

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Fifteenth Legislature**  
**33rd Day**

**Thursday, March 24, 1966**

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

**RESOLUTIONS**

**MOTION: CEASE-FIRE, PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM**

**Mr. I. E. Nollet** (Cutknife) moved, seconded by Mr. H. Link (Saskatoon City):

That this Assembly, aware of the impossibility of resolving the conflict in Vietnam by military action or by negotiations on a bilateral basis, and fearful of the serious and tragic consequences of an escalated war, strongly urges the government of Canada to work diligently to achieve a cease-fire and to move negotiations for a peaceful settlement to the United Nations or a reconvened Geneva Conference.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize and assure all members of this House that when speaking to this resolution I do so with a sincere desire to find a lasting and realistic end to all wars between nations, both large and small, regardless of ideologies. This is no time for recriminations or attributing blame. To do so would destroy the purpose of this resolution and all prospects of unanimity of purpose in our search for a new world of hope, peace and human understanding throughout the world.

Peace is indivisible, it is an encompassment which includes people of all religious beliefs and political persuasion. Peace is the hope of and belongs to all mankind the world over. It is the cornerstone and the structure of Christian belief. If this structure is to remain and to stand as the ultimate goal of Christian and human aspirations we must, of necessity, after 2,000 years of failure achieve this objective now. In the light of the present world situation, further procrastination and recriminating delays could well mean the destruction of the human race and all it stands for under God. This is no idle surmise, it is a growing reality. I recently saw and listened to a TV interview with a top United States atomic scientist, who amongst other things mentioned the possibility of an atomic war by accident. He referred to a considerable number of plane crashes in the United States which were carrying atomic bombs. The more recent crash off the coast of Spain emphasizes the possibility of atomic war by accident. This same top scientist also referred to atomic war, other than by accident. He stated clearly for all to hear that if such a war occurred it would all be over in a matter of 25 minutes.

This is the point, Mr. Speaker, it will be all over. This indeed means peace, but not the kind of peace we all yearn for, peace for the living, but the peace of death and destruction. Mr. Speaker, it is beyond comprehension that intelligent so-called civilized human beings who claim to be creatures of one divine Creator could ever reconcile themselves to such a fate. This entire concept, in view of man's present unlimited potential to kill

and destroy, is immoral, unrealistic, and is the epitome of frustration and fear that need not exist. This philosophy can no longer be justified on the political basis that if the other fellow does it we have no choice but to do it ourselves on a more mighty scale. This is merely the law of the deterrent which history proves has never worked. In fact, 2,000 years ago a contrary and more hopeful Christian philosophy was proffered for acceptance by the human race. It is now time we accept this as a more realistic and intelligent approach to relationships among the world family of nations. None of us are so pure and beyond blemish as to self-righteously claim they are justified in exercising their so-called sovereign right to attack others. It is high time that the rule of law be established in all aspects of international relationships.

History records, Mr. Speaker, that nations are as a result of bitter experience moving much too slowly and much too painfully towards this objective. We have the example of the world's first Confederation of States in the United States and Canada on this continent, in which the states gave up sovereign rights to a national government which was made up of various nationalities, various ideologies and religious beliefs, living in peace and harmony together. We can all recall the international Peace Conference at the Hague many years ago and the establishment of an international Court of Arbitration in 1899. I wish at this point, Mr. Speaker, to repeat an excerpt from my old school history book the last copy of which was published in 1905. I thought it would be apropos at this time to read some excerpts from this, to indicate the position then in terms of relationships between nations and the situation that exists now. It says this in justification of the Hague Conference:

It is most significant that, at the same time that these movements towards world unity have characterized progress in the political and moral realms, wonderful discoveries, inventions and developments in physical domain, the steam railway, the steamship, the telegraph, the telephone, wireless direct telegraphy, and a hundred others through the practical annihilation of time and space have brought the once isolated nations close alongside one another, and have made easily possible in truth, made necessary the inevitable formation of the world union.

That was written a long time ago. Today when we look back at a statement saying that space has been annihilated, in the context of the present world situation, there is no comparison, Mr. Speaker. Not only have we developed faster and more adequate communications between one another but we have also done another thing; we have developed and carried to the ultimate our ability to destroy one another. It is on this basis that I moved this resolution in the House. To go on, Mr. Speaker, the court that was set up, the World Court that was set up at the Hague Conference, or the World Court as a result of the Hague Conference, did arbitrate quite a number of international disputes successfully, but it did not prevent the formation of power block alliances nor remove the fundamental cause of war, primarily because nations at that time were not prepared to accept and abide by the rule of international law as an alternative to war. I am saying here, Mr. Speaker, that this has long been the hope of mankind. Again I turn to my history book and in it when speaking in regard to world unity and the need for world peace, the writer of that time had this to say, Emmanuel Kant who wrote a thesis on Perpetual Peace, 150 years ago,

**March 24, 1966**

said this and I quote:

For nations and their relations to one another there can be according to reason no other way out of the lawless conditions which inevitably result from war than that they give up their lawless freedom just as individual men do, accommodate themselves to public restraining laws and so form an international state which will grow and at least embrace all the peoples of the world.

This was said and written 150 years ago, so I wish to emphasize the urgency of now facing the realities of our existing situation. However, after the Hague Conference, and in the course of time, we again had the unhappy experience of the greatest world war up to that time. The cost in destruction and loss of human lives shocked the conscience of the entire world. Out of it, the war of 1914, came the League of Nations which did not obtain universal approval, nor was the rule of law firmly established and accepted as a total alternative to war. However, after World War I we once again witnessed the development of great power blocs bent not on collective security but collective aggression, such as Germany, Japan and Italy which gave rise to similar safeguarding alliances amongst other nations, all of which were contrary to, and rendered useless, the purposes upon which the League of nations was originally founded.

The League of Nations rendered valuable service in the interest of peace for some 20 years but its work was finally scuttled by these more powerful power blocs. Once again, the nations involved ignored the concept of giving up their sovereign rights, to wage war as an instrument of international policy as against peace under the rules of world law and their enforcement by a single international sovereign authority.

So some now say, as they said previously, this possibility is an idealistic dream. Well, more and more people in both low and high places now say it is an urgent reality. I am glad to note that the Christian churches and other faiths throughout the world now realize that man has got a common origin, that he also has got a common purpose, and that we all do have a common identity with one another. The World Council of Churches came out very strongly in support of an agency that would resolve the need for continued conflict and the courtship of ultimate disaster.

His Holiness Pope Paul, as members all know, has taken quite an active role and a most constructive role in his endeavours to bring about peaceful understanding through nations. We all recall his recent trip to the United Nations and his subsequent efforts to solve the latest conflict in Vietnam. May I emphasize Vietnam is merely mentioned in this resolution because it is now the latest and the newest danger trouble spot in the world.

Mr. Speaker, the terrific destruction and loss of human lives in tens of millions of people again shock the conscience of humanity the world over. The advent of the atomic bomb and other mass killing devices frightened and stunned all mankind. The United Nations was born. It found its origin in the fear and misery of the past. It provided the only shred of hope and light for the future. It spoke of freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom from oppression, and freedom of conscience. It envisioned a world of peace guided by men of good will for the common betterment of people everywhere. It held great promise for a total war

of destruction. What have been its failures and its achievements and why? First of all, almost immediately after the United Nations was formed we witnessed bitter recriminations, escalating fears, suspicions and hatred, all of which weakened and undermined the good work the United Nations was intended to do. The post war period became a period of iron Curtains, Bamboo Curtains, in the hope of segregating and containing ideological evils. We became so obsessed by our own fears that we generated still greater fears. The law of the mighty atomic deterrent grew and developed to the point where a most dreadful fear now grips the entire world. The fear of total destruction now hangs over all of us; man has reached a new pinnacle in the art of his own destruction.

Mr. Speaker, have we reached the point of now return? A firm Yes if we continue down this road in frustration and fear rather than choosing a more mature and realistic understanding of the problems that beset all of us. Our hope lies in the choice of a better, more reasoned, and more constructive pathway for human survival and a great hope for the future.

The United Nations has accomplished much good. Its great potential for good must be strengthened, not destroyed by fears and recriminations, in the midst of the giant conflicts of views which have deterred the UN from its intended purpose. Canada has the distinction of having played a most prominent role in its endeavours to make the United Nations and its principles an effective means for peace and human progress.

Here I might mention, Mr. Speaker, Canada's role in the Suez crisis, in the Cyprus disputes, and its intervention in the dispute between Pakistan and India, and just previous to that is intervention under the Geneva agreement in finding a solution to the regrettable Vietnam situation. Canada committed itself wholeheartedly in this regard as a member of the International Control Commission. Peace, Mr. Speaker, in this area of world trouble seemed to be assured, but most unfortunately the same area has now become a potential explosive area that could well become a major war with dreadful atomic overtones. This trend must be stopped. The logical alternative is that this matter, of necessity, must be placed entirely under the jurisdiction of the United Nations and/or that the principles of the Geneva Agreement be implemented as originally intended through the international Control Commission of which Canada is a member.

I would, therefore, hope and trust that all members will support the resolution, keeping in mind that in these critical times there is no purpose at this stage of engaging in a long and hopeless debate as to who is right and who is wrong. Such a debate will not only be inconclusive, but it will fail in unanimity in the all-important matter of making the United Nations and similar peace keeping agencies achieve their objectives of world peace and human betterment.

Let us, therefore, Mr. Speaker, unanimously support the government of Canada as a loyal adherent to the founding principles of the United Nations and its peace keeping mission and urge them to still greater efforts in this direction.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in begging leave of the Assembly to move this motion, seconded by Mr. Link (Saskatoon).

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher** (Premier): — I rise to oppose this motion, I think every citizen of Saskatchewan, I think every citizen of Canada, I am sure every citizen on this continent would like to see peace and would like to see the Vietnam crisis ended. But in order to have peace, you must have both sides desirous of it. I don't always agree with everything the Americans do. They make mistakes like other people. But I do get a little sick and tired of the attitude of my socialist friends opposite, in that they seem to be anti-American on everything.

