Dumont agreement, I would first like to make a general statement, relating to forestry. Mr. Speaker, the stagnation in industrial and resource development that has existed in Saskatchewan, as compared to other provinces, is reflected nowhere more than in our forest development. There are virtually millions and millions of board feet of timber and pulp wood left unharvested, often over ripe and stagnant to rot and to burn, while scores of people in our forest areas sit idle and, in many cases, on social aid.

Mr. Speaker, it is a well known fact that the forest, like every other crop, must be harvested in order to be developed. Mr. Speaker, we propose that it be harvested. Section 5 of the Forest Act, which appoints the Timber Board as agent of the minister for the purpose of harvesting, marketing and utilizing the forest parks of the province, will be repealed. In our view, the policy placing a virtual monopoly in the Timber Board, has failed to provide adequately for a sustained development of our forest resources.

I hasten, however, Mr. Speaker, to point out that there is no intention to eliminate the Timber Board. I recognize that it can serve a valuable purpose in the case of certain producers who require assistance to operate their mill and require a central agency to dispose of their lumber or product. But, Mr. Speaker, any person or company able to show a ready market for their timber products, or ability to utilize that product will, in the future, be entitled to obtain cutting rights or management licenses direct from the Forestry Branch without the necessity of going through the Timber Board.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — Every effort will be made to attract investment in forest development and particularly for the utilization of our pulp wood of which we have such a vast quantity.

I assure the house, what steps will be taken for the preservation and the conservation of the forest on a sustained yield basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that a start in the development is being made as a result of the negotiations and the agreement with the Dumont's last July and which have just now been revised. The July agreement, which have just now been revised. The July agreement, which was in operation provided that Dumont would construct a stud mill at both Hudson Bay and at Amisk Lake. The mill at Hudson Bay was to commence operation in January.

That agreement provided that a company would, on or before July 1st, 1967, commence the construction of a 150 ton pulp mill and that if the company failed to commence the construction of this pulp mill in 1967, the agreement would be terminated and all physical assets of the company would be forfeited to the minister. Following the execution of the July agreement, Dumont's took steps to clear the site, grade a spur track and make other improvements and they entered into contracts with local people for the supply of pulp wood.

When the July agreement was signed, the company was satisfied that it was feasible to construct a pulp mill within the three year period called for in the contract. They must have been satisfied or surely they would not have entered into an agreement whereby they would forfeit possibly \$1,000,000 worth of assets if they failed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the house the fact that, unfortunately, a vast change took place in the pulp situation between July and November of 1964. During that period, it became publicly known that projected pulp mills in British Columbia alone had increased tremendously. And, Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from the Royal Bank of Canada. It is signed by the secretary to J.K. Rolls, Manager of Commercial Industrial Development. This includes a number of clippings from newspapers. Here is one summarizing what has taken place in the expansion of the pulp and paper industry in British Columbia alone. It is dated February 3, 1965, Mr. Speaker, and it tells a very interesting story. It is entitled "Expansion of Pulp and Paper Industry in British Columbia." The first item deals with existing mills in production, and it lists eight mills showing the market pulp, sulphate and paper that is produced. Now, this shows that there were eight mills in production in British Columbia at this time — that is to say as of February 3rd. Of those eight mills, five are presently expanding and expansion alone will increase the output by twenty-five per cent.

The next item deals with "New Mills under Construction". This shows that, at the present time, there are three new mills presently under construction. But what is even more alarming, from the point of view of the contract that was entered into with the Dumont's, was the fourth item entitled "Projects Planned — Timber Allocated", and it shows that there are, at the moment, six mills that have announced their plans and that have received timber allocations. Then the final item, "Projects Announced Awaiting Timber Allocation". These are the mills that have been recently announced. It provides for nine new mills. So in addition to the eight mills presently in existence, five of which are expanding, and the eighteen mills under construction or planned or announced, there are these eighteen mills which have now announced possible production.

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Would the minister permit a question?

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — Yes.

**Mr. Willis:** — Do I understand it. You are announcing pulp mills for British Columbia?

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I made it very clear that this is an expansion of pulp mills, and all I am doing in answer to the hon. member from Melfort (Mr. Willis) is to try to explain the reason why it became necessary to change the basis of the contract that was entered into last July, and I am going to come to that. I am prepared to lay the agreement on the table I will give you the full particulars of that very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, here is another item, dated February 3rd:

Because of massive expansion in the pulp and paper industry, the market is likely to be very competitive for a few years in the 1967-1970 era.

And then it goes on:

The pulp and paper expansion projected in B.C. plus other new capacities which will no doubt eventualize in other production areas, represents a formidable potential increase in pulp availability.

Now, all these developments, after the July agreement was executed with Dumont's and placed them, of course, in a rather difficult if not impossible position. After these announcements came, Mr. Speaker, it was no longer clear to them that it would be feasible for them to construct a pulp mill within three years. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this information that I have given to you, bears that out, that it would be almost impossible to be sure that it was going to be feasible now to proceed with the construction of a pulp mill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because of that uncertainty, and the resulting danger of forfeiture, the company found it difficult to obtain necessary finance for the construction and operation of their stud mill. Accordingly, in December, Dumont's appraised me of their position. At that stage, we either had to agree to a cancellation and forfeiture of its existing assets, or negotiate an agreement. And under the terms of the existing agreement, if at any time the company could not proceed with the construction of a pulp mill, of course, the contract would be forfeited and whatever assets were there, we could take over.

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — Lose their \$400 . . .

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — Now, the company pointed out that it had an alternative proposal in which it would be joined by another company, to utilize the same product of pulp wood in large quantities in the Hudson Bay area.

As a result of negotiations, which have extended through January, until last Friday, with the Dumont interests and also with representatives of the Simpson Timber Company of Seattle, Washington, it was agreed to cancel the July agreement. Today, I wish to announce that a new agreement has been executed.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — Mr. Speaker, under the new agreement, Dumont's have forfeited all exclusive right to any forest area of . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — . . . the province. Admittedly, incidentally, this 8,000 square miles that was allocated to them and for which you are applauding, are now being released. Do not forget, it is right here, in correspondence with my predecessor, which these preliminary arrangements were made, and from time to time since the Dumont's agreement has been signed, certain members of the opposition have been taking credit for having arranged it. Of course, I should point out that the 8,000 acres were set out, the map prepared, and the letters were all written and the option to the Dumont's was given up until the end of June. So, if you want to applaud, that is fine. This was not one of our give-aways. It was one of your give-aways.

Now incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I have the correspondence here. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the former agreement would have provided for even lower stumpage than was finally negotiated, even following the construction of a pulp mill. I am going to deal with stumpage in a few moments.

Now, under the new agreement . . .

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — . . . give-away . . .

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — Yes, we will talk about the give-away program, Mr. Speaker, in a moment.

Under the new agreement, as I said before, we have forfeited all exclusive rights to any forest area of the province. Admittedly, the firm commitment for a pulp mill is gone. But gone also is the 8,000 square mile commitment. The new agreement is solely a pulp wood utilization agreement. In other words, all other forms of saw timber is still reserved to the minister. Under this new agreement, cutting rights under the direction of the Director of Forestry were granted the Dumont's to cut 100,000 cords per year, to produce 50,000,000 board feet of studs. This is going to be made out of wood not now going into lumber. The company has agreed to proceed immediately with the construction of a larger and better mill at Hudson Bay, only to the value in excess of \$1,000,000. All existing contracts for a pulp wood mill made with contracts, will of course, be honoured.

The company will, in the future, be associated with the Simpson Timber Company.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about stumpage and the financial returns. I think it is 5.30 and I think that possibly I will leave the subject of stumpage for immediately after we reconvene.

The assembly adjourned at 5.30 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned at 5.30, I was dealing with the new contract that had just been entered into with the Dumont interests and I had given some of the particulars of what was being done or was going to be done under that contract.

I want to speak for a moment on the matter of stumpage or the financial returns to the province under the new agreement. Under the July agreement, and until the pulp mill was built, the stumpage payable by Dumont was roughly speaking, pretty well as provided in the regulation. When the pulp mill was built, the province would have received, under the former agreement, \$1.40 per cord for rough spruce, and \$1 for jack pine.

Mr. Speaker, under the new agreement, the province will receive \$2.00 per cord for rough spruce and \$1.50 per cord for jack pine — the highest return ever paid for pulp wood in the history of the province. In addition, the company will pay fire dues on cutting areas and other charges provided for in the regulations.

Mr. Speaker, it was most distressing indeed, to hear speaker after speaker, going up and down Hanley constituency and elsewhere in the province crying, "sell-out" and "give-away" of our natural resources.

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — That is what it was.

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — In contract after contract, signed by the former government, between 1954 and 1963, they offered pulp wood at stumpage rates of 66 and 2/3 cents for the first five years; \$1.33 and 1/3 for the next five years; and \$1.40 thereafter, for rough spruce. And, Mr. Speaker, less than 35 cents per cord for jack pine for five years; less than 70 cents per cord for the following five years; and \$1.10 or less per cord thereafter.

There is a company, now operating in Saskatchewan, which paid 75 cents per cord for jack pine for two years; \$1.00 per cord for the next two years; and are now paying \$1.10 per cord.

**Mr. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — Giving it away.

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — The Dumont agreement provides for 50 cents per cord for rough spruce and 40 cents per cord for jack pine, more than any other contract signed by the previous government, without any concessions for the first years of operation.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Best price.

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — The present contract with Dumont industry will bring more to the province in revenue and will, what is more important, bring employment to many in the forested areas of the province.

Mr. Speaker, employment has already begun. I quote from a news item appearing in Saskatoon Star Phoenix, February 2nd, 1965. This news item is entitled, "Pulp Wood moving to Dumont Mills — Endeavor".