The line that we heard the hon. member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) give today, even though he may have given it quite sincerely, was the Communist line, pure and simple. It was the line of the fellow traveller, the line of the Socialist in most parts of the world, but not the line of Prime Minister Wilson in Great Britain, thank goodness. Down through the years on a great many occasions of economic and military peril, we have had to depend on the goodwill, the hard work of the people of the United States. This relationship has been an umbrella under which Canadians have found shelter in many storms. Why then must we listen to the sentiments that have been expressed today? We have to admit that there is a great similarity between those sentiments and those which are expressed as I say by Communists everywhere. We've seen the peace marchers, we've seen the names of many of these Labor-Progressive supporters, members of the Communist party of Canada and so on. We want to see an end to the Vietnam crisis but we are unalterably opposed to any intervention by this legislature in a matter which involves our best neighbour, United States and a Communist power. We believe that sooner or later Saskatchewan would do a lot better if some of these sentiments were not expressed. In recent years, in recent months, we have watched the Americans and President Johnson make every conceivable effort towards bringing about peace in Vietnam. We know that if there was any reasonable way that the Americans could bring about peace, that they would do so. As I said a moment ago, we think that the Americans don't know how they can bring about peace unless those on the other side are willing to sit down to a conference. A few days ago I received notice in a letter on my desk intimating that this Saturday there will be a march on the legislature to discuss the Vietnam crisis. Who is it signed by? One signator was Mabel Hanley, former Communist candidate. A man called Jim Harding is very active in it. I don't know whether he is a Communist or a Socialist but he could be either. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that members of this government will not be here to meet this delegation.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — My hon. friends opposite can do what they like. May I express the hope, Sir, that this delegation at no time will be permitted inside this Legislature Chamber. It's a free country, they can be outside of it if they want to.

**Mr. J. H. Brockelbank** (Kelsey): — They won't have any door kickers.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No, but maybe you'll have a few Communists on that side to meet them. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House believe we were elected to deal with provincial matters — improve agriculture and find jobs for our people. We believe we were elected to help Indians, to help the homeowners and so on. I think that

resolutions like the one this afternoon is wasting the time of this House. I am going to have some more to say on this debate. In the meantime I would beg leave of the Assembly to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### MOTION: ABOLITION OF THE SENATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. A. M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City).

That this Assembly believes that in order to implement the fundamental principle of democracy, the laws of Canada should be made by the elected representatives of the people, and to this end the Assembly urges the government of Canada to take immediate steps to bring about the abolition of the Senate so that for the second century of our history the parliament of Canada will consist of the Queen and the House of Commons;

and the proposed amendment moved thereto by the Hon. Mr. Cuelenaere (Minister of natural Resources):

That all the words after "That" in line one be deleted and the following words added:

The matter of abolition of the Senate, being a provision to amend the Constitution of Canada, should not be finally determined without the widest possible consultation and debate so as to permit the opinions of all interested groups and individuals to be solicited and obtained.

**Mr. A. E. Blakeney** (Regina West): — I did want to address a few words to the House on this matter, Mr. Speaker, because I considered with a good deal of care the amendment moved by the hon. member from Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere) and I thought that on looking at it, it had a good deal of merit.

I looked at the resolution as it was originally moved by my colleague, the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) and noted that the essence of the resolution was that this Assembly urge the government of Canada to take immediate steps to bring about the abolition of the Senate. I then noted the amendment of the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere). He indicated that he felt that there ought not to be urged upon the government of Canada the taking of immediate steps to abolish the Senate before there was adequate consultation. On reflection, Mr. Speaker, I felt that the position taken by the member for Shellbrook had a good deal of merit and I am personally prepared to accept the general intent of the amendment. I think it may well be premature that the government of Canada take immediate steps to abolish the Senate. It seems to me that perhaps the government of Canada should seek opinions all across this country. Perhaps it is presumptuous of this legislature to suggest that because of a particular point of view held by this legislature or a particular point of view held by the people of Saskatchewan, the government of Canada should

therefore necessarily abolish the Senate. Perhaps the widest possible consultation of all interested groups and individuals ought to be solicited and obtained. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I don't think there can be any doubt that one of the groups that ought to be consulted, one of the interested groups that ought to be consulted, and one of the interested groups whose opinion ought to be obtained is the legislature of Saskatchewan. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that his legislature ought to acknowledge the fact that it is simply one of the organizations, one of the groups which ought to be consulted. But having reached that conclusion that it was probably not reasonable — a shade presumptuous to suggest that because we, the legislature of Saskatchewan, felt in this particular way the Senate accordingly ought to be abolished, nevertheless it is fair to say that it is certainly not presumptuous of us to express an opinion on this subject. Because I believe it is a subject on which the people of Saskatchewan would want us to express an opinion to the government of Canada, and because I agree with the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere) that there ought to be widespread consultation and that one of the groups that ought to be consulted ought to be the legislature of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, to the amendment moved by the member from Shellbrook, the hon. Mr. Cuelenaere, and my amendment is:

That the proposed amendment be amended by adding at the end the following words:

and that as an early step in the Canada-wide expression of opinion, the Saskatchewan legislature records and transmits to the Prime Minister of Canada its opinion that the Senate of Canada should be abolished.

Seconded by the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. J. H. Brockelbank).

The sub-amendment was negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 19**

Messieurs

Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Snyder
Walker	Nicholson	Broten
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Berezowsky	Pepper
Nollet	Dewhurst	Robbins
Blakeney	Michayluk	Brockelbank (Saskatoon city)
Davies	Link	Thibault
Baker		

**NAYS — 31**

Messieurs

Thatcher	Loken	Breker
Howes	MacDougall	Leith
McFarlane	Grant	Radloff
Boldt	Coderre	Romuld
Cameron	Bjarnason	Weatherald
Steuart	Trapp	MacLennan
Heald	Cuelenaere	Larochelle
Gardiner (Melville)	McIsaac	Hooker
Guy	MacDonald	Coupland
Merchant (Mrs.)	Gallagher	Mitchell
Gardner (Moosomin)		

The amendment was agreed to.

The motion, as amended, was agreed to.

**MOTION: RE — OLD AGE SECURITY PENSION**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey):

That this Assembly is of the opinion that the government of Canada should increase the old age security pension to \$100 per month payable at age 65 without a means test;

and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. C. MacDonald (Milestone):

That all the words after the word 'should' in line two be deleted and the following words added:

give immediate consideration to implementing the recommendations of the Special Senate Committee on Ageing so that all Canadians over the age of 65 be assured of a guaranteed minimum income.

**Mrs. Marjorie Cooper** (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, before I adjourned the debate on this resolution before us, I had given reasons why I felt the original motion calling for an old age pension of \$100 a month at age 65 was preferable to the amendment offered by the member from Milestone which asked the government, in effect, to implement the recommendations of the special Senate Committee of a guaranteed income at 65 of \$105 a month for a single person and \$185 a month for a married couple. Now I am not going to take the time of the House to repeat all the arguments that I made but I will, because it is a while since I made these arguments, remind you just in point form why I feel that we should vote for the motion rather than the amendment.

First of all, and I think most important, the chief weakness inherent in the amendment is that many thousands of people who badly need that extra \$25 a month would be left out under what is suggested in the amendment. These people could probably apply for extra money through the Canada Assistance Plan which would mean a humiliating kind of means test. We feel that this is not necessary, that these things should be given as a right. Then I pointed out secondly, that the cost of implementing a pension of \$ 100 at age 65 is not excessive. It is nothing like the figures that were quoted in the House of Commons by Prime Minister Pearson. I gave reasons and I will just restate them quickly in point form.

(1) Because the government is already committed to lowering the pension age progressively to age 65 and this will cost \$475,000,000 in any case. (2) There is a surplus in the Old Age Security Fund of \$216,500,000 that could be used and \$100,000,000 spent by the federal and provincial governments now under the Old Age Assistance Act would be eliminated. Millions of dollars would be saved under the Canada Assistance Plan if the old age pension was raised to \$100 a month, and if the Guaranteed Income Plan, as suggested in the amendment, is followed there would be substantial expense to the Income Tax branch in checking thousands of income tax returns to see if people were eligible to get this guaranteed income. There will be a sizable amount returned to the federal



treasury anyway if the \$100 a month is passed by extra income tax payments. I noted several ways in which money could be found if additional money was needed to pay this \$100 a month. Answering further one argument of the member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) that pensions were a political football, I don't agree. I think the question of pensions is raised because the need is there, but even if he were right and it was a political football, I can see that it would be no less a political football under the amendment because pressure to raise the guaranteed income would be just as great a pressure as now exists. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel there is an urgent and an immediate necessity to raise the old Age Pension to \$100 a month at age 65 and I feel that the principle of the universal Old Age Pensions a basic right is a good principle and one from which we should not depart. According to the amendment we would be departing from the principle, because that extra \$25 would only be paid to a relatively small number of the population. We believe the universal Old Age Pension should be given as a right and should be universal. Because I believe such a plan could be financed without any undue burden on the economy and indeed such a move would spur the economy, and would leave thousands of needy persons without that additional financial assistance, for all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion and vote against the amendment.

**Mr. A. M. Nicholson** (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) and the lady member for Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) have made excellent presentations, but I would like to make a last appeal to have a free vote on this particular resolution. I am aware that the Premier for many years has been advocating the introduction of the means test in connection with the Old Age Security payments. These views are not shared by most members across the way and not shared by the present Liberal government at Ottawa. in view of the fact that Mr. Pearson is committed to providing \$75 per month at 65 within a few short years, I think the figures presented by the lay member for Regina would suggest that this is in the public interest. The passage of this resolution, if accepted by Ottawa, would relieve the Saskatchewan taxpayers of our share of the cost of Old Age Assistance which is a sizable item. Although the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan would be picking up this particular program. I am sure that there are many members across the way who do believe that before Canada is 100 years old we should have \$100 a month for everyone at 65 without a means test.

I wish to commend the member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) for the comments made with regard to the special Committee of the Senate on Ageing. I have referred to this excellent study. I would urge all members to read this report. On page two you will find that we have a relatively young population in Canada compared with other western countries. Using the 1960 statistics, follows: Sweden 12 per cent; United Kingdom 11.9 per cent; Norway 10.9 per cent; West Germany and Denmark 10.6 per cent; U.S.A. 9.3 per cent; Netherlands 9 per cent; New Zealand 8.6 per cent; Australia 8.4 per cent; Canada 7.6 per cent. It may be of interest to hon. members that Prince Edward Island has the highest percentage over 65 of all our provinces with 10.4 per cent; B.C. is a close second with 10.2 per cent; Saskatchewan comes third with an average slightly above the Canadian average.

Other trends worth noting I think might be that the continuing trend from the farm to city continues in all provinces. Canadians live longer than they did a generation ago, chiefly as a result in the changes in infant rather than in adult mortality rates. Deaths fell in the first year from over 100 per thousand live births in the early twenties to a low of 27 in 1961. At present a male infant at birth has a life expectancy of 68 years and a female of 74 years, eight and twelve years more than in 1931. This establishes again the fact that the women are no longer the members of the weaker sex. The fact that women on the average outlive men goes a long way to explain why there are so many more widows than widowers in the population. According to the 1961 census, 71.6 per cent of the widowed population age 65 and over were women compared with 66 per cent twenty years ago.

One of the most serious and difficult problems faced by society in relation to old people is that of helping them maintain some satisfying foothold in the community and with it a sense of self-worth. I submit that this recognition by the Canadian public as we celebrate our 100th year would go a long way to indicate to this particular group that we appreciate the work they have done over the years.

Saskatchewan's most serious problem which presents itself to those 65 and over is that they have lived through two World Wars, a worldwide depression and a serious drought. My friend, the late Professor Britnell in his book "The Wheat Economy — 60" wrote:

A period of drought unprecedented in prairie settlement synchronized with the depression unprecedented in Canadian agriculture; and the province of Saskatchewan, in which the dried-out area chiefly lies, has had to bear an exceptionally heavy burden.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this legislature, I think, should give special consideration to the needs of our people 65 and over and see to it that the federal government has the opinion of this Assembly that we should move immediately to provide pensions of \$100 at the age of 65 without a means test. On page 74 of this report of the Senate Committee, we find some information that is not appreciated by most Canadian people. Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of the 1961 census more than 11 per cent of the males between 65 and 69 received less than \$500 per year and 50 per cent of the women in this age group had less than \$500. Those over 70 have been eligible for the Old Age Security and are in a better position, and so consequently only 1.5 per cent of the males had under \$500 and 5.7 per cent of the females. Take the group \$500 to \$599 and a third group \$1,000 to \$1,499 and we find that of the Canadians 65 to 69 receiving under \$1,500 — 38.5 per cent are males and 85 per cent females. Again the Old Age Security improves the position of those over 70, but still 60.6 per cent of the males and 84 per cent of the females were in the position that they had less than \$1,500 per year. This statement indicates clearly that older women have a much more difficult time finding adequate food, shelter and the necessary clothing than men. It is encouraging that no one opposite has made a good case for supporting the amendment and defeating the motion. I submit that someone should advance some good reasons because the electors of the members, of all members, will want to know why the members of this legislature did not consider it wise to pass an opinion and ask the federal government to move. There are two very popular Canadian welfare programs which have been identified by people in countries all over

**March 24, 1966**

the world as being of public interest. I refer to Family Allowances and Old Age Security. These have made a valuable contribution to raise living standards and to help to build a buoyant economy.

Mr. Pearson in speaking in opposition to Mr. Douglas' amendment in the House on the 20th of January referred to this \$855,000,000 cost figure. My colleague from Regina has dealt with this argument very effectively. I think it should be noted that Canada's defence expenditures are still running over \$4,000,000 per day. since the end of the Second World War we have spent on our defence over \$22,000,000,000. There isn't anyone in his right senses who would suggest that the economy of Canada will not stand the spending of \$855,000,000 for our elderly citizens. The lady member for Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) pointed out the providing of the extra \$25 for those over 70 would only be a mere \$225,000,000. She mentioned the surplus in this fund is \$216,000,000. She might also have gone on to say that even in the event that it was necessary to raise additional funds it is hard to make a case for no one in Canada paying more than \$120 out of income tax payments for this particular program. It really doesn't make sense, Mr. Speaker, that the citizen I spoke about in another debate was in the fortunate position that after paying all the high income taxes for people in his bracket he had over \$300 a day, seven days a week, 52 weeks a year, and should only give \$120 a year towards the old Age Security Fund.

Mr. Speaker, in the House of Commons on the 8th of March, Mrs. MacInnis of Vancouver-Kingsway made an excellent case in supporting the resolution which is before us. Mrs. MacInnis is one of the very few people in Canada, I imagine, who was in Ottawa in 1926 and 1927, when the first old age pension legislation was introduced. She was there when quite a young woman as her father's secretary. She mentions three outstanding years, at least three years that should be outstanding, the year 1927, when Canada introduced its first old age pension legislation, the year 1951, when Canada moved to provide a pension to everyone without a means test at 70, and hopefully, 1966, the year in which we would move to reduce that age to 65 and increase the amount to \$100 a month. I am convinced that members across the way are really out of step with trends in Canada. I hope that some of them will show the good judgment to vote for this motion because it is my considered opinion that Mr. Pearson will be moving in this direction before many more moons.

Mrs. MacInnis in her remarks referred to a letter that she received from one of her constituents. This woman wrote:

I am 68, retired, and thought 20 years ago that I would be able to live comfortably on the pension I had arranged. What can I do? It costs 40 cents bus fare to get downtown, no tea, no meal; even window-shopping must be avoided as a way of life. Is this living? How does one enjoy oneself? People were never meant to be pigeon holed alone in one room. Even dogs to be healthy must have running room and, for just one of our top politicians for one week to try and live as a lot of our older folks are forced to do. How much fortitude would they have at the end of it?

She ends her letter by:

Let the last ten years of life be a reward and a blessing, not a curse.

and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the old people in Canada can't wait. The time is now for the members of this legislature to speak up for this very important group in Canada and especially in Saskatchewan. I hope that some of the members across the way will be voting against the amendment and for the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

The amendment was agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 32**

Messieurs

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

**NAYS — 20**

Messieurs

Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Baker
Nollet	Nicholson	Snyder
Walker	Dewhurst	Brotten
Blakeney	Berezowsky	Robbins
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Michayluk	Pepper
Davies	Smishek	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Thibault	Link	

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

**MOTION RE TELEVISION OUTLET IN SASKATCHEWAN**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):

That this Assembly

- (1) Notes with concern that Saskatchewan continues to be the only Canadian province west of New Brunswick which is not served by at least one CBC-owned and operated television station.
- (2) Urges the government of Canada and the Board of Broadcast Governors to authorize the CBC to proceed immediately with construction of a television outlet in Saskatchewan.

and the proposed amendment thereto, moved by Mr. MacLennan:

That all the words after the word “concern” in line two be deleted and the following words added:

That many areas of Saskatchewan continue to be served by only one TV channel and urges the Board of Broadcast Governors to award additional franchises in those areas where applications are pending for alternate channels and that careful consideration be given to the location of satellite stations so that the interests of those areas which have insufficient populations to warrant originating stations would be best served.

**Mr. A. M. Nicholson** (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, when this amendment was moved by the member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) the other day, I didn't have a copy and consequently I adjourned the debate. Now that I have had a chance to read the original and the amendment, I hope that members opposite will have a second thought about what they are suggesting. They are asking that all the words after “concern” in line one be struck out. They do not seem to be concerned that Saskatchewan continues to be the only Canadian province west of New Brunswick which is not served by at least one CBC owned and operated television station. I cannot think of any member in this House who is happy that Saskatchewan continues to be in this position. I am sorry I wasn't able to watch television last night but a bright young girl from Mikado was appearing on a TV program from Montreal. I think it is a great pity that young artists in this province have to go to Winnipeg or Calgary, or Edmonton, Vancouver or Toronto before having a chance to appear on the television programs which are so much of our everyday life. This girl and her husband have had the good fortune to study in Vienna and in Paris. I am sure there are very few members in this House who ever heard of a place called Mikado, but here is a young couple who have a distinguished record and many more could be named who have left Saskatchewan who would continue to live here and would make a contribution to the life of Saskatchewan, if we had a CBC owned and operated television station. I think that members on both sides of the House have had representations from a great variety of organizations, urging that the government of Canada and the Board of Broadcast Governors authorize the CBC to proceed immediately with construction of a television outlet in Saskatchewan.

I saw in the Leader Post some time ago that the Wascana Site had been set for a TV station. our friends in Saskatoon haven't yet conceded that Regina should be the logical place but certainly either Regina or Saskatoon should be selected. The junior member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) suggests Moose Jaw. Yes, I have no objection to Moose Jaw, but some place in Saskatchewan should be selected. I hope the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) will be opposing the proposal made here. I notice that the Conservative member for Meadow Lake had a motion in the House of Commons on March 14th of this year. His motion was:

That in the opinion of this House the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should take steps to carry out its duty to provide television coverage by immediately establishing transmission facilities in northwestern Saskatchewan including Buffalo narrows, Uranium City and on to Fort Smith, Hay River and Yellowknife.

Mr. Speaker, there is a very large important area in Canada within the boundaries of Saskatchewan and immediately to our north and to the northwest of us that people of this House should not forget about. I was interested in reading a presentation made by the Canadian Broadcasting League when they appeared before the Board of Broadcast Governors at a public hearing in Ottawa. It was on the 7th of March that they made their submission. They point out that they speak for a number of organizations and represent a large cross-section of Canadian society, for example, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the Canadian Labour Congress, Co-operative Union of Canada, Federated Women's Institutes of Canada, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Canadian Association of Consumers, Catholic Women's League, Crop Insurance Services, and a number of others. This is not a new fly-by-night organization; it has been working for over thirty-five years with three objectives. First, to protect the public interest in broadcasting, to safeguard public ownership, especially as representatives of the CBC and to speak for the consumers, the viewers, the users of broadcasting, and to work for high quality programming.

Their submission points out that the group is not a group of long-haired intellectuals as they have been pictured; they speak for hard-handed farmers, for workers, for women and mothers, for ordinary citizens who are deeply concerned about what comes into their homes over the air waves. I will mention two or three of their points in their submission. They point out first that the airwaves belong to the people of Canada, not to broadcasters. I license to broadcast is given as a public trust, a privilege granted and may be revoked when not properly used.

We want the CBC to fill a central, national and predominant role; and we don't want to see anything done that might prevent or erode the effectiveness or lessen the coverage and influence of the CBC. We believe that all networks should be under public control. A network is too powerful an instrument to be given over to private profit interests. We believe that a network should not be in the hands of private people for the same reason that Trans Canada highway and the Post Office should not be in private hands.