Pulp wood was being loaded on flat cars on the C.N.R. here daily to be sent to the new Dumont pulp mill being erected at Hudson Bay. Truck loads of pulp wood were being brought here day and night from William Jokabowsky's mill, twenty miles northwest of the village, filling the contract that Mr. Jokabowsky has with the Hudson Bay plant.

It was reported that Fred Dalton, local contractor and lumberman, was taking out 30,000 cords of pulp wood for the same company from the McBride Lake area, east of the reserve in the

Porcupine Plain.

And the article concludes:

Many men from the district were being employed in these enterprises.

**Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question at this point?

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — Yes.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Did I understand you to say that this pulp was going to a pulp mill at Hudson Bay Junction?

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — It says Pulp Mill . . . No, it did not say a pulp mill, the article does say "to be sent to the new Dumont Pulp Mill being erected at Hudson Bay".

Admittedly, it was referring to this article, and I am just quoting the article, of course. The announcement had been made in July that what was to build there was a stud mill. This is there in the report from Endeavor, but Mr. Speaker, the point that I am trying to make is that this article does show that large quantities of pulp wood are now being cut and that many men in the district are being employed in this particular enterprise that we are talking about.

Dumont's have let out a number of contracts that I stated before would be honoured, and, of course, there is a large quantity of wood being cut now and giving employment, which is something of major importance.

To continue, Mr. Speaker, the Dumont and the Simpson people have assured me that the mill provided in the new agreement is only a first step in the development of a complex for the integrated utilization of the forest, including the possibilities of a pulp mill when such an enterprise is feasible.

Dumonts, Mr. Speaker, enjoys a good reputation for having carried on successful operations in British Columbia. The Simpson Timber Company, dating back to 1890, has carried on successful operations in western United States. This company is a forest product company, operating twenty manufacturing plants, including a pulp mill, in eleven communities. It, alone, of all the timber companies founded in south western Washington, in Simpson's time, had continued to this date, without change of ownership or location. A demonstration of the faith in the land and people, has been the theme of Simpson operation policy, since it was founded. This confidence of land to product timber in continuous crops has been expressed by faithfully keeping all cut-over land for reforestation.

Officials of the company have stated that the policy which has been adhered to in the United States by this company will be adhered to in Canada, and that their future plans, in the area, include the establishment of a forest utilization complex which will serve both the area and the province in a way in which both they and the province will be proud.

In fairness, Mr. Speaker, to the Dumont Forest Industries Limited, I would like to refer to a front page article appearing in the Leader Post on February 16th, which stated that: "Dumont Paid-up Capital said \$400."

This was an accurate reply to the question asked in this house. The reply is, as it appears in the record of the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies. Mr. Speaker, however, the question does not give the date. The returns showing a paid-up capital of \$400 was filed on April 25, 1964, only twenty -five days after they were incorporated. The authorized capital of the company is over \$500,000 and Dumont's have offered proof that they have spent over \$140,000 in site improvement and grading of spur track and they have built an office building and have made other expenditures, all apart from the contract for pulp wood entered into with the contractors in the area.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that this is just a beginning and it is a good beginning for the utilization of pulp wood in the Hudson's Bay



area, and I venture to predict that more favourable contracts will be entered into in the near future for the better utilization of our forest resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to turn my attention to the proposed Indian and Metis branch . . .

**Mr. C.G. Willis:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question, please?

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — May I complete my address, then I will be glad . . .

**Mr. C.G. Willis:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of order, I have here the question which I asked in the house regarding Dumont. The question is, "what is the total paid-up capital of Dumont Forest Industries Limited?" Not what was, or anything in the past — it is, "what is the paid-up capital, the total paid-up capital?" I understand that the minister has not answered the question correctly. Have we been given false information in the house, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — In answer to the question, I think that the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Willis) could have obtained exactly the same information and maybe possibly knew it before he asked it. I do not know, but it is a very simple matter to go to the office of the Registrar of Joint Stock Company. I have here a photostat of the certificate of incorporation of the Dumont Forest Industries Limited, and I shall be pleased to lay this on the table. It is dated the first of April, 1964. I also have the returns of allotment of shares by the company. This return of allotment of shares was referred to by some other speaker on the other side and when he mentioned that there were — I think it was the hon. member from Melfort — when he referred to 40,000 shares that had been given, and to whom they had been given, and he proceeded to say that they were valued at 1 cent. Therefore, a total paid-up capitalization of \$400. But, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what I am referring to, this is dated the 25th of April, 1964, and as far as the question that was answered by the provincial secretary, this was the information as far as was filed at the office of the Joint Stock Company.

I am only pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that this is dated the 25th of April, 1964. The hon. member, I believe it was the hon. member for Melfort, who said that he had been there on Labor Day and that there was some clearing of the land at the site. He mentioned the fact that there some work was apparently being done and so on. Mr. Speaker, I can say that any reasonable person would know that this could not have been done for the sum of \$400, particularly, when you bear in mind that the registrar's fees alone for incorporation, amounted to \$282, at the time of incorporation.

The capitalization was probably the amount that was advanced at the time in order to pay the incorporation fee. It was done at a time when the Dumont Forest people were in the process of negotiating with the previous administration and the incorporation, of course, as is indicated, was done on the first of April.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am only pointing out that while, as I said before, the question was answered correctly as far as the records at the office of the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies is concerned, it does not necessarily represent how much money was invested by way of improvements, and by way of studies by the Dumont people, which could be done by way of loans or in many other ways. As some members, who may have had some experience in private companies, know well, there are various ways of financing operations by a private company. I want to point that out to the house.

As I said a moment ago, I am now going to turn my attention to the proposed Indian and Metis branch.

It has been suggested, Mr. Speaker, that this is a branch that should not be proceeded with. Concern and even criticism in the house has been made on the establishment of the branch. It has been suggested that work on behalf of the Indians should be done, as with other people, through existing departments and agencies of the government. With this, I must take serious issue. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are many good reasons why an Indian and Metis branch urgently needs to be established.

Mr. Speaker, figures would indicate that government has the

third largest Indian population of any province in Canada. It is exceeded only by the province of Ontario and the province of British Columbia. Until 1963, there were just a few Indians less in Saskatchewan than in the province of Manitoba, merely a matter of 200. But the rate of growth in Saskatchewan, as indicated by statistics, is larger and the indications are that we now have the third largest Indian population of any province in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to bore the assembly with statistics on the plight of our Indian population. A few will suffice. The latest statistics were issued by the federal government at the time the provinces met with the federal government at the federal-provincial conference on Indian Affairs, in the latter part of October.

These tables show that there are nine Indian agencies in the province of Saskatchewan and gives the percentage of workers earning less than \$2,000 per year. In the poorest agency, 98.1 of the workers earn less than \$2,000. The second highest one is 94.2 and then it goes down to 94.2 again; 92.4 — 90 per cent. In the wealthiest agency, 80.8 per cent of the workers earn less than \$2,000. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in the best agency only 19.2 per cent of the Indian workers earn more than \$2,000. The figures revealed that in six out of the nine agencies in Saskatchewan, 90 per cent of the workers earn less than \$2,000.

Mr. Speaker, these figures are reflected in the social aid cost. The lack of earning power of our Indian population is reflected in social aid costs. The federal government's expenditure for food, fuel, clothing, and other supplies for Indians has nearly doubled in the four years following 1959 — from \$1,250,000 to over \$2,000,000 was paid to the Saskatchewan Indians. In one agency in Saskatchewan, social aid costs increased four-fold from \$70,000 in 1960 to almost \$300,000 in 1963. While the per capita cost of social aid for all the rest of the population of Saskatchewan is \$16, which, Mr. Speaker, I might suggest is in itself a cause for alarm, the per capita cost of social aid among the Indian population is almost ten times that figure, nearly \$153 per capita. This is to day \$153 per year for every Indian man, woman and child in Saskatchewan.

As I said before, it is growing at an alarming rate. Mr. Speaker, in the light of these figures and in the light of facts known to all of us, as to living conditions of our Indian population, I suggest that any government would be remiss in its duties if it did not recognize the conditions and at least try remedial measures. Surely it is apparent that what has been done in the past has been a dismal failure. In this opulent society, boasting the second highest standard of living in the world, there is still this large segment of our population living in extreme poverty, and often in degradation. It is a situation crying out for immediate attention.

As the Premier explained, this branch is not going to be a branch to control the Indian and the Metis. Its main functions will be to promote and co-ordinate community development, to provide upgrading and training, to assist in the placement of Indian and Metis in gainful employment, to assist integration, and offer guidance.

It will be the aim of the branch to work through other departments of government which offer specific services. Education will continue under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education. Social welfare services and health service now available to the Metis population, will of course, continue under their respective Departments. I shall speak further on the function of the branch later on in this session when the amendments to the Department of Natural Resource Act will come under review.

Meanwhile, I want to assure the house that nothing will be done to in any way affect treaty rights and reserve rights which the Indians now have and enjoy.

I have already expressed myself as being in favor of negotiating with the Indians and the federal government and the municipalities to have Indian Reserves form part of our municipal institutions. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this would serve to make available to our Indian population the municipal services and the many governmental services now operated through or by the municipality. But more important, it would serve to bring our Indian population into the stream of provincial life and give them more local self-government, which we believe is so essential.

Statistics, similar to those I have quoted, relating to the Metis are not available. I suggest, however, Mr. Speaker, that it is a well

known fact there are large numbers of Metis who are living in conditions similar to those of our Indian population and are as urgently, if not more urgently, in need of assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in a news item that came over the C.B.C. this morning and is also reported in yesterday's Leader Post, regarding a group of 150 treaty Indians who marched to the legislature of the province of Alberta asking the government to give some assistance. The news report reads in part as follows:

150 treaty Indians, some of them carrying placards, arrived at the legislature to protest living conditions at Hale Lake. Mr. Coburn said,

and that is the Hon. Mr. Coburn,

that the Premier promised to write to Ottawa making strong representations on behalf of the Indians.