Another paragraph which is also important makes an appeal to a great many who watch television. We are opposed to the present dominating influence of the advertisers' programs. At its best advertising is pretty poor broadcasting fare, and a great deal of advertising on radio and TV today is an unworthy use of the airwaves. We don't believe broadcasters have a right to pummel viewers and listeners with silly commercials. The present influence of the advertiser induces poor broadcasting and represents a distortion of social values. The public is not well served where a commercial interest is paramount and where profits for investors are the main objective. We are not purists about advertising, but if we must have advertising let it be in good taste, not pitched to the lowest common denominator. We object to advertising that offends by its frequency and its intrusion and we don't think the Board of Broadcast Governors has to guarantee the profitability of the private broadcasting sector or any particular private station or the CTV network. The private broadcaster goes into a free enterprise venture with his eyes open in the hope and expectation of making profits. If he fails he shouldn't come crying to the BBG to be released from the conditions under which he got his license to broadcast. If the CTV is bankrupt, that comes from the risk which the free enterpriser takes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal more information that

**March 24, 1966**

could be advanced in this general field. I remember hearing the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) deliver the Quance lectures at the university of Saskatoon, back in 1959. His reference to the CBC in the field of education was of special interest. Here is a paragraph on page A of the Role of Government in Canadian Education:

Out of the Aird Commission report in 1929 and the findings of a subsequent parliamentary committee in 1932, came the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission, later the CBC, and the assumption of some public responsibility in the field of communication. In justification of this new role of government, Mr. Bennett, then Prime Minister said 'No other scheme than that of public ownership can ensure the people of this country, without regard to class, or place, equal enjoyment of the benefits and pleasures of radio broadcasting'.

The Leader of the Opposition in the Quance lectures went on to say that in many ways the CBC had been a factor in Canadian education development in school as well as out of school. Television's power as a means of communicating ideas and influence is so tremendous as to be almost frightening. It seems essential that parliamentary government representative of the people should be vested with the responsibility of guaranteeing reasonable access to the transmission and receipt of such an influence.

One more quotation, Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. B. Bennett, when the legislation was introduced — he was the Prime Minister back in 1932 — had some wise words to say:

Canadians have the right to a system of broadcasting from Canadian sources equal in all respects to that of any other country.

and he declared the intention of the government to have the House appoint a committee to inquire into the whole system of radio broadcasting. Then a few years later in 1936, when Mr. Bennett was the Leader of the Opposition, another very well known Canadian, C. D. Howe, brought in the legislation establishing the CBC. It was interesting to have these wealthy Canadians who had made their fortune in the free enterprise system recognize that in the field of radio — no television in those days — the public had a vital interest. I am aware that in Saskatchewan the existing TV facilities have performed a very useful role and they are covering the province. I understand that many of them would like to have in Saskatchewan the establishing of a CBC facility because no private organization has the resources and the possibilities of developing that would be available to CBC. So I hope that members on the government side will have had a second look at the improvident proposal made by the member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) and defeat this amendment and support the motion which was so well received and so well presented by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) when he moved it initially.

The amendment was agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 31**

Messieurs

Thatcher

MacDougall

Leith

Howes  
McFarlane  
Boldt  
Cameron  
Steuart  
Heald  
Gardiner (Melville)  
Guy  
Merchant (Mrs.)  
Loken

Grant  
Coderre  
Bjarnason  
Trapp  
Cuelenaere  
McIsaac  
MacDonald  
Gallagher  
Breker

Radloff  
Romuld  
Weatherald  
MacLennan  
Larochelle  
Hooker  
Coupland  
Gardner (Moosomin)  
Mitchell

**NAYS — 22**

Messieurs

Lloyd  
Cooper (Mrs.)  
Nollet  
Walker  
Brockelbank (Kelsey)  
Blakeney  
Davies  
Baker

Whelan  
Nicholson  
Dewhurst  
Berezowsky  
Michayluk  
Smishek  
Link

Snyder  
Brotten  
Robbins  
Pepper  
Pederson  
Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)  
Thibault

The motion, as amended, was agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 50**

Messieurs

Thatcher  
Howes  
McFarlane  
Boldt  
Cameron  
Steuart  
Heald  
Gardiner (Melville)  
Guy  
Merchant (Mrs.)  
Loken  
MacDougall  
Grant  
Coderre  
Bjarnason  
Trapp  
Cuelenaere

McIsaac  
MacDonald  
Gallagher  
Breker  
Leith  
Radloff  
Romuld  
Weatherald  
MacLennan  
Larochelle  
Hooker  
Coupland  
Gardner (Moosomin)  
Mitchell  
Lloyd  
Nollet  
Walker

Brockelbank (Kelsey)  
Blakeney  
Davies  
Thibault  
Whelan  
Nicholson  
Dewhurst  
Michayluk  
Smishek  
Link  
Baker  
Snyder  
Brotten  
Robbins  
Pepper  
Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)

**NAYS — 3**

Messieurs

Cooper (Mrs.)

Berezowsky

Pederson

**STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER RE BILL NO. 19, AN ACT RESPECTING THE CREDIT GRANTORS REGULATION ACT, 1966:**

Hon. members will recall that on Friday, February 11th, when Bill no. 19, entitled An Act respecting The Credit Grantors Regulation Act, 1966, standing in the name of the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) was introduced by leave and read the first



time, its further proceeding was made subject to the customary Speaker's caveat as to its being in order. I listened with interest to arguments as to its admissibility so ably presented by hon. members on Tuesday, 1st march, and I wish to express my thanks to them for the benefit of their advice, which has helped me to discharge one of the most difficult duties which falls on the Chair.

Standing Order No. 45 of our legislature states in part as follows:

Any vote, resolution, address or Bill introduced in the Assembly for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost to any purpose whatsoever or to impose any new or additional charge upon the public revenue or upon the people shall be recommended to the Assembly by message of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, before it is considered by the Assembly.

Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Citation 355, states in part as follows:

The Recommendation of the Governor General must be obtained before any Resolution or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue or of any tax or impost is presented;

and again in Citation No. 246, subsection 3:

An amendment infringes the financial initiative of the Crown, not only if it increases the amount, but also if it extends the objects and purposes expressed in the communication by which the Crown has recommended a charge.

Erskine May states on page 779 of the 17th Edition of Parliamentary Practice:

It is not always easy to determine whether a particular proposal for expenditure actually imposes a charge and therefore requires the Queen's Recommendation. The practice of the House has evolved certain tests for deciding this question which may be summed up as follows: In order to constitute a charge upon public funds expenditure must be (1) new and distinct; (2) payable out of the Exchequer; (3) effectively imposed.

Examples as stated by May of Bills requiring the Queen's recommendation are as follows:

- (1) Charges upon moneys to be provided by Parliament for salaries and other expenses caused by the imposition of novel duties upon the Executive Government by the legislation of the session; and
- (2) The expenses arising out of the imposition of new duties on an existing department or authority.

Bill no. 19 provides for the regulation of credit grantors for which purpose the Deputy Provincial Secretary shall be the Registrar of credit and that he shall amongst other things, exercise general supervision over credit grantors and over the business of credit granting in the province; that he shall conduct studies, inquiries and surveys, and that he shall disseminate information respecting the methods of obtaining or granting credit; the practices of credit grantors; the costs of loans; the facilities available for obtaining loans or credit; and such other

information as he considers desirable for the purpose of informing the public respecting such matters.

I have looked at the precedents in this matter, and I agree with the hon. member for Hanley that our practice in the past does not appear to have been consistent. To mention one instance he drew my attention to the Cemeteries Act, 1955, which imposed additional duties on a public agency by requiring it to issue licences, examine financial statements and so forth. This Bill was not given the Lieutenant Governor's recommendation. Yet in 1965, another Cemeteries Act was passed which re-enacted many of the provisions of the 1955 Act as well as imposing new duties on the authority responsible for overseeing the administration of cemeteries. This 1965 Bill was given the Lieutenant Governor's recommendation.

I might add that the other Bill mentioned by the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) as not carrying the Lieutenant Governor's recommendation — namely the Bill respecting the Department of Industry and Commerce — was in fact given that recommendation. The hon. member may have been misled by the fact that the recommendation was given not on first reading as is usually the practice but on second reading.

Despite this and other variations in past practice, however, I am clear that in relation to the authorities already cited, the terms of Bill no. 19, if enacted, would effectively impose a new and distinct additional charge upon the revenues of the Province of Saskatchewan by the imposition of new duties upon an existing department, namely, the Provincial Secretary's Department, and by extending the objects and purposes of that department.

Moreover, and in addition to the foregoing, I would draw the attention of the House to further examples as stated by me, of money resolutions requiring the Queen's recommendation:

- (3) Contingent or prospective charges upon the Consolidated Fund; and
- (4) any proposal whereby the Crown would incur a liability or a contingent liability payable out of money to be voted by Parliament.

So strictly has this ruling been applied in the British House that in the session of 1933-34, a guarantee of the principal and interest of the stock issued by the Government of Newfoundland was required to carry the Royal Message of Approval.

In the light of the foregoing it becomes necessary to define the meaning of the term "contingent liability". This term is ably defined on pages 367 and 368 in Volume 17 of that complete work of legal reference, "Corpus Juris Secundum", as follows:

- 1. A liability which is not absolute but depends on an uncertain event.
- 2. A liability which may or may not occur.
- 3. A liability which has not accrued, but may accrue on the happening of some future event.

A contingent liability is not an absolute liability existing in the present, but one which may become an absolute liability upon the happening of a future event.

Bill no. 19 makes provision for an appeal by any person dissatisfied with the decision of the Registrar, to a Judge of the

District court. Where an appeal lies, a defence is implied. It follows, therefore, that it would be the responsibility of the Registrar to defend his decision in court, if it were appealed. The Bill therefore creates a contingent liability to the province for any costs in connection with the defence.

It is my firm belief that those charged and entrusted by the people with the work of raising the provincial revenues must be the sole arbiters of the institution of new or additional expenditures and that the privilege of initiating legislation which will be a new or increased charge upon the people must therefore be the absolute prerogative of the government.

I believe this principle to be fundamental to the preservation of self-government. It does not limit the right of members to place their views before the House and the public and to test the opinion of the legislature, for though they may not introduce a Bill involving money which would, if passed, be an Act of the legislature binding on the government, they are not prevented from moving a properly worded resolution or recommendation in general terms seeking the consideration of the House and of the people. Resolutions of this nature are permissible because, if adopted, they have no operative effect and no grant is made or burden imposed upon the people.

Accordingly, I rule that Bill No. 19 is out of order.

**Mr. R. A. Walker** (Hanley): — Your Honour, may I say on my own behalf, and I'm sure on behalf of the House, that the House is very much indebted for the learned and scholarly ruling which Your Honour has given and I, for one, will be grateful to be able to refer to that ruling from time to time in the future.