And speaking of Indians, they have requested help in establishing farms or ranches in launching logging operations and help to remove conditions in which most must beg for livelihood.

We are not waiting for delegations of Indian people to march on the legislature with placards. We called a conference of the Indian and Metis people in Saskatoon. We were willing to sit down and discuss with them their problems and possible remedial measures.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we are doing a little more than merely writing to Ottawa and making representations on behalf of the Indian people. We propose to do something positive in an effort to free them of the plight in which they now find themselves. Mr. Speaker, I can truthfully say that I am proud to belong to a party which before the election, saw the problem and which is prepared to do something about it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — I do not pretend, Mr. Speaker, that we have a magic formula to solve the problems facing our Indian and Metis population. I am the first to acknowledge that it cannot be solved in a year or two, or even possibly in the lifetime of a government, but I do hope that a good start will be made to the end that this Jubilee Year will mark the dawn of a brighter day for our first citizens, the people of Indian ancestry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other interesting programs in my department about which I could speak — the program in fisheries, community development, housing and industrial development, relating particularly to the northern part of the province, I could speak at some length on the proposed ARDA program and how this is going to affect the northern areas, and which has been described as one of the most dynamic programs ever conceived to fight poverty wherever it may exist. Working with the officials of the department, we have set out a blueprint of desirable future programs. I shall leave these to speak on when the estimates are dealt with. I do hope that in this area that I have spoken about, all can join together to the end that not only the Indian and the Metis, but all who now have less than most of us, will enjoy the bounties of a good land and a good province.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this budget that is before the house offers a good beginning and I shall vote for the motion and not for the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere), first of all for his appointment to that important position in Saskatchewan, and his election to this house. Also, I would like to say that I have a very high regard for the hon. member and I certainly hope that he will continue to try to keep the Department of Natural Resources in the present good condition. I would not like to see a good department like that go to pot in a year or two when we will have to take it over again . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — And so I am happy that under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, this department at least is in fairly good hands.

I cannot congratulate the hon. minister (Mr. Cuelenaere) however, on the few words that he had to say both before 5.30, and since. He made a few starts before 5.30. The first start, I think, did mention millions of feet of timber that were deteriorating and rotting and unharvested over the years and at the present time — and millions of feet remaining to be harvested. I would invite the hon. minister to table a report from the Forestry Department indicating where these millions of board feet are so that the rest of this house and the rest of Saskatchewan might become acquainted as to these new discoveries of timber in the province of Saskatchewan. I hope the hon. member will comply with this request as soon as possible, because I am going to be waiting for this with considerable interest.

I am going to say a little bit more about timber later on. I want to direct my comments to some of the starts that the hon. minister made before 5:30 and since. Before 5.30 he did start out to say, and my expectations rose, I was all set to applaud when he started out by saying "now to proceed with the construction of a pulp mill" — and low and behold we did not get an announcement. The only thing we got was an announcement of several mills being constructed in British Columbia. I had looked twice, my eyes are not quite as good when I do not have my glasses on. I thought possibly we have imported a minister from British Columbia, but I looked and sure there was the hon. member for Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere) standing in his place and it was he and he sounded very much like the people did when they were on this side of the house, talking about construction of mills in B.C. and in Alberta and over in Nova Scotia and everywhere but in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — What did you do in the last three years?

**Mr. Kramer:** — Oh, Mr. Speaker, we will come to that, we will come to that. We will be waiting with continued expectations to see what comes from these mighty, mighty dreams that have been touted and the tremendous announcements that have been made. Because it was not so long ago, Mr. Speaker, that somebody rose in his seat and said, "We do not announce pulp mills before elections, we announce them after elections." Now we have the spectacle of the hon. minister getting up in his place and announcing that because of the tremendous development in British Columbia, we unfortunately have to back out of the agreement we made with the Dumont people so that they are not going to lose their \$400 and so that they are going to be able to survive and build a stud mill and we hope for the sake of the minister that there will eventually be a pulp mill, if I heard him correctly, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we know there are several mills in British Columbia and that there are several mills more. We have known for some time, we have read the papers too. There has been a great deal said on both sides of this house and incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with some of the comments that have been made on both sides of the house, about the Dumont application. There have been several things said in the press last July by the hon. members opposite, announcements supposedly emanating from the hon. minister's office and from various other branches of the government and statements from other interested people and other possibly disinterested people. There was even a statement that was supposed to be accredited for political purposes and I hope it was put in the mouth of Mr. Robert Dumont, that he had negotiated unsuccessfully with the previous government for fourteen months. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest right now that the first time I ever saw the Dumont Brothers was in the fall. The first snow was on the ground — it isn't possible that this may have been late September in Prince Albert. These very pleasant gentlemen arrived in Prince Albert and were flown by the Department of Natural Resources' plane over the whole Hudson Bay forest area and I met them on their return. I was rather startled when they walked into the hotel room. At first glance I thought it was Hoss and Adam and I looked for Little Joe, but the third fellow was even bigger. I felt a little short when these three Douglas Firs walked into the place and I was really impressed with these lumber jacks, and we had a very, very enjoyable meeting. I am sure they had enjoyable meetings with the Department of Industry, with the hon. Russ Brown, on some other technicalities of the development. We paved their way as easily as we could. We made every bit of information available to them. We told them what the government of Saskatchewan was

prepared to do. The hon. minister stated before supper that agreements and maps and so on had been made available, and there was nothing, Mr. Speaker, that was left, no obstacles in their path, except to prove their financial worth.

We did some checking on that, and even after Dunn and Bradstreet. Well, it wasn't a bad report, if they were going to start a saw mill, but it was rather questionable whether they could finance a pulp mill as they proposed to do, but the previous government told them, Mr. Speaker, that if they could provide proof of financial responsibility that we were prepared to go ahead with certain commitments, and the hon. minister well knows this. I see no reason for any of us to be hiding anything that went on before, but I am beginning to wonder about some of the things that have gone on since.

I am beginning to wonder if some of the warnings of some of the senior members on this side of the house were not well taken. Mind you, I was pretty enthusiastic and I was hopeful and I was still hopeful when the hon. minister rose in his place tonight before he called it 5.30, until Mr. Speaker, until he started to give us credit on this side of the house for having initiated the original agreements and initiated the original proceedings, and then I knew, Mr. Speaker, that this pulp mill was not going to come, for some time at least.

This is when my heart sank, when I knew that my hopes were in vain because when any Liberal will give the party, the previous government, any credit for any development or projected development or promised development, you can be mighty sure that there is something radically wrong. "Beware the Greeks when they come bearing gifts."

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — You claim it.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Oh, Mr. Speaker, I did not claim it, I said that we had negotiated, I said that the company had been formed. I believe, if my memory serves me correctly, it was April 8th, and I was hopeful, and I said that we had done everything and that Mr. Dumont's statement was not correct, that he had negotiated unsuccessfully, that we were waiting for him, and if you are prepared to produce the records, and I am sure you know the records, that we were waiting for a letter from him, from the companies that he said were willing to back him financially, and we would have been very foolish, Mr. Speaker, to have proceeded with an agreement until these people had produced proof of financial responsibility and that is all I am going to say on this matter.

Well apparently we have got another pulp wood camp. And more pulp wood is going to be shipped here and there all over the territory and that is fine. It is going to create employment. We were cutting pulp wood, I lost money trying to produce pulp in 1938-1939 under the previous federal government up in the meadow Lake country. I know how that was, but anyway, we have been producing pulp wood for a long time in this province, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that we are going to be producing it for a lot longer. But for the edification of some of the new people here who believe all the propaganda that they have listened to about the north, I want to suggest there is more than just a political climate necessary to bring a pulp mill into Saskatchewan.

We have some considerable draw backs. We have some considerable disadvantages here in the centre of the prairie area, because, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, and let us try and be objective in our approach here. We are in the centre of the prairie region, we have a very scant rainfall and this goes into the north too, may be it looks kind of we when you go up there fishing, but the average mean rainfall in the Prince Albert-Candle Lake area, where incidentally some very important negotiations were being carried on with another pulp firm, which had everything done for them that was possible, in order to try and make the development of a pulp mill possible. But in this area there is a six inch per year average rainfall, compared to twenty-two inches at Hento, and Mr. Speaker, this means a great deal more production per year, per quarter section, per acre, and this means that when a multi-million dollar mill is going to locate in an area they are going to look at all the points, they are going to look at the overall annual production over a period of years, and if there is three times the production at Henon, three times the production of timber per year is available because of the climate over a long term period of years, and besides that all the other factors are also more advantageous. The fire hazard is not nearly as great. Our fire hazard is three or four times as great in the dry area than it is in the wet area, this is obvious. These

are built in disadvantages we have, Mr. Speaker, and it is high time that everybody in this province recognized this and stopped trying to play politics with pulp mills.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — I think this is very true. So let us stop this hanky-panky. We know we have got these disadvantages. I want to see a pulp mill come just as much as the hon. gentleman over there and when I was in office, and when the previous government was in office, we did everything possible to bring them here. Let us, as I say, let us give credit where credit is due. The records show and I am sure that the hon. Minister of Natural Resources will agree with me, the records show that we have done everything possible. The same personnel in the Department of Natural Resources is hosting prospective builders, it is hosting them now, and doing a good job of inviting them and providing the information, everything that is necessary. We have a good staff in the Department of Natural Resources and these people have figures and facts that will show them exactly what is available. We have a good many things, Mr. Speaker, that we did not have twenty years ago, we have . . .

**Mr. Coderre:** — You had, you had.

**Mr. Kramer:** — . . . we have a forest inventory that we can lay on the table before a prospective customer. This has been done through painstaking work by foresters over the past few years and I want to say something else (and I hope that the hon. minister is as proud of it as I am) that the federal forestry people stated that Saskatchewan had the best forestry program and the best conservation programs in Canada. That was the federal Liberal government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — It was a little further back than this — it was prior to the Diefenbaker regime. They stated it then and they will not deny it now, that, through good conservation practices we have built what is and will continue to be a somewhat marginal forest resource, and I hope that the Press will not quote me, because I do not want to brag about it. I do not think we want to go around saying that we have a somewhat questionable forest, somewhat marginal one. This is not for publication. I do not want to sabotage my province.

I do not think I want to go about saying that this province has not the rest of these disadvantages. Business men will find them out soon enough and let us not talk about the disadvantages. Let us talk about the advantages, Mr. Speaker. But I want to say for the information of this house, it is only fair that you should be informed of these things and let us start from there.

Not too many years ago, Mr. Speaker, the government took an audit. They took a look at our forest resources and they went to Ottawa. The statement that was made to Ottawa, was that if we continued to dissipate our forest resources at the rate they were being dissipated at that time, if we continue to cut at the rate they were cutting at this time that within ten years, we have no merchantable timber left in Saskatchewan, that our forest resource would be completely gone. I take objection to the minister making the statement that millions of feet are rotting — yes, there is a little over-mature timber in places, we have known about this — but not millions of feet. Let us not be so extravagant in these statements because they are not statements of fact, Sir, and I do not think that it is in the best interest of Saskatchewan for us to be talking this way.

The forest resources and other resources of this province are pretty close to my heart, and I do not like to see this kind of hanky-panky played. I hope that the minister will correct this or at least produce a statement. I do not think that he intended to say this in just exactly those terms, but anyway, I do not want to belabor the point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that I have said about all that I want to. I get wound up pretty tight when I start talking about our forest resources because they were dissipated. It was admitted by the previous Liberal government that they had been dissipated, and it took a long time to get a conservation program where we could take a sustained yield, so much per year, and this is why it was necessary to have a pretty orderly

marketing system in forest production. There are some good reasons for some of these things, and I am a little bit worried, Mr. Speaker, when I see something going back for a moment to something I overlooked.

There was a question asked in the house, how many saw mills are operating in the Hudson Bay area this year. It seems to me that they are down fifty per cent from last year. This worries me, because this, Mr. Speaker, was one of the points of discussion with the Dumont people, when they sat in my office, now occupied by the hon. gentleman opposite. I said if this proceeds we are going to have to take care of these mill operators and see to it that they are not simply thrown out of the position they now hold — to see that they too, were taken care of and that their rights were respected and Mr. Dumont agreed that when the contract was finally signed, that these people would be taken care of. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Would the hon. member permit . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — You will have plenty of opportunity to ask questions.

**An Hon. Member:** — Come on, be a gentleman.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting for a long time to say this and I prefer to continue. Now, I do not want to say any more but I am concerned and I am sure that if there is an answer to this sudden drop and if the hon. minister will pardon me, we heard questions asked in the legislature year in and year out, "how many mills operated in 1944, in 1945 — how many mills are operating now?" Well obviously, on the strength of what the former Premier of this province, Mr. Patterson, said to Ottawa, that our forest resources were nearly dissipated, you could not allow as many operators to continue to operate if you are going to go into a conservation program.

So getting back to the debate and the statements made on Indian and Metis. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that anything being done for the Indian and Metis population under any title is certainly bound to do some good. Any attempt will certainly be welcomed, but, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. minister says that the plight of the Indian and the Metis people in the north are disgraceful, that conditions are terrible, I am inclined to agree. From our view point they are, but I want to say this, that if they are bad now, they were ten times as bad twenty years ago when we took over. The people who exploited them the most and that were the most responsible for the situation were some of the best supporters of the party represented by the people who sit opposite.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — The people who were the most responsible for the poverty stricken conditions twenty years ago when the native Indian, according to statistics, was dying as fast as he was being born — when the birth rate equalled the death rate, when the native people were dying as fast as they were born from every disease that the white man could import. This was the situation then. No schools, no hospitals to amount to anything — this was the situation and we had to start out at something less than scratch.

Now twenty years go by in a hurry. You put your emphasis on the first needs and what happens? Well, something happened. I say something very significant happened and the records will speak for themselves, because, Mr. Speaker, twenty years ago, the beaver had been completely trapped out, because there was no conservation policy. It was every man for himself. The records show that practically no beavers were marketed or marketable in Saskatchewan twenty years ago.

A good many lakes could not be fished. It was against the law to fish because white fish were infested with cysts, and they were not marketable unless fish filleting plants were built. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman opposite, "Who built the fish filleting plants and who, Mr. Speaker, opposed them? Who opposed assisting them in this?"

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Friends of the hon. people opposite opposed them. The

only private business that co-operated and did very well was White Fisheries. They built plants and they worked in partnership with the government and they did help the native population.

**Mr. Coderre:** — And what did you do?

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest this, that when this party represented on this side of the house (the previous CCF government) went, they built fish filleting plants which allowed these people to go out and fish and get some measure of return for their work. Lakes were then again fished that could not be fished before, and not only, Mr. Speaker, by the Metis who were our responsibility. We went into areas that were the responsibility of the federal Liberal government which would not give one single penny for fish filleting plants, not one penny would they give. We went into those areas, Mr. Speaker, and we built fish filleting plants and both the Indian and the Metis population benefited from the erection of those plants, as they did from other facilities — from the fur conservation blocks, and gradually the beaver population came up, the fur population came up to where we now have a far greater market and a far greater production than we had before. Do not take my word for it. Look at the records, but this is not enough. This is what I am coming at. I said something significant happened — and while the position and the plight of the Indians is still bad, there is one thing that is significant, that is now in the same north country, the birth rate is one of the highest in the world. Why? Because these people have been and are reasonably healthy, they are reasonably well red, both through some improved policy of the federal government and through improved conditions that were created by the previous government of which I have had the honor of being a minister for a short time.

Mr. Speaker, let us not be deprecating again, let us try and be objective, let us say that the first phase of the work was done — schools, hospitals, trading stores, some basis for community life had been established. You can't establish self-governing communities as we did last year unless there has been some basic education. Some of these native people are taking responsibilities in their communities for the first time, and this is what must be done and I do not care whether you set up a Department for the Indian and Metis, or a Department for Eskimos, you are going to have some basic training for these people, and some object lessons for them before they are going to be able to proceed with self-government. So I congratulate the government for taking a look at this situation. I hope that their look is going to be objective. I sincerely hope so because I would prefer in this age where segregation is becoming a bad word, that we do not even use the title of Indian and Metis. I think the sooner we forget that they are Indians and Metis the better . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — . . . and I do not think integration is going to come any quicker, under the proposed plan. I am not going to object to it, but I think there is a better way of doing this, I think the start was made, as the hon. minister and some of the members well know, with the housing programs and the industrial programs. I had the pleasure of seeing in North Battleford, at the Fish and Game League Convention, toys, furniture, and different odds and ends that had been made in the new school in La Ronge. This has been under the guidance of a man called McPhail and I think he has done a pretty fair job because a start has been made. Originally starts were made by a co-operative group and a lot of credit is due to them. They were working with Indian craft and canoes and so on. The small start is growing. It is good, but you see, Mr. Speaker, we made some wrong assumptions as to what would happen. It was a white man's assumption, I suppose. We supposed that when these people got an education and a better standard of living that they would move out of these northern settlements. We assumed this. For twenty years, we assumed that this was going to happen, and all of a sudden, we found we had more and more people with the same resources base, even though it had been improved in some cases by five-hundred per cent. The same resource base remains and they are not moving out and you cannot pick them up by the neck and take them out either. I do not think that this is accepted in a free country. So the whole thing is that you are going to have to take industry to them and this is what you are going to have to continue to do. This is what we had to look at, and it was a development that was completely unforeseen twenty years ago. It began to appear about five years ago and it was hoped that the young people would move out, but they have not moved out, and you cannot make them move out. You can continue to encourage them to move out.



They did move out of places like Green Lake, the only thing is that very few, very few of the young people have remained in Green Lake and there is a certain residue, but literally hundreds of very good citizens have moved out of the Green Lake community and it is a rather surprising thing, and I would like some of the hon. members to visit Green Lake on a long weekend. Here is something that is going to give you a bit of a surprise. You find these, quite often, very neat but pretty humble little cabins and cottages and some of the odd Metis parents are there, possibly with one or two children, but several of the young people have moved out, but on a weekend, like Good Friday, low-and-behold there will be some fine looking automobiles drive in from parts of Saskatchewan and sometimes the odd Alberta license among them. These young people will be visiting the folks. They have gained status and have made their way and I think the hon. minister might find some use in this little bit of information, something that never occurred to me until a couple of years ago. You will find that these people have gradually moved out and the ones that are not as able to adjust have remained behind. In the middle of the week, Green Lake looks much the same, but when you take a look at all of the citizens that have been produced by Green Lake, don't sell Green Lake too short. They have done well, and I suggest that in spite of the shortcomings (and I will agree that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, (Mr. McFarlane) who said the other day that the Green Lake farms leave something to be desired) times change. Many young fellows learned how to weld, how to run a tractor, how to do mechanical work, and it was not very long before some fisherman came up from possibly Elrose or Rosetown, or maybe an oil driller came along and picked up this young fellow and took him out with him and first thing you know this young fellow was going places, because of the basic training he received but the same basic training was not provided, unfortunately, in the isolated settlements. This is why the programs that we thought would work out, have not worked in the northern settlements and with the population explosion descending on you, you are going to have to be moving pretty fast. Now I know that possibly some members have not read the report of the Centre for Community Studies, but I recommend it for reading. It has certainly an awful lot of good information and I am sure that possibly while he might not advertise it, the hon. minister will kind of take a sneaky look into it once in a while while he is setting up his department. In fact I hope that we might even get a quote from this once in a while, even though the Centre for Community Studies has been deprecated to some extent by some hon. members opposite. There is a lot of good material in that report, Mr. Minister. I recommend it for reading. I think it will be a big help to you.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that this Indian and Metis branch is going to make some headway. I hope it is going to improve the lot of our native people to some extent, but I am a little bit startled when I hear the hon. minister say something about the Indian programs being a dismal failure. Well, we know on this side of the house how much initiative and imagination has been shown over the years by the Department of Indian Affairs. We know that the Department of Indian Affairs and the Indian Agencies throughout this province up to about seven or eight years ago, was a place to get rid of the odd fellow that is not too popular around the district yet he may be sort of popular with certain politicians, so they say, "well all right, you run off back over there, you go back and fix it. You are going to be an Indian agent". And they get him out of the way — sort of like a remittance man.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — But this was the unfortunate history of the Department of Indian Affairs and a good many Indian Agents. Now I want to give some credit to the Conservative government when they were elected in 1957. They took a new look at the Department of Indian Affairs, and a good many programs were instituted and a great deal more of co-operation was enjoyed by our department and the Department of Indian Affairs, and I believe that since that time there has been a continual move forward. For instance, it was not until a Conservative government came into office that we ever got fifty-fifty assistance up in north-eastern Saskatchewan for a fish filleting plant.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — It was the first time that the Department of Indian Affairs ever recognized the need of their native Indians, the first time they ever contributed and again the records will show this, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Indian Affairs did this. I think that this was a bit