## **SECOND READINGS**

**Mr. W. S. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition) moved second reading of Bill No. 30, An Act to amend the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the motion to give second reading to Bill no. 30, an Act to amend the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act, I should like to divide my remarks roughly into two parts. One part will be a description of the machinery by which the proposed amendments would extend and protect the rights of Saskatchewan citizens. The second part will be concerned with the reasons why in our opinion we think such amendments are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, it may be noted that this Bill is one of four proposals which those of us on this side of the legislature are seeking to have the legislature approve of this year. These four proposals all aim at extending the basic rights of the people of Saskatchewan by adding to the machinery whereby those rights may be protected. In doing this, of course, our objective is to guarantee better than we have, the individual freedom of Saskatchewan citizens.

The first of those proposals was the resolution with respect to investigating the position of Ombudsman as it might apply to the province of Saskatchewan. It was turned down by the government after being moved by my colleague, the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney). It may be called that outside of the House, the member from Regina West promised to reintroduce it next year and

the Premier has rejected it already for next year. In the light of that, it's worth noting I believe the two recent editorials, one in the March 18th issue of the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, indicating that in Manitoba a proposal there by the Liberal party later supported by the NDP, for the appointment of a provincial Ombudsman, has now been adopted by the provincial administration of that province. Just following that, of course, there was an endorsing editorial in the pages of the Regina Leader Post.

The second of these proposals to extend human rights in Saskatchewan is the one to which I am now speaking, Mr. Speaker. The third one is the one which stands next on the Order paper which proposes similar amendments to the Fair Employment Practices Act. The fourth one was to have been the Bill with respect to consumer protection. This we have not been able to proceed with because of the rules of the House. We will seek to draw attention to it in later action in the legislature.

Now I turn more specifically to the legislative proposals of these amendments. They propose to clarify certain rights established under the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act. The amendments propose to do so by including, among the beliefs and activities concerning which one ought to be able to express himself, concerning which one ought to be able to take reasoned and reasonable and appropriate action, those beliefs and activities which relate to participation in politics as a right of individual citizens in democracy. To achieve this purpose the amendments propose some added definition of rights. They propose some machinery also. They propose that an individual believing he has a grievance with regard to the violation of these rights, may use the machinery which already exists in the Fair Employment Practices Act. This machinery, Mr. Speaker, provides that any person claiming to be so aggrieved may complain to the director appointed under that Act. The director is one who is designated by the minister to receive and deal with such complaints. When the director receives such complaints he is, by the Act, required to have the matter investigated and in the words of the Act "shall endeavour to effect a settlement". In addition to this the minister may appoint a commission. This commission operates under the authority of the Public Inquiries Act. The minister may issue and again I quote "whatever order he deems necessary to carry the recommendations of the commission into effect". Later the Act states "every personal shall comply with the order".

The Act also provides for court reference and establishes penalties for violation and non-compliance. The final section of the Act states in part, "The provisions of this Act shall bind the Crown . . ." In establishing why we think it is necessary to move these amendments, I want to take a few minutes to deal with the history of this kind of legislation in Canada and in Saskatchewan. "An Act for the Recognition and the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms was passed by the Parliament of Canada on August 4th, 1960. This Act states in part this:

It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms namely, (d) The Freedom of Speech; (e) Freedom of Assembly and Association.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that it does not say freedom of speech "except with regard to political matters". Nor does it

**March 24, 1966**

say “freedom of assembly and association” except those intended in political action.

In Saskatchewan almost 20 years ago we passed the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights. Section four of that Bill now reads:

Every person and every class of person shall under the law enjoy the right to freedom of expression through all means of communication including speech, the press, radio and the arts.

It does not say, Mr. Speaker, shall enjoy the freedom of expression “except on political matters”.

Section five adds:

Every person and every class of person shall enjoy the right to peaceable assembly with others.

The section does not exclude peaceable assembly for political purposes. Section seven says:

Every qualified voter resident in Saskatchewan shall enjoy the right to exercise freely his franchise in all elections.

It says “exercise freely his franchise”, and freedom in exercising his franchise is more than just the right of secrecy while in the polling place putting an X on the ballot.

The proposed amendments which are in this Bill are introduced because we in this group believe that there have been violations of the spirit and of the intent of these principles, which were set out as law in this legislature almost 20 years ago. Mr. Speaker, I admit that the amendments don’t provide all of the corrections and all of the guarantees which would be of advantage to Saskatchewan people. They don’t do that because there are limitations on the type of legislation which the rules of the legislature allow an opposition party to introduce. During recent months I have frequently urged establishment of a Commission on Human Rights. This commission could do more by way of giving comprehensive guarantees that freedom would not be denied or abridged in these times in our province. However, the very proper rules of the legislature prevent an opposition from introducing such legislation.

Admittedly also, Mr. Speaker, legislation by itself can’t fully guarantee all of the necessary rights and freedoms of people in an intelligent democracy. The effective guarantee of such rights depends in large part on the people themselves. It depends on the responsible acceptance by people of the right to speak and to organize according to the dictates of one’s conscience and mind. This indeed is a cherished right. It depends on the willingness of people to insist that governments or employers or others shall not be allowed to destroy or abridge these precious rights. It depends on the fervent belief of people that only in this way can everybody achieve full meaning and dignity and make a complete contribution to the general welfare. Also, of course, regardless of the goodness of any law its effect depends in part on how it is administered by the government of the day.

Now, in speaking of the events which give rise to concern about the danger of human rights in Saskatchewan I find it advisable to go to some which admittedly the proposed amendments

cannot correct or prevent, would not have prevented had they been in force. While there is this admitted limitation, my hope is that the amendments will provide at least a finger in the dike mechanism and may prevent the flood which may be inevitable, unless there is some such action taken.

One writer has pointed out to us that “the ultimate value of a free economy is not production but freedom”. I submit that that value is being eroded as a minimum, that it is being ignored by some of the emphasis and some of the motivation in today’s scene in Saskatchewan. Our aim in Saskatchewan ought to be production with freedom. There is no reason why Saskatchewan people ought to be denied either production or freedom. The struggle for freedom is, of course, one of the telling characteristics of our days. The story of this struggle for freedom is the main ingredient of such of today’s news of the world. We can make a contribution in our province. We can make it in part by our example, that is, by putting our own house in order and keeping our own house in order. It was my privilege a number of years ago to be in Eastern Africa at the time the United States Supreme Court made some very far-reaching and wise rulings with regard to integration in the school system in that country. It was amazing the extent to which that ruling brought forth a great wave of hope in the hearts of Africans, in nations many thousands of miles away. Obviously the ruling that we seek here today is not of that consequence. But it is important. It has not been infrequent at all in Saskatchewan history that a candle lit here has become a beacon in all of Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Freedom, Mr. Speaker, must steadily become inclusive of more people. It must in a sense become increasingly inclusive of more aspects of life. To some extent freedom is constantly being redefined. To a very large extent the freedoms of yesterday are kept safe only by the extensions of today. As a minimum we can’t afford to go backwards.

Let me turn to some more specific matters, to examples which convince us in this group that the rights of freedom of speech and the freedom of association have been eroded by recent events in our province, that these rights may well stand in danger of further erosion and that the actions which have resulted in this erosion have been without need and have produced no public good.

First of all I refer to the right to do business, to do business without fear of reprisal from the government because of differing political opinions. I hold that this right has in fact been destroyed for some in Saskatchewan and has been threatened for others. As one example, in community after community, we know of supposedly independent businessmen who contract to sell government insurance was cancelled. No notice was given. The standard procedure was to cancel the contract the day before the agent received the notification. The fact of good production performance on the part of the agent was of no help in continuing his right to sell. The circumstance of being a veteran of two World Wars, supported by a petition signed by many in the community, the supporting resolutions of municipal councils, these were considered to be entirely irrelevant. No reason was given for this action. The minister hides behind the curtain of claimed privilege because of public interest. The agent in these cases had no right to know why continuing business opportunities were denied him.

**March 24, 1966**

He had no opportunity to sell the business. His business was simply wiped out by the stroke of the pen whose scratchings were dictated by a Liberal cabinet minister in Regina. The right to do business while differing with the government is threatened in this province. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that such threats are not confined to SGIO agents. I want to urge all businessmen to be concerned and remind them of a very old and very wise saying "ask not for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

I submit for example, that the bell tolls rather loud and rather clearly for many people in business in the remarks of the chairman of the conciliation board with respect to what has been called the Basken case. I admit that he wasn't a government spokesman, that's true. He was chosen by the government and I submit that inadvertently perhaps he expressed government philosophy when he used these words taken from the transcript. He said this:

Let's take the case of a corporation that does spend money actively supporting one political party, and it loses the election — this party is not elected, but it has been out actively campaigning to elect the losing party, should that company be surprised if it suffers the consequences — the political consequences of its actions?

I submit, that suggests Liberal policy. The chairman went on to say this:

Suppose it . . .

(that is the company that has been supporting a political party that didn't win.)

Suppose it loses its licenses, or fails to get something that it comes to the government to ask for at a later date — should it be surprised that it doesn't get these things?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the right to do business, free from go reprisal, has been destroyed for some and is threatened for others.

Secondly, let me go on to the treatment of some public employees, because I find there also some added violations of basic human rights. I give just a few examples of the many which are available. First of all one which is very close to us in this legislature, Mr. Speaker. For many years, starting back before 1944, the Sergeant-at-Arms in the legislature Assembly was a distinguished soldier, one of Canada's Victoria Cross holders. He continued in that position, except for absence during the Second World War, until his death of just a few years ago. At that time the government appointed another good citizen of Regina, one also who had been a soldier of good repute. In recent months, just a few weeks before the legislature was to open, he discovered accidentally that he wasn't to be appointed this year, that his appointment was not to continue. The familiar pattern again reappears. No notice was given. No reason advanced, no courtesy nor consideration applied. In the end, when this person did complain he did then, on his request receive a letter. But he didn't receive a letter from the Premier nor from a cabinet minister. He received a letter from a civil servant who had been, I presume, told to write it. I submit that in this case the members of the cabinet and the Premier refused to accept their responsibility and required a civil servant to write in an attempt to explain their action.

I would like to refer briefly to that letter, Mr. Speaker, it was tabled in this legislature on February 18th; the letter was dated January 31st. It says first of all:

I can assure you that this decision in no way reflects on the adequacy of the manner in which you carried out your responsibility in that role over the years.

There was no fault to be found with the gentlemen's work. It goes on to say that:

The decision of the government was predicated on a change in circumstances that arose with your cessation as a full-time employee of the Saskatchewan government.