sporting of them seeing that they had about forty-four Indians that were fishermen in that area, compared to our five Metis and Whites. They gave fifty per cent, but that was fifty times more, or one hundred per cent more than we ever got from a liberal government. I say that, if the plight of the Indians in this province and in this country is a disgrace, whether it is Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, or where it is, then the disgrace falls squarely on the shoulders of the liberal party of Canada, because they have had the responsibility for Indian Affairs over the years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, and let the responsibility fall where it may. We did the best we could with limited funds and a great many things were done to improve the lot of the Indians and I could go on a great deal further. I do not intend to take up a great deal of time, but a good many people that intended to speak in this debate were crowded off the air for no good reason this afternoon, and I certainly do not intend to use up anyone's time any more than I should.

There are a few more things in this budget that I would like to remark on in addition to the problems of the Department of Natural Resources, such as pulp mills, and under privileged citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we need any coaching from the former ghost minister of Industrial Development either. I looked through this budget speech again, and I want to say that a lot was said about the promises kept by the hon. Premier and Provincial Treasurer. I would like to say that just looking at what he says himself and what he said last spring, the I do not think he has kept any promises at all. Regarding the great 'to-do' made about the one per cent tax cut, I suggest that he is really going to keep his promise,. After you have actually increased taxes on low income groups, after you have over-run your period for six months which gave you another \$5,000,000, you have already collected one per cent, about one and a half times over. Mr. Speaker, maybe he is really going to keep his promise of a one per cent tax cut. He should have made it two per cent because this would have been honest, Mr. Speaker. He is enough of a politician to know it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, north western Saskatchewan, and especially North Battleford knows all about the economy drive. We contributed \$1,000,000 to this in foregoing the technical school and we have had announcements and sub-announcements and then re-announcements quite a few times. We had the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) saying it was ridiculous, that it couldn't be done. Then we had the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) say they thought they could take care of the whole business at Prince Albert, and that figured. Then, during the Hanley by-election, back they came. Yes, there was going to be a technical school all right, and it looked as if they were going to be at North Battleford and Yorkton, if I am quoting the hon. gentleman correctly.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Are you opposed to that?

**Mr. Kramer:** — No, I think it is wonderful, but when I see, instead of \$2,000,000 that was set out last year, Mr. Speaker, a mere \$1,000,000 and that is stuck in to bolster the education budget, I have some doubts, and you will pardon me, Sir, if I have, I am sure that the hon. Provincial Treasurer would not pull a fast one like this on North Battleford. I am sure that he would not just build a lean-to on the old North Battleford Collegiate. I am sure he would not do this because what we want in North Battleford is a full fledged technical school to accommodate the vast area of north-western Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — . . . that will meet the increasing needs of training and retraining the young people and the older people of north-western Saskatchewan in a fast changing technological society. I just thought I would mention this, Mr. Speaker, so that the hon. gentleman knew that our bid is still in.

We are very happy about the announcement of the bridge, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Maidstone and Deer Creek and Paynton will all be very happy if they get a bridge too.

Now there is another thing that goes back to the north, and I

see an item in the budget with reference to Saskair — not so much for the people on the front benches, because they are pretty badly prejudiced, and their minds are made up and it is pretty difficult when a man takes the attitude, "don't confuse me with the facts, my mind is made up." I would like to suggest again respectfully, Mr. Speaker, for the good of northern Saskatchewan especially, that if it is not too late, the government reconsider this sale of Saskair. This was a good company, a good organization, I think all hon. gentlemen who take an unbiased look would agree with this. It was well run and I suggest too, that if you are going to fly people around in that scattered hazardous area, great distances and very often inclement weather, that you cannot afford to take chances and regardless, Mr. Speaker, whether it is sold or not, I suggest that you do not throw this company to the wolves and have it start taking short cuts. Do not let them run on a margin where they are going to have to sink or swim because it has been recognized in other parts of the world that you cannot afford the luxury of competition in the airline. Mr. Speaker, you cannot afford this, and this is why I suggest that if it has to be a monopoly, better it be a monopoly that the public can take a look at once in a while. I am not opposed to private enterprise, I never have been, Mr. Speaker, but I am opposed to monopoly and cartelism. This is what I am opposed to and I will continue to be opposed to this, and this is what you people never talks about or seem to think about. You put on your smoked glasses and say it does not exist. This is the difference, but if it must be monopoly, then I suggest that the public had better have a good look at it had better run it as a corporation, and I suggest in the interest of public safety, that it must be a monopoly. They only reason that this company could not show a profit was mainly because of actions taken by the federal Department of Transport, which had some curbs on it under the previous Liberal government. When Mr. Hayes took over as the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker, he took the lid off and what happened? What happened, Mr. Speaker? I will tell you what happened. Saskair had to operate through the winter months when the going was tough and the flying was rough, but when the lucrative summer season came along, Mr. Hayes turned everyone loose that had an aeroplane to come in and scalp. Well you cannot run a business that way. It is just like turning two-hundred taxis loose in a city where only fifty can make a go of it. They are bound to run into trouble. I want to say one more thing, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to take a second look at the costs of Manitoba's airline which is run by the Department of Mines and Minerals. Their flying is nine per cent higher than ours was under Saskair. Take a look at the flying services run by the Department of Natural Resources of Ontario. They are seventeen per cent higher than ours was with Saskair.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — This to me, Mr. Speaker, is something that should not be taken lightly. The safety record is the best of any airline of its size on the North American continent. It had a little trouble, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Two planes down . . . the last year . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Two planes down the last year and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that possibly some of the economy drives may have had some affect on this . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — . . . because you were running them, you were running them and the fears that were installed into everyone that they had to make a profit or else, may have just made that little bit of difference of taking a chance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many more things I would like to say in criticism of this budget. I think I covered the need for a Timber Board. I see that the Timber Board was up for discussion here, and I suggest again that you read the hon. Mr. Patterson's submission to the federal government in 1943, before you do anything drastic. It is in the library. I suggest too that we are not any happier than you are about the

Estevan brick plant, but I would say the hon. member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) would agree that there are a lot of people employed and that certain other things being considered, this one has not done too badly and it can and will do better, regardless of who runs it in the future, but I wish that they would not worry too much about something like Sodium Sulphate which I think was in the hundred per cent profit bracket over the operation, and I would suggest that they should not at least give this one away. I do not think it is necessary to say too much about these things.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that there is much more I can say except with regard to purple gas. I think that because of the shape the Liberal government at Ottawa has got the farmers into, any kind of a straw that they can clutch at is better than no straw at all. I would suggest too that judging from the actions and decisions of this government, they are going to need purple gas if they are going to play politics as they have done in the past. Now I just did a quick little sum on the number of farm trucks and the number of people shipping into the stock yards in Saskatoon, and all the people in the east end of my constituency and certainly in the Redberry constituency. They produce a tremendous amount of cattle and haul them in over the famous Langham detour that you people originated. Now they are going to need purple gas because at 50 cents a mile, not only are you throwing them two miles further out of their way, but they have got to go the two miles back to the stock yards, that is eight miles on a trip and that is going to cost every cattleman in that country at least \$4.00 a trip. He will need purple gas, Mr. Premier, he will need purple gas.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — They will get it.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I suggest once more, that you take a second look at the public subsidizing the popularity of the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) by at least \$3,000,000 and you cannot deny that, over the next twenty years, it will probably run closer to \$4,000,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe you will possibly recognize that I am supporting the sub-amendment and the amendment but I cannot in conscience support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time in my first official time at bat, to first congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker, and speaking for myself and the other new members, I must say that before coming into the legislature, I had no real idea of the importance and the extent of your duties as Speaker. I must therefore compliment you for your performance thus far in the session.

I should like also to add my congratulation to all of the new members of both sides of the assembly. I consider it a real honor to be here in this house and I believe that all new members share this feeling. I also consider it an honor, Mr. Speaker, to be here representing the people of Wilkie constituency. I only hope that I can prove worthy of the excellent support they have given me.

The Wilkie constituency is an area that has practically all the assets of rural Saskatchewan — good land, good cattle, good crops and above all, good people. Mind you some of the other assets of Saskatchewan are not nearly so obvious to the residents of Wilkie constituency. I think, for example, of the opposition claiming the many roads they have built in this province over the last twenty years and how terrible they were in 1944 — mud trails, ruts, etc. Well, if any of the new members are interested, we still have some of those roads up in our area, in fact we are thinking of labelling some of them as historic sites. They have been there for such a long time! In our area we have to drive elsewhere to see any evidence of good roads. Mind you, we can drive East into the Biggar constituency and see around 160 some miles of dust free surface. The good road begins just over the boundary of my constituency. We can drive south into the Kerrobert-Kindersley constituency and gaze on another hundred miles of dust free road. Or we can wend our way over highway 14, a fairly dusty trail, west to the Alberta border, and there at the Alberta boundary, our little highway 14 is completely swallowed up by a wide paved road into the heart of Alberta. Now, last year being an election year, we were of course promised eighteen to twenty miles of oiled road and I am pleased to tell you that the new Liberal government completed this work this fall.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Mr. Speaker, road work in my constituency has always seemed to run in cycles — four year cycles. Every election year we get our little drib-drab, and in between times, we occasionally got a few pieces of grading. And I want to tell the Minister of Highways, the hon. member from Regina South (Mr. Grant) how pleased I was yesterday with his announcement of some sixty some miles of oiling in the Wilkie constituency. The budget of \$175,000,000 for highway improvement as a four year program is a very welcome announcement for every rural area of this province, especially . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — . . . especially in areas such as mine, that have been somewhat neglected for many years. Also the announcement by the minister that some grid roads will be taken into the highway system is welcomed on both sides of the house, and if I may refer to one that particularly applies to me, it is the one from Kerrobert to Unity. This announcement, Mr. Speaker, takes recognition of the fact that for years there has been no north-south highway in that whole area. Our nearest north-south highway is no. 4 through Biggar and it is almost one hundred miles to the Alberta border and yet there has been no road linking Kerrobert, Unity, Cut Knife, Maidstone right up into the Loon Lake resort area of the north-west.

Now, Mr. Speaker, being a veterinarian, I understand that I am the second one ever to sit in this assembly, I think perhaps it is only appropriate that I should spend a few minutes discussing the proposed new Veterinary College to be built in Saskatoon, and the impact that we hope this will have on the livestock industry of this province. I have been quite closely associated with the various committees and studies conducted on the subject of the need of a Veterinary College in Western Canada. Many people and many groups have contributed to the successful conclusion of these studies. You, yourself, Mr. Speaker, deserve the thanks of the livestock industry for your continuing efforts in this regard in the past.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.C. McIsaac:** — I must also commend the hon. member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) the former minister of Agriculture, who I regret is not here tonight, for his part in bringing about the founding of a Veterinary College in Saskatoon. Mind you, it did take a long time for him to become convinced, but when he did, he got busy and action was taken.

An amount of \$1,000,000 was set aside in March, 1963. It is also worth noting, that this is also the year that saw the previous government's policy of over-taxation produce a fairly embarrassing surplus, but in any event, we are not complaining, we were really happy to see this step taken.

Now, the first plans for the college, Mr. Speaker, called for graduating about thirty students each year. Since then, it has become quite obvious that a school of this size is simply not large enough — not large enough to meet the present demands or the estimated demands of our growing livestock industry.

It might be appropriate, at this time, to review some of the basic objects and aims in founding a Veterinary College. It should provide for:

1. The training of an adequate number of graduates.
2. The development of research facilities.
3. For greatly expanded diagnostic services.
4. For post graduate training and continuing education courses.

Now, with regard to the need of graduates, Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say that the demand for qualified veterinary service definitely does exist and is increasing. The intelligent application of research results, good diagnostic procedures, and surgical techniques, is possible only through fully trained personnel.

Basing calculations on present estimated needs, and I am

speaking here of the entire prairie area, we will be needing over 1,100 veterinarians in the prairie area, in the next twenty-five years. Two hundred and ninety to cover the present shortage and two hundred and fifty for replacements and some five hundred to six hundred for the increased livestock population that will be coming into this area. Allowing for about twenty per cent migration or changes, this will mean around fifty-five per year.

Now, at present, only one-third of Saskatchewan's herds and flocks are within twenty miles of a veterinarian. It is commonly agreed that twenty to twenty-five miles is the distance in which reasonably complete veterinary service is economical, both from the point of view of the veterinary practitioner and the farmers. Out of a total of about one hundred and forty veterinarians registered in the province of Saskatchewan, we have around eight men in practice. The remainder are employed by the federal and provincial governments and by the university.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, we have sixty-six students in the three prairie provinces who are taking the second year of the pre-veterinary course and one hundred and eight students who are taking the first year of this course. This is not counting any students from British Columbia, or any immigrants or others who may wish to apply. The course, incidentally is a six year course, two years being pre-veterinary and four years at the university level.

Thus we find ourselves with a definite need for veterinarians for students who are anxious and interested in taking the training, and I think it is obvious that we must train these people. It is estimated that a college graduating fifty-five to sixty persons per year is the very least that we can get by with. It is the obligation and the intention of the liberal government of this province to provide for these training facilities. It is going to cost much more than was planned. The original plans were in the neighborhood of \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000. Now it is estimated that it will cost at least \$5,000,000 to \$6,000,000 and possibly more. The capital cost will be largely ours to bear in this province. The operating costs will be set up on a somewhat different basis, with the other participating provinces contributing toward operating costs. But this government has enough interest in the livestock industry and enough faith in it, to spend this extra money gladly, and we have also enough interest in the young people and enough faith in them to likewise gladly spend this money.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — I want to say to the hon. member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) if one of the extra millions that should have gone to North Battleford is in this money we are spending on the Veterinary College, I am sure he will agree, it has been put to good use.

The Budget Speech, Mr. Speaker, indicated the concern that this government has for use for our livestock industry and for our university facilities. I would suggest to you that the plan for an enlarged, expanded veterinary college is an excellent concrete example of action on all three of these aims.

Now, a recent issue of the Saskatoon Star Phoenix carries a report that a start has been made on the premises. The first contract has been let for the initial building and it is to be completed by next September 1st. Classes in the four year degree course will begin at that time, next September, but at the moment we can only take in thirty students and in September, 1966, we will still be only equipped to take in thirty students. It will be at least 1967 before the school will be set up to accommodate sixty students. As I mentioned earlier, we already have one hundred and six people in the pre-veterinary course. I think we can thank the previous administration for dragging their feet for so long on this project but we cannot handle the student demand that exists today.

Since the opening of this house, Mr. Speaker, we have discussed the importance of the wheat industry, the potash industry, the oil industry, and this evening the pulp industry. I think we should also bear in mind the value of the livestock industry to the people of this province.

This is an industry that last year put something over \$150,000,000 in the pockets of Saskatchewan's farmers. It is an industry that is also on the verge of new horizons in this province. For a couple of reasons, I say, firstly, there are great changes taking place within the

industry itself. The greater specialization currently demanded, the smaller margin of profit per individual animal, and the resulting larger individual operations, Mr. Speaker, are rapidly becoming the order of the day whether we like it or not.

Secondly, the centre of the entire prairie livestock industry will, in the next twenty-five years, be shifting towards Saskatchewan. I say this for a variety of reasons. I will not go into the reasons but I think it is true when you make a study of the situation, it will be agreed that in the next twenty-five years 's will be the centre of the prairie livestock industry.

Now, the Budget speech has again recognized this fact. I refer here to the announcement in the Premier's remarks that SEDCO will be permitted to provide loans for livestock operations. This does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that we are only encouraging the gigantic type of operation, far from it. Any present day livestock set-up must have adequate up-to-date housing and facilities to stay in the picture. This applies to livestock men, hog feeders, cattle feeders, poultry raisers and the like. These set-ups require cash and we intend to use SEDCO, where possible, to provide this cash.

Such a policy, I say, Mr. Speaker, is a recognition of the fact that the livestock end of farming is becoming a specialized industry, and as I say, it does not follow that we agree with this trend or support it. However, we do intend to provide for people who wish to avail themselves of the opportunity to go along with the changing pattern.

Now, greater efficiency of production is a phrase we hear frequently. It may be applied to small business, large business, any type of operation. In the case of the livestock industry it is only through a greater knowledge of our own particular problems in this province and in the prairie area that we can hope to become more efficient in producing livestock.

I refer to studies on soil composition, the nature and the types of fodder available plus the climate and other factors. Studies need to be conducted and correlated on these subjects. The disease problem is related directly to these factors then. The physiology of the animal and newer practices of forcing these animals to their full capacity to gain weight are also related factors. We have much to learn in the broad field of disease control and disease prevention methods. Unless we do immediately take steps, we will not be able to stay in the increasing competition of the livestock industry today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot close without a word or two on the great hog policy that the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) introduced a couple of years ago — his \$30 sows which cost us close to \$500,000. It did demonstrate one thing, and I will give him credit for that, that they finally woke up to the fact that the hog industry in this province had slipped and slipped badly.

Mind you, the policy, as such, was a rather temporary, hasty, ill-conceived and ill-advised type of measure that really did nothing whatever to improve the hog industry as a whole. Here was a chance to boost the quality of Saskatchewan hog marketings, to do something basic for the industry and improve the type of hogs, to do some studies or some work on feed conversion rates and get a better strain of hog into the province. Yet no such attempt was made — no strings were attached — just a brood sow — she could be any size, any shape or color or combination, and you have your \$30.

This policy, Mr. Speaker, I submit, is somewhat typical of the many that constituted agricultural policy of the previous administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say more, but I think it is obvious that I definitely support the motion, not the amendment or sub-amendment.

Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. M.P. Pederson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, I always feel that it is better to be late than never, and for that reason I have come on fairly late in this Budget Debate to put before the assembly the views, not only of the people that I represent, but of the group that I represent in this house. I have a small amount of whip trouble, Mr. Speaker, having to whip myself several times a day, and it gets a little tiring. I do not know whether I have been whipped back into a tail-end Charlie position here, but if so, I want to warn the other whips that I do not intend to serve an apprenticeship in that position any longer. I had hoped to be able to present, in a debate such as this, the views of my party at a much earlier period in the debate. But for various reasons it has been set back to this time.

Now, before dealing specifically with the Budget Debate, I want to make a couple of remarks in connection with things that have been happening and things that have been said in this house during this debate in the last few days. I would like to say to my friend, the hon. member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher), as well as to some of his colleagues on that side of the house, and also on this side, to please be careful to remember that in these charges and counter-charges of hirings and firings, and espionage and hidden documents, that they be careful to exclude me from these sort of remarks, because I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have never hired or fired anyone, with the exception perhaps of a rather ersatz type of Liberal by the name of Mr. Taal. But I wanted to make absolutely certain that the hon. members opposite to me bear that in mind when they rather carelessly refer to those members on this side of the house, who are, they say, constantly hiring and firing people.

Now, at the outset, I would like, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the presentation of his first Budget Speech. It was quite a document— rather unique in many ways. As it was being presented, I could not help thinking that I can remember way back when a Liberal was someone who was generous with his own money. Now I find that this is not necessarily so and I want to deal with some of those matters that I feel fall into that category this evening. I must say, however, before proceeding, Mr. Speaker, that part of my surprise also stemmed from the fact that the contents of the budget were so severely criticized by some of the members on this side of the house, because, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have been unable to find, in looking at this budget, and comparing it to past budgets, the 1964 budget in particular, that there are any real major differences, or that there is anything really new. I am sure that, after having perused the contents of this budget and in light of the promises that were made to the electorate of this province, there must be many disappointed taxpayers in Saskatchewan today.

The Provincial Treasurer and his party came to power on the promise of substantial tax cuts with no reductions in services. Now, I have watched with some interest, the Premier's claim, and that of various members of his party, that they were going to reduce costs through an economy drive. There has been a good deal of publicity in this regard, Mr. Speaker, but I have noticed, when I start to look at various items in the budget and in the estimates, that the economy drive amounts to little more than nit picking — little bits and pieces here and there.

The Provincial Treasurer tells us here in the house, that he has saved \$6,500,000. But I believe that this has partially been obtained by cutting out and curtailing certain services. The actual per capita saving is very small indeed, because I notice that in his address, by his own count, the Provincial Treasurer stated in his Budget Speech, that the population of the province was 949,000 as of December, 1964, as compared to 939,000 one year earlier. Now, Mr. Speaker, based on these population figures, after you eliminate receipts from other governments, the per capita tax load for 1964 was \$197.40. The per capita tax load estimated for 1965-66 will be \$196.70 — a reduction of 70 cents per person or \$3.50 for a family of five. That is the total reduction in taxes that is laid down in the proposed budget or in the estimates for the coming year for the population of this province — a saving of 70 cents in taxes for the year, per capita. A family of five people, in this province, Mr. Speaker, will carry a tax load for the coming year, exclusive of the taxes they contribute on the federal level and on the municipal level, exclusive of that, a family of five will be paying provincial taxes of \$983.50 — almost \$1,000 a year for provincial taxes of one sort or another. Is this the kind of saving that the voters were promised? I think not. It is fortunate, I feel, that we are experiencing a buoyant economy and that receipts from other government and government enterprises have increased so dramatically, or else, the Provincial Treasurer, I am sure, would have found that he would have had to increase taxes to cover his proposed expenditures



rather than reduce the tax load by 70 cents per capita.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this government has increased spending by over \$6,000,000, slightly in excess of \$6 for every man, woman and child in the province of Saskatchewan. That I believe, is a fair assessment, Mr. Speaker, of the so-called tax reductions that were promised.

Now, I want to turn to the question of agriculture. I do not want to belabor the point that has been raised by many members in this house. It was indeed fortunate that this government did concentrate some attention on the problems facing farmers. Now, I understand, Mr. Speaker, that it is improper to refer to other debates that are before the house, but I want to say that in view of the fact that we have seen a very drastic reduction in the price of our wheat, that it is fortunate that the Saskatchewan saw fit to at least lift some of the load that is being carried by farmers in this province. I had hoped that they might have gone a little further in another field, which I shall deal with later on, but I want to deal with some of the specific items that were enumerated under the particular section in the budget referred to as agriculture, the mineral tax, saving \$250,000. That works out a \$3 per farmer per year. Reduction in the sales tax, of course, is very welcome — from 5 to 4 per cent. The elimination of items under the sales tax, the twenty-four additional items, I believe, was excellent, because they were merely, as the treasurer said, items that were nuisance taxes and should be removed. But the total saving there to farmers, \$90,000 — about \$1 per farmer per year.

Purple gas was of the real savings as far as the average farmer is concerned, estimated I would say, at about \$40 per farmer per year. These, I think, are excellent moves, but not nearly far enough in the area of offering help where it is needed. The elimination of various nuisance licenses, also, I thought, was excellent, but I was rather interested, Mr. Speaker, in taking a look at these various lists of exemptions, the elimination of the so-called nuisance taxes, and I did a fast count. Of the twenty-four exemptions under the 5 per cent to 4 per cent tax, fifteen of them were items that are normally used on ranches . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — . . . and I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if perhaps in dealing with the nuisance taxes, that the fact that the license fee for artificial insemination was removed, if this had anything to do with the activities of our provincial treasurer. But I agree with him that they were nuisances and certainly needed removing. At least, it will not be so difficult now to develop a big bull farm, as perhaps it might have been in the past with all these taxes being levied.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the treasurer, that with the elimination of these nuisance taxes, we should have reduced quite substantially the cost of collecting these taxes. I looked through the estimates and unless I failed to know where to look, I certainly could see no such a saving budgeted for the coming year.

Now, before leaving the question of the education and health tax, I was rather pleased to note that the provincial treasurer expects to provide a \$50 wedding present to about 6,000 newlyweds in the province in 1965, and it struck me that this government will obviously do almost anything to assure a population growth for the province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — I would like to point out that the government failed, as has been pointed out by other members in this debate, to fulfil its promise to exempt children's clothing and school books from the sales tax. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this would have benefited large families, far more important to benefit them than to provide a \$50 wedding present, and I believe would have filled a far greater need in the low income groups in the province of Saskatchewan. I have people come to me, almost daily, asking if it is not possible to have these taxes removed from these types of commodities such as children's clothing and books because they are creating a considerable hardship on the people who have several children attending school at the same time.

Still dealing with the question of agriculture, Mr. Speaker, I noticed that a grant of \$50,000 is being proposed for the commencement of fodder shelters. Now, I am not opposed to this, Mr. Speaker, because I believe there is a real need for farmers to be reminded of the necessity to lay up ample stores of feed for themselves. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial treasurer, in drawing up the budget, made a provision for a start to help farmers erect such structures. But I want to say to the government, Mr. Speaker, that they should give serious consideration to the question of eliminating this problem on a long range program. I have noticed, in looking at the estimates from year to year, that almost every year a very substantial item is included for an emergency fodder program. I know that in the supplementary estimates of this year, \$120,000 was voted for that purpose. Almost every year in Saskatchewan, in some area or the other, and emergency exists, where farmers and cattlemen are unable to obtain adequate amounts of fodder.

We, in our party, have advocated for some time, that the government should look at the principle of establishing pelletizing plants under a fodder bank type of program. Now, I recognize, Mr. Speaker, as do all farmer members of this house, that you cannot store hay and feeds of that type for any indefinite period of time. They can only be stored for a limited period. This, of course, is the weakness in the provision of fodder shelters. Even well baled hay deteriorates very quickly when it is not consumed from year to year.

I believe that modern methods of pelletizing, which is a process that allows for the storage of vast quantities of concentrated feed, in a small area, is ultimately going to be the solution for our feed problems in this province.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, particularly with the coming of the south Saskatchewan river dam, that this government should seriously consider a program of establishing pelletizing plants under a fodder program, in various spots of this province where feed normally is in abundance. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I would go further than merely to make the statement, I would like to describe what I consider would be a good type of program and how it could work. I believe that farmers could be asked to supply their surplus feed to these plans at a fixed price that would allow for the cost of picking the feed up and for a small profit.

Their contribution to the plant would be listed as so many tons at such and such a price. Should they require feed in a dry year, they could purchase back up to that amount at the price that they had received plus a small allowance for the cost of processing. If they did not require it at all, it would go into the general market for emergencies and be held by the government.

I believe this is a sensible program, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the provincial Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) would give serious consideration to this type of a program and I only hope that when the next budget is brought down that there will be some provision for instituting such a program.