In other words he was no longer a full-time employee and the argument in the first part of the paragraph is that this interfered with his re-appointment. In the same paragraph it goes on to say:

It was felt that with the relatively short period which the Sergeant-at-Arms is required during the year, it would be preferable to place in this position, persons interested in carrying out duties for only a short time of the year.

Which, of course, exactly explains the position of a man who was not reappointed or who was dismissed. He was told first of all it was because he was no longer a full-time employee that he was not considered to continue at employment. He was told secondly that the employment was available only to people who were part-time employees. Then the following paragraph is:

For that reason . . .

It doesn't say which one.

For that reason the government embarked on the course it is now pursuing. I trust this will adequately explain the policy of the government in this regard.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I leave to anyone who can read whether or not that explains adequately or otherwise, the action that was taken.

**Mr. R. A. Walker** (Hanley): — Some minister must have drafted it.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Now, I turn to a second example, which to me demonstrates that human rights have been violated in this province. The must discussed dismissal of a Power Corporation employee must be named for what it is or what it was. It was and is a destruction of the right of free speech and of the right of political expression. It was and does demonstrate a willingness on the part of the government that sits opposite to make political rules unilaterally and to apply them retroactively. Mr. Basken, the citizen concerned did engage in political activity. He did so on his own time. He did so while on leave of absence without pay. This leave of absence without pay was properly granted by those with proper authority to grant it under a collective bargaining agreement signed between the union and the government and properly ratified in every way. All this the government ignored. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that Basken broke no law, that he violated no agreement with his employer; that he abused no rights which were not accorded to him. He was accused of something or other. He was accused by whom? We



**March 24, 1966**

don't know. The government says in effect "You have no right to know". He was accused of what? We don't know. The government says in effect, "You have no right to know".

His accusers to this day remain faceless, nameless and, to the public, voiceless. But he was fired. A Conciliation Board was established. This board, with minority dissent, refused to allow the public to hear the evidence. This decision was commented on in the Leader Post in an editorial, January 28th, 1965. The editorial concluded with these words:

The people are entitled to a full disclosure of the facts in the Basken affair. But they can obtain it only if the hearings are conducted in the open. The right of the people to be informed is involved directly, a right which is abrogated by conducting hearings behind closed doors.

The editorial, Mr. Speaker, is appropriately entitled "Abrogation of Right".

Nevertheless the procedure was followed of excluding the public from any chance to hear these discussions. The board again and again, with minority dissent, accepted the claim of privilege by the government with respect to certain relevant information. As a result the board was unable to examine all the facts in the case. The government, according, at least, to the Minister of Labour, had planned to keep the text of the report secret. I refer to a Leader Post news item on December 16 which reads as follows:

The Minister (that is the Minister of Labour) told the Leader Post the hearings of the board were held in camera and the complete text of the report would not be made public.

Let's make certain we get those words, Mr. Speaker. He told the newspaper that "the complete text of the report would not be made public". And he held to that position, that attempt to preclude the public from knowledge about this case, until after the union concerned pointed out that the minister could not rewrite this particular law, could not do so unilaterally and retroactively. Then the decision was changed and the report was made available to the public.

To the extent that it was made available is perhaps the only way in which we can say that the procedures stopped short of being a Star Chamber performance in all respects. I want to ask the legislature, Mr. Speaker, to contrast what has happened in this case with a statement made by the Premier on May 22nd, 1964. He was at that time addressing representatives of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association, and his words were printed in the Dome, a magazine issued by the organization in June, 1964. I read the direct and exact quotation:

I want to reiterate again today what I have said so many times in the past, that civil servants have nothing to fear from the new government. Their jobs will be secure and their political independence will be respected. I believe the politics of the civil servants is his or her personal affair so long as that policy is conducted on their own time.

It didn't take very many months, Mr. Speaker, until that statement was forgotten entirely. Nothing could more thoroughly repudiate

the Premier's speech than the action that was taken in the case of which I have just spoken. More recently, in a telecast, the Premier put forth some other claims about this case. he claimed that it has been handled by management. This was news to the people because this claim had not been made before. Well, he supplied no evidence about this statement, however, and this and some other statements which he made are denied by the evidence which the law forced the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) to make available when it forced him to make available the text of the report.

But let me raise some questions about this statement. If it had been handled by the management why then did the Acting General Manager inform Mr. Basken on September 24th, six months after the election, that "we", meaning management, "have received word from higher authorities that you are to be moved, September 24th". Secondly, if Mr. Basken was dismissed for political activity while working, why did the corporation not present such evidence to the Conciliation Board? Never at any time did the management of the corporation make any such claims. Not in any single word does the testimony before the board support this particular claim. Thirdly, if it had been handled by the management then why, according to the transcript of the Conciliation Board hearing, did the Premier in front of several witnesses say this and I quote from the transcript:

Let me set the record straight. The action and the instructions came from this desk, from my desk.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, to contrast this treatment given to one public servant with that given to at least one other public servant. I refer to Mr. Odishaw, who was until last year the Executive Assistant to the Premier. Last year in this legislature it was demonstrated that he not only carried on political activities but continued to hold political office while fully employed, presumably, the government of this province.

Let me go into some more recent events. Contrast again the way in which he was treated with the way in which Mr. Basken was treated. The North Battleford News Optimist on September 14th, 1965, had this to say about Mr. Odishaw:

He (meaning Odishaw) hit the campaign trail on Saturday while he waits for the party's official nomination day of October 2nd.

Let's note those dates. September 14th the paper says that Mr. Odishaw "hit the campaign trail" — September 14th. On September 29th, two weeks later he was writing and signing letters as the Executive Assistant to the Premier. I know because I have one of such letters. Again, Mr. Speaker, Return No. 31 in this House this year, tabled on March 18th, confirms that Mr. Odishaw was paid until October 2nd, more than two weeks after he had "hit the campaign trail" in the federal constituency of The Battlefords. He hit the campaign trail without leave of absence from the government, while receiving pay from the government, while still writing letters as the Executive Assistant of the Premier.

**Mr. I. A. MacDougall** (Souris-Estevan): — He did this on his own time.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I suggest, while receiving pay

**March 24, 1966**

from the government that might have been his own time? Without leave of absence from the government, that might be his own time? There is no record of him having applied or received leave of absence from this government. Let me refer to a second gentleman in the same area. Still employed by the government, Mr. Norman Rebin, according to a report in this House had no leave of absence and asked for no leave of absence from the government and presumably he was on full pay. He was on full pay for a while in North Battleford, according to news reports, looking for the federal nomination. He withdrew afterwards, after having his qualifications described in the most glowing fashion. (I hope everybody has read about what a valuable person they have) and after saying that his duties were going to take him out of the province so that he could no longer run. Just recently, evidently there was a change in plans, because while still on government salary he, too, has announced that he is going to be a candidate, or will be seeking to be a candidate in the provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that Mr. Rebin for example should not be allowed to take this kind of action he is doing. But what I am saying is: contrast this with the situation with respect to another employee, namely, Mr. Basken. It was alright for them, but for Mr. Basken to do this, on his own time, while on properly granted leave of absence, without pay, so wrong that it results in being dismissed from his job.

Let me go on, Mr. Speaker, to still another aspect of the situation, and one which leads me to say, as I said earlier, that further erosion of these rights are threatened in the province of Saskatchewan. You know in 1916, that is a long while ago now, there was a report of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations. In part this report said and I quote:

Political freedom can exist only when there is industrial freedom.

It goes on, I quote again:

There are now within the body of our Republic, industrial communities which are virtually principalities, oppressive to those dependent upon them for a livelihood and a dreadful menace to the peace and welfare of the nation.

Mr. Speaker, most of us would have said that this situation couldn't exist in Saskatchewan 50 years after such a statement was made in the United States. It has, I submit, come to pass here. My reference is to the fact that the government of this province through the minister in charge of the Power Corporation, the Minister of health (Mr. Steuart) has recently proclaimed the Saskatchewan Power Corporation as its own political principality. A form of state rule which most people thought had long disappeared. According to an editorial in the Star Phoenix on January 21st, 1966, and I quote:

D. G. Steuart, the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation issued a warning that the corporation would not 'accept, all or condone political activity in the provincial field by its employees'. Such activity the minister said would result in dismissal.

They would not "accept, allow or condone political activity by its employees. Such activity, the minister said, would result in dismissal", and some hon. members over there say Hear, hear.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, it is only illegal if you happen to do this in support of the wrong party, that is what the government demonstrates by the events of recent months.

Contrast this statement declaring the Power Corporation being a political principality owned by the Liberal party with the request contained in a Resolution passed by the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association at its 1965 convention, less than one year ago. According to the same Star Phoenix editorial, this Association which comprises the majority of public employees in the province of Saskatchewan, public employees of the provincial government, has this to say, again a direct quote:

At that convention, a Resolution was passed during the government to adopt the policy which would permit political freedom except for formal political activity during working hours or for using one's position in a political way.

Again, I ask you to note, the conflict in the statements of policy announced by the minister in charge of the Power Corporation, and the deliberative request of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association. One says that there will be no political activity. If there is it will result in dismissal. The other urges freedom of speech, conscience, and of freedom to associate with others in the interests of respectable ends (meaning in political activity) except, and this I agree with and all of us will, for formal political activity during working hours or for using one's position in a political way. Regardless of this expression of hope — I think we must call it — Mr. Speaker, on the part of the employees, the government made the announcement to which I refer. Regardless of that request, one large group of public employees have been told that to express a political view is to place their employment in jeopardy. That is all they have to do, is to express a political view, although one might add "which does not agree with the political view of a minister of the government". They place their employment in jeopardy. They received this information, how? This is an important other part of the story. They received it through the press, or on the radio, or on the television. There was no discussion, there was no agreement, just the raw dictum issued by the political head for those who live in his self-claimed political principality.

May I submit this, that if this rule of the new Liberal state in the province of Saskatchewan is extended to other public employees — and we have no reason to expect that it won't be — it naturally also affects the freedom, the right to speak out and act according to one's beliefs and conscience of their immediate families as well. They, too, will come under this same sort of stricture. This is a significant step in the attempt to "thought control" of at least 50,000 Saskatchewan citizens, and cognisance ought to be taken of it by this legislature.

Let me add some still further reasons for being concerned with regard to freedom in this province, with regard to believing that the right to work ought not to be dependent upon how one thinks or talks politically. Again, I refer to a Star Phoenix editorial, under date of September 18th, 1965. It is entitled "Explain Civil Service Firings", and it comments on a number of people who are missing from the Civil Service. It speaks again of one very close to many of us in this legislature who have been here over a period

of years — Mrs. Nellie Johnston. I quote the words in respect to her, and this is the Star Phoenix editorial I am referring to, “without prior notice”, the latest in a lengthy list of departures from the province Civil Service since the Liberal government took office — in the public service 30 ½ years, a few years short of retirement. A fairly steady exit of senior employees — Mr. Blackburn of the SGIO, members of the Crop Insurance Board (I could have added the Labour Relations Board and Board of SPC.) They do mention J. A. Christie, D. J. Vansickle, Chief Electoral Officer. In another editorial, this one dated October 25, 1965, there is mention of three other SGIO employees. They report this most interesting incident. One of their reporters questioned the minister in charge, this time the venerable Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) as to whether or not he didn't fee the public had a right to know what was going on. The minister was his dogmatic best, he said: “No, the public has no right to know”. Mr. Speaker, at that point, click went the lock on the door of the Liberal closet of information. Well, the Minister of Health, (Mr. Steuart) had somehow seemed to disagree with this locking of the door on information because in reply to, or in comment on the previous editorial, he has said that “an explanation would be forthcoming in about 10 years”; in about 10 day, excuse me. I was probably right the first time. But you know, even the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) doesn't escape the restraining or other kind of hand of the Premier from time to time. The 10 days came and the 10 days went, presumably the Premier came back from Europe or somewhere else and again click went the lock on the door and it has never been opened since.

Mr. Speaker, such locks don't, unfortunately, prevent the drain which results in Saskatchewan losing many of its most valuable employees. Part of the tragedy of this whole series of events is this. Saskatchewan at one time was known as the province with one of the best — frequently people outside the province not connected, said — the best public service in Canada. That recognition and reputation is one more item which the Liberal government, it must be admitted, has sold and sold at high cost to the people of Saskatchewan.

Too many of these people have left. Some were dismissed, not all of them have been. Some were simply dismayed, some were disgusted. I wish the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) would keep calm because I have some names for him in a minute. Some were disillusioned. Others I must admit left for other reasons, or perhaps they are included in these reasons, but not the reason of socialism, I should think. I think of people like Mr. Odishaw, whom we talked about, Mr. Noonan, who has been talked about, Mr. Loran, Mr. Wilson, last heard of by the way as campaign manager for Hazen Argue, now Senator Argue. Even those whom they selected themselves have in considerable numbers become disillusioned at what is going on.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that my Act wouldn't correct that particular situation. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I realize that the amendments here can't counteract what has happened. That, if they had been in effect, they wouldn't necessarily have prevented all of this from happening. I do think it is necessary for us in this legislature to recognize what has happened and recognize it for what it is. It is not just a problem of one employee. It is not just a problem for any one group of employees, or for any one class of businessman. I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is something for you and me and indeed all the people not only of our province but of Canada, to be concerned about. That is why this

issue of human rights — that is what it is — this matter of the opportunity for full dignity and decency and freedom in Saskatchewan, in employment or in business, must be raised in this legislature and ought to be discussed in every community of the province. To remove the present threat that there is to the right of freedom of speech and the right to organize according to conscience, is not just our challenge, I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of this legislature and to do something about this responsibility, I would beg leave of the Assembly to move second reading of Bill No. 30, An Act to amend the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act.

**Hon. A. C. Cameron** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on this Bill. I listened with a great deal of interest to the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Lloyd), I must say my interest was much greater at the beginning than it was at the end because when he began to speak of the needs of the Bill of Rights and what the Bill of Rights had done for the province of Saskatchewan and what it had done in other places of the world, I thought he was really concerned about human rights, human dignity . . .

**Hon. D. Boldt** (Minister of Social Welfare): — They were just concerned about Socialists.

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . and the freedom of opportunity for individuals. I thought that perhaps this man was sincere in attempting now to extend this Saskatchewan Bill of Rights and make it broader by bringing in the amendment that would bring in political creed as well as creed and religious creed. I thought perhaps there was some merit in looking at a suggestion of this nature. I couldn't follow him when he said this is not a cure-all; there are many things yet to be done in Saskatchewan to guarantee human rights and human dignities and civil rights. He said, however, it will at least be a finger in the dike. He said we are at least making a beginning, and, therefore, he said, I propose these amendments to the Bill.

I wondered where was this great champion of human rights when he was a school teacher, when he was first elected to the legislature, when he was first appointed a cabinet minister, when he saw in those days the rankest form of discrimination Saskatchewan has ever witnessed. Where was he during the first eight months of office of the government which he supported and was a cabinet minister, when according to official returns tabled in this legislature, in the first eight months 107 civil servants were fired? Where was his heart bleeding for these people? Why did he not cry out in the name of humanity and in the name of civil rights? In the first eight months of the CCF government when he was a responsible cabinet minister, 462 others resigned for devious reasons. Why didn't he ask the reason for this? Why didn't he look into it when the bulk of these were cooks, nurse attendants, jail guards and other people in the low echelons? These were the little people of the province of Saskatchewan, these were the ordinary men. Why didn't he cry out in those days for the plight of these little people? If his heart was as pure then as he professes it to be today, he would have been in conscience-bound to resign from a government that would indulge in that type of discrimination.

**March 24, 1966**

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — But no, the real purpose of the introduction of the Bill came forth, as I thought it might do, after he got on into his address. It is evident to anyone who would see that the purpose of this amendment is to have a forum to review the Basken case, and all other people in the province who have left the government service, and try from this to make a political issue on the grounds that he is protecting human rights and civil liberties. This is the man, this is the man who condoned these things in 1964 . . .

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher** (Premier): — Instigated . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . 1944 to 1948. Now he repents or leads us to believe that now he is dressed in sackcloth and ashes. I have a letter which someone just handed to me, written to the Minister of Social Welfare, dated February 1st, 1966. This is from a man who says:

I have been following the sessions of the legislature, and I have heard a great deal of talk about civil servants leaving the province, of others being fired without reasons, and I just want to report to you my incident.

**Mr. Walker:** — Is the hon. member going to table the letter?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Oh yes, I am. He said:

In 1957, (I believe he was an SGIO agent, and the Leader of the Opposition made reference to SGIO agents' contracts being cancelled in the dark of night without even a notice) I was an agent for the government; I was an SGIO agent, I was an issuer of license plates, and without warning, without prior notice, a man appeared on my doorstep and he said 'I've come to collect your plates you have on hand and I've come to collect your documents in regard to Saskatchewan Government Insurance, and to notify you that in a few hours someone will be around to pick these up'.

He asked for a reason. The answer: he was being relieved. To this day, Mr. Speaker, of course, he has received no reason. He knows the reason, I know the reason, the Leader of the Opposition knows the reason, and yet he would put on this air of purity today as a great battler for human rights. He said "When the bell tolls for one, it tolls for all". How often did he toll that bell in 1944-48? He kept on pulling it until they were out of office. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, and as I have a few more remarks to bring forth I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**Mr. Walker:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said he was going to table a letter and I think he should do so before he forgets. I think we took him at his word and he hasn't done so.

**Mr. Speaker:** — To tell the honest truth, I didn't see him reading from a letter.

**Mr. Cameron:** — No, I didn't read from a letter at all.

**Mr. Walker:** — Well, he said he would table it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, he will have to go through the usual procedure, either tabling the letter or taking full responsibility therefore.

**Mr. Walker:** — On that point, Mr. Speaker, he said he would table it.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, may I on a point of order, this is why I adjourned the debate. I want to deal with this very man tomorrow, or the next time it comes up. He asked me if I was prepared to table the letter. I said yes, I was prepared to table the letter, I've not finished my address, and I will certainly table the letter but at my pleasure when I sit down in this debate.

Debate adjourned.

**Mr. W. S. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition) moved second reading of Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Fair Employment Practices Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a companion Bill to the one of which I have spoken. It includes the same kind of machinery. As I have indicated earlier how that machinery operates I think it is not necessary to make any further extended remarks at this time. I move second reading of the Bill.

**Hon. J. W. Gardiner** (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, because it is very near the supper hour and I haven't had the time I would like to have had to discuss this Bill, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

#### **SPEAKER'S RULING**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Hon. members will recall that, when Bill No. 51, standing in the name of the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) was introduced by leave and read the first time, its further progress was made subject to a Speaker's caveat as to its being in order.

I have read the Bill and considered its contents. It is in substantially the same terms as a Bill introduced last year by the hon. member (Mr. Smishek). I ruled that Bill in order, and accordingly I find Bill No. 51 also to be in order.

**Mr. W. E. Smishek** (Regina East) moved second reading of Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Hours of Work Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I see more members coming in. I believe the members of the Assembly seem to be a wee bit tired and draggy as the weekend comes near. It is probably quite appropriate that we should be discussing hours of work. I hope that in the not too distant future we will make some amendments to make the hours of work applicable to the members of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to speak at any length in



respect of Bill No. 51. It is the same proposal that I put forward before the Assembly last year. It was then entitled Bill No. 61. Last year I discussed the Bill at some length. It seems to me that the arguments presented last year by myself are as good and cogent and as valid today as they were a year ago, except that the need I suggest in respect of reducing hours of work has become much more urgent as we face the future with the introduction of more automated machinery, more technical equipment in our industries and the resulting unemployment which is occurring.

The Bill, Mr. Speaker, involves relatively simple amendments. There are six main features to this particular Bill: even though it is a lengthy document, it is nevertheless not a document that presents any extreme changes. The Bill provides for a 40-hour workweek for all centres of 1,000 population or more. The 40-hour workweek would also apply to mines and factories in operation or under construction anywhere in the province. the hours of work in centres small than 1,000 generally speaking would be reduced from 48 hours to 44 hours a week.

It provides for the maintenance of same take-home pay when hours of work would be reduced. It also provides that when a public holiday occurs in a workweek the workweek would be reduced by eight hours, thus making the legal workweek 32 hours where a 40-hour workweek applies and a 36-hour week where a 44-hour week applies and the same take-home pay would follow in this respect. It ensures that in order to facilitate rotation of shifts where shift-work applies and hours of work are averaged, then in such a case the minister cannot give an authorization to average hours in shift rotations unless the authorization has been requested in writing by a trade union representing the employees directly affected, or, where no trade union represents employees, then requested by a majority of the employees affected.

It provides that the regular hours of work shall be confined within a period of nine and one-half hours consecutively in any one-day and no employers shall require or permit employees to work or to be at his disposal on more than two occasions during that period. This means that there would be a no split shifts; the eight hours' work would be confined within a 9 ½ hour period, thus providing a maximum one and one-half hour lunch period. the Bill would come into force on June 1st, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the present legislation governing hours of work in Saskatchewan was introduced back in 1947. It provides for a 44-hour workweek and provision is made for an exemption from it under which the 48-hour week for smaller centres applies. At present all employees in cities are covered by a 44-hour workweek, and shop and office employees in some 70 towns have a 44-hour workweek. The 44-hour workweek also applies to factory workers, and the balance of the workers come under the 48-hour legal workweek in the province.

Mr. Speaker, the International Labour Organization in its report dealing with hours of work a few years ago agreed that it is generally recognized that shorter hours of work frequently lead to an increase in productivity. With shorter hours there would not only be less absenteeism but the pressure on the family would also be relieved. Additional leisure is of greater importance today in the light of the increase of fatigue and nervous tension in modern society. Shorter hours enable the worker to improve his qualifications in order to keep up with a changing technology. The most satisfactory workweek is not that which provides for the greatest

amount of goods and services, but something markedly shorter, a workweek that provides the happiest combination of production factor and leisure factor. Hours' reduction tends to ease adjustment to major technology change, to minimize labour displacement and stabilize employment opportunities and to aid in maintaining generally a prosperous condition. A shorter workweek makes it possible for older workers to compete more effectively with younger workers. A shorter workweek enables the husband to help with the family responsibility where the wife is also working.

Mr. Speaker, I read through some of the presentations that were made a year ago in the House of Commons when the Canada Labour (Standards) Code was introduced. I note that the Minister of Labour, Mr. MacEachen, when he introduced the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, made the following observation concerning hours of work. Let me quote:

It is generally recognized that excessive hours, worked over long periods of time do not contribute to industrial efficiency, are injurious to health and can be an important factor contributing to industrial accident.

Technological advances and gains in productivity have already brought substantial benefits to most workers in the form of shorter hours as well as in other ways, and will no doubt produce more and more leisure time in the future. We must seek means of absorbing this leisure by providing for a more equitable sharing of it. The enactment of a 40 hour standard is thus intended not only to benefit those employees under federal jurisdiction who still work longer hours but also to help spread employment among the work force.

It seems to me that the question of spreading employment is a very key issue today. The results of technology are beginning to have an impact on our economy, on our society. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that in a MacLean's Magazine, published in January, 1965, the January 23rd issue, a lengthy article appears under the heading of "Crisis in our Classroom". The article deals extensively with the problems automation is posing. It notes that we are now in a period where some 1,000 young people a day are entering the labour market in Canada and in this same period some 4,000 jobs a week are disappearing as a result of automation. There are several paragraphs of this article that are important for us to consider in this discussion regarding the reduction of hours of work. Let me quote a paragraph or two from it:

They say that today's children are standing on quaking ground. Those now in colleges have been warned that they will go back to school three times in their working lifetimes to keep up with new developments. Those now in high school can expect to change their occupation up to five times as automation permeates every business and trade, and science and profession. Public school students will become adults in a well-to-do economy that has few jobs to offer. Economists of all people are urging that they be educated for leisure. As for this year's crop of babies, some claim that 90 per cent of them will never hold a job at all. Some claim that Canada's current low level of unemployment is a picture of false health like the pink cheeks of advanced tuberculosis.

According to their analysis, Mr. Speaker, there are at the present time some 1,250,000 youngsters that are going to be

**March 24, 1966**

entering the labour market. These are the post-war babies and I note that jobs for these people in the years ahead will be very few. The article points out that in the United States where automation is about three years ahead of Canada, the Under-Secretary of Labour, John F. Henning, has calculated that during the sixties more than 12,000,000 young people will be ready to enter the labour force and during the same ten years some 24,000,000 jobs will disappear because of automation. This article notes the situation in the oil industry. It says:

Imperial Oil Limited, for instance, increased its Canadian production by 20 per cent over a five-year period during which it actually reduced its staff by 20 per cent. Three thousand jobs disappeared. There were few dismissals and these were confined mainly to relatively new employees. A secretary working in the office said, 'It's so strange when people retire around here or leave for another job their desks just vanish and we carry on exactly as we did before. It's really weird'.

The resulting unemployment as I said because of automation is something that we as legislators must become really concerned about. In Saskatchewan it has been estimated that there are approximately 65 per cent of our non-agricultural labour force now on a 40-hour workweek or less. This means that approximately 35 per cent of our non-agricultural labour force is working more than 40 hours a week. It is these people that would be affected by the Bill that I have brought before this House. I note, Mr. Speaker, according to a most recent publication entitled, "Working and Living Conditions in Canada", in the edition for May, 1965, published by the Economic and Research Branch of the Canada Department of Labour on page 49, the following appears:

A large proportion of employees from Canada work a five day forty hour week. This is most general in the highly industrial province of Ontario and in the western provinces. In the largest of the major Canadian industries 83 per cent of the plant employees and 96 per cent of the office employees were working a five-day week in 1964. For most non-office employees in Canada the standard workweek is 40 hours or less and for most office employees 37 ½ hours a week or less. A standard workweek of five eight-hour days is almost generally in effect in such industries as railway transportation and public utility operations. The hours of work tend to be slightly longer in the retail trade.

Also the statistics that are shown tell us that among the non-office employees 71 per cent work a 40-hour workweek or less; 29 per cent work more than a 40 hour work week. The standard work week for office employees under 37 ½ hours, 34 per cent; 37 ½ hours, 36 per cent; over 30 hours, 7 ½ per cent and under 40, five per cent; 40 hours a week, 22 per cent and only three per cent of office employees work over 40 hours a week.

In the Department of Labour report for the province of Saskatchewan, the 21st Annual Report — in case some of you have not had a chance to study it — I note the hours of work figures for 1964 are as follows: In the mining industry the hours of work averaged 41.1 hours; in all manufacturing 39.2 hours; food and beverage, 38.6 hours; all construction, 40.6 hours; and service 38.2 hours.

Mr. Speaker, the figures that are published here only take

account of those workers who are employed in industries or in plants and in those industries which employ less than 15 employees where hours of work are the longest and it is these people that would benefit most from this type of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the question of unemployment, I note that while we have had some drop in unemployment in the last year, the situation is far from anything to be smug about. If you review again the last report for the Department of Labour you will notice that in January of last year, over 21,000 workers in Saskatchewan were unemployed; in February — 21,240; in March — 20,500; in April — 18,000; in May — over 10,000; it dropped to 5,683 in mid-summer. By December of last year we were back on the climb, 13,574; and by now my estimate would be that we are back to having about 20,000 workers unemployed. This, I submit, is a serious situation. I submit that despite the fact that we are making progress in industrial development, the number of people who are subject to unemployment because of the changes that are taking place in industry seems to remain constant. Even in the best months of the year, during the summer months, when we consider that our non-agricultural labour force in the province of Saskatchewan is slightly over 200,000 we find approximately 10,000 workers looking for employment. This is only taking into consideration those workers who register with the NES offices. Thousands of workers, for one reason or another, do not register with the National Employment offices, therefore, the records are not kept for these numbers of unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important for us to take a look at the analysis that has been made by the Economic Council for Canada, for here they warn us about the problem of employment that is going to face us in the next few years. on page 33 of last year's report the Economic Council of Canada notes that the number of people in, and I quote:

the 20 to 24 age group in the labour force is expected to increase by 33 per cent from 1965 to 1970, and by 57 per cent over the decade as a whole. Whereas the male labour force in this age group increased by 25,000 in the decade of the 1950s, in the 1960s it will increase by 27,000 or more than ten times as much. In other words the average increase for this group each year will exceed the increase which took place over the whole of the last decade.

Another striking aspect of the labour force growth is the rapid increase in the number of workingwomen. The female labour force numbered a little over 1,000,000 in 1950 and over 1,500,000 in 1960. By 1970 it is expected to number about 2,500,000, accounting for almost one-third of the Canadian labour force. By the end of the decade about three out of every ten married women are expected to be in the labour force compared with only one out ten in 1950.

Mr. Speaker, last year when we considered a Bill similar to this, after second reading the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) undoubtedly with the approval of the government, chose to move a six-month hoist to the Bill. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that in considering this Bill the government and the minister will not try to take an easy way out. I submit that it is too important an issue for us to dodge. It's too important an issue for us to shelve. Mr. Speaker, I am not that much concerned whether it is this Bill in its exact content that is adopted. Certainly, we on this side of the House, will be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to consider amendments if the government feels that there are particular sections they would not be prepared to go along with at this time. But I

would urge that if there are those sections that might not be palatable at this time, let us not take the easy way out — by shelving the whole Bill. Let us bring the kind of amendments that the government would be prepared to consider. I think that the time is urgent that we do move with a reduction in the hours of work. Canada, some years ago endorsed the ILO convention that the time is ripe, the time is now for a reduction in the hours of work. Economists tell us that we must move in the direction of Labour for Canada, Mr. MacEachen, introduced the Canada Labour (Standards) Code which established the 40 hour work week, it was the wish of parliament that the provinces would follow in the pattern established by the government of Canada. I think it was their hope that the provincial governments would not wait for a long time to follow the lead established by the parliament of Canada. In going through the promises that had been made to the people during the last elections I note that one of the promises that the Liberal party held out was that they would maintain, and improve workers' wages, vacations, hours of work, compensation and trade union rights and security. Well, if the members opposite intend to live up to this pledge that they made to the people, I submit that the time is ripe to proceed in that direction now. In closing, may I urge the members opposite to give this Bill earnest consideration. Because the Bill was introduced by a member of the opposition, it should not be automatically opposed. There are, I'm afraid, some people who will tend to take this kind of a position. I submit that this is too important an issue for us to ignore at this time. I do urge and plead with the members opposite to give the principle of this Bill unanimous approval. As I said before, if there are some amendments that the government would like to discuss with us, we certainly would be willing to discuss and consider them. But let's move on the road of reducing hours of work in 1966. Let us ensure that on Canada's 100th birthday, next year 1967, the workers of the province of Saskatchewan can enjoy a maximum 40-hour workweek, Mr. Speaker. I, now beg leave of the Assembly to move second reading of this Bill.

**Hon. L. P. Coderre** (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words on this Bill I presume I will be sandwiched between the two mighty moguls, the member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) and the senior member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies).

The hon. member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek) was just saying that this is too important an issue to let stand by because of the unemployment figure as we see it. He mentioned as well that in 1947 the Hours of Work Act was changed. in