On looking at the estimates, I notice that the provincial treasurer is budgeting for an increase of \$270,000 in fines, forfeits and penalties. That is an increase over that estimated for 1964-65. Now this is a thirty per cent increase over that period for fines, forfeits and penalties. Surely the provincial treasurer does not expect a crime wave in order to balance his budget? That item to me, Mr. Speaker, is a complete enigma. The provincial treasurer was very careful to point out many times during his address that his was a private enterprise government and I want to remind the provincial treasurer, Mr. Speaker, that his is not the only party. Indeed, most parties have, as one of their requisites, a belief in the private enterprise system, in spite of the fact that it is often charged that the people who sit on this side of the house have absolutely no faith in that principle at all. I do not blame government members for thinking that they do not because some speeches from this side sometimes make me think that they are right, but nevertheless he talked about this question of being a private enterprise government. His tax reductions from figures that he presented show a reduction in taxes to the farmer of \$4,240,000 as well as some others that he did not specify, and a total reduction of \$9,900,000 in education and health taxes on consumer goods. The tax reductions, Mr. Speaker, do absolutely nothing to ease the tax load on the small business man or provide incentives to prospective small business men. And this is the area where I feel the provincial

treasurer failed, when he spoke in keeping with this principle of being a private enterpriser. Outside of the sales tax reduction, the urban dweller, the people living in the cities, small towns, villages, small business men and so on, are forgotten people as far as this budget is concerned. Increased grants for education as has been mentioned time and again, would have reduced property taxes and I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, that our party have been pushing very hard for the implementation of a program which would lead to a budget that could in fact provide a greatly accelerated amount of expenditure in the field of education, so that municipalities would be in a position to reduce the property tax on the property owner. Now I am not going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I advocate that this government should launch into huge programs and do these things and that all the things that I advocate would not cost money. I want to suggest to them, Sir, that there are things that they could do to help these little people that would cost the province government virtually nothing. One of the things that I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, is that in dealing with programs, the hon. members opposite on the hustings and again in this house, seem to be very short on new ideas. And of course, as tradition has always had it, and I could recite numerous newspaper clippings to establish this, I am quite happy as a Conservative to give them some ideas so that they could implement them because they do not seem to have too many new ones of their own. I find, Mr. Speaker, that one of the proposals that they might well take under consideration would be to take a hard look at the fact that a very high percentage of our people in this province, as in other parts of Canada, are paying very excessive rates to finance companies, and I know this has been a great concern to many people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — We in our party have studied this for a long time, and we feel that in keeping with the type of legislation that is provided for farmers, that similar legislation could be provided for the urban dwellers. We would refer to this type of legislation as some type of a family loans legislation. Now there are five purposes or five reasons for setting this up. First of all, there is a broad need for providing fiscal aid to urban dwellers to assist them in providing the necessary tools of production and to provide this assistance at a reasonable and stabilized rate of interest. Second, to provide a service for non-agricultural workers in keeping with and at a comparative level with borrowing facilities available to farmers for farm improvements. Third, to check an ever increasing, and often, Mr. Speaker, undisclosed rate of interest being charged on credit purchases of consumer goods. Fourth, through financial saving to consumers by having available money supplied at reasonable interest rates and thus increasing consumer purchases, and indirectly promoting both prosperity and greater job availability. And the last reason, help place the method of the methodical financing of consumer goods on a business like basis and give such borrowing a degree of dignity as a business practice, that in many cases it does not presently enjoy. Many people feel that when they want to purchase a refrigerator or stove or whatever it is, that they must sort of get around behind the scenes and see if they can quietly make some arrangements for credit. This is not necessary. As a farmer, when I want to buy a tractor, or a combine or anything else for my farm, I enter the bank and participate in the Farm Improvement Loans Act, obtain my money to purchase my machine from a dealer at a price that quite often is far superior because I am able to pay him cash than what might otherwise have happened.

The areas in which I felt that this type of loan system could be used in, is in the purchase of automobiles, and this is a necessary thing, I think, because transportation to and from work, or used directly in the worker's business has become increasingly a necessity rather than a luxury. Very few people of modest means today drive a car simply for luxury purposes. The increase in suburban dwelling plus a tremendous growth in our cities has made it imperative, Mr. Speaker, that working people be given ample opportunity to purchase automobiles on a financial plan that does not incorporate exorbitant interest rates.

As I mentioned earlier on, the Premier and the provincial treasurer allowed in this budget a grant for newly married couples. I believe that this type of thing that I am referring to would go much further and cost the taxpayers nothing. Modern appliances, refrigerators, electric stoves and so on, have become a necessity just as much as the old coal and wood stove did many years ago. Almost all our urban living and in fact much of our farm living today is geared to modern conveniences. This means for new householders costly purchases of equipment, running sometimes to several thousands of dollars, and generally they have to make

these purchases at a time when the purchase of the home itself is consuming a substantial portion of the take-home pay. Now the NHA does provide loans at low interest rates to build a house, but there are very few methods available to the young couple starting out to purchase equipment for that home, except through plans put to them by finance companies or companies who actually sell the goods. And too, there is the question of trade tools. People such as carpenters, and mechanics who have to supply their own tools find that they have to buy some of these tools and some of them are very expensive, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you know, and they have to buy them and finance them, but there is far too limited an opportunity for these people to borrow. Now you may ask, how would this work? Well I propose, Mr. Speaker, that it would work exactly like to Farm Improvement Loan. Because the goods involved are much less durable, you would naturally expect that they would have to have a higher rate of interest than you would normally under the farm improvement loan. But I have done some checking, Mr. Speaker, and I find that interest rates on an average, run anywhere from 18 to 38 per cent on purchases made by people in this country. These people are paying a prohibitive rate of interest and what it means to them sometimes goes beyond description. I find in checking around with people who might conceivably be in this bracket and who are prepared to disclose their personal dealings to me, that I find the average home, in the lower income brackets, has approximately \$2,000 worth of goods or services financed through some type of a finance loan, and based on that amount of money, Mr. Speaker, the difference in interest alone, providing this type of legislation were established by the government, would amount to something like \$25 a month in take home pay to these people. These are the kind of things, Mr. Speaker, that this government should have looked at if they are wanting to help the ordinary man and woman, the little man and woman. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the mere passing of budgetary estimates, the mere spending of great sums of money in these various areas is not the only answer. There are many types of programs that can be set up. I know that the hon. gentlemen opposite may very well say, that it is all good and well to talk about setting up this type of a loan, but we need a change in the Bank Act. I know that, Mr. Speaker, but I understand that legislation to that effect is before the House of Commons at the present time and these adjustments will be made. We, in this province, must give serious consideration to helping people to get out of the clutches of this type of a thing.

Now, I notice, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the cultural development of this province that there was a \$1,500,000 grant directed towards the construction of the two auditoriums in Saskatoon and Regina. And I made some brief reference a while ago, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that I do not mind supplying these ideas providing someone will initiate them. It is rather humorous to me to think back, Mr. Speaker, to the spring of 1960, when in the election campaign of that year, I on behalf of my party made an announcement that we if elected would provide funds to help Saskatoon and Regina build an auditorium in each of these two centres. I recall, Mr. Speaker, the prominent Liberals of that time, and chief among them, Mr. Buchwald, who was then mayor of Saskatoon, laughing and poking fun at this and saying it was ridiculous and that we had far too many other things to attend to than to be spending money building auditoriums, and the Star Phoenix has some rather snide things to say about it. In an editorial of the 14th of March, they label it as a "Strange Tory Promise", and poked fun at it throughout the entire editorial. But gradually the idea sank in, Mr. Speaker, and the people finally woke up and realized it was a good idea, and I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is what I mean, when I talk about concrete criticism in this house — the offering of proposals that are a benefit to the government regardless of who they are. I noticed after checking through the past issues of the Star Phoenix, that after that initial editorial, they let it simmer for about three years before they felt that people would have forgotten and then they came along with four editorials, one on the 24th of June, one on the 22nd of November, 1963, another on October, 1964, and again in October 1964, all now praising the idea of building auditoriums. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that these two buildings will contribute probably more than any other single project not only to the total advancement of the culture of the people of this province, but more important than that, it will focus the attention of the people of this province on the need for us to direct our thoughts to things other than the mundane task of making a living. I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, that this government has seen fit to provide these funds. I hope these auditoriums are difficult for the two cities involved to look after, that the government would give very sympathetic consideration to making a further grant to make these two auditoriums a reality.

I want to turn now to the budgetary expenditures proposed by

this government. Now the province government had an opportunity to reduce the tax load on our population either directly through a reduction in taxes levied by provincial authority, or by providing sufficient funds to allow a reduction in the municipal or school taxes. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I have shown that proposed tax reduction at the provincial level are insignificant. I have referred to many of them in my remarks up to now. I would hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to find substantial increases in municipal assistance or educational assistance. Now if we eliminate the capital spending, we find that the third largest proposed expenditures are for social welfare, the other two being education and public health, and with the advent of automation and advanced technology, one of our prime concerns should be in the field of education in all of its aspects. Government has also committed itself to provide jobs in order to attract people to the province and to provide an incentive for trained people to stay in the province. What kind of jobs does this government intend to provide when it proposes an increase of less than \$5,000,000 in the budget for education? With the rising cost of education, I suggest to the provincial treasurer, that at this rate, he will be faced with providing jobs to untrained or unskilled labor.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — In the long run, Mr. Speaker, this can only add to the cost of social welfare because people will be unable to do the jobs that may be available. I have been listening with some interest, Mr. Speaker, to the constant flow of announcements that are being made in recent days about new potash developments, new mines and so on, the on-again, off-again, on-again, Finigin type of lumber operation or pulp mill operation. I suggest that it is an old song that we have been hearing for many years.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how much consideration has been given to provide an opportunity for the young people of this province to train themselves to take their place in these new developments. I have heard the Premier say that they might have to import people to take on these jobs. I have heard discussions in this house on unemployment, and on social welfare. A majority of these people are unable to get jobs simply because they do not have the training to take the jobs that are available. We are spending a good deal of time, Mr. Speaker, as I know the government is in bringing in new industry, but we must be bold, Mr. Speaker, in allocating funds to provide for the education of the people who are going to operate these industries. We will carry on, Mr. Speaker, with a large labor force that is unskilled and continue bringing in skilled people and carrying our own people on social welfare. This is not in keeping with the principles of the party that I represent, Mr. Speaker. In addition to this, it will be inevitable that school taxes at the local level will have to increase and it will not take long, Mr. Speaker, to use up that 77 cents per capita that was saved in provincial taxes.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to hon. members opposite, that since they have found it necessary to increase the total revenues, that a much larger proportion should have been used to increase the school grants.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The assembly adjourned at 9:46 o'clock p.m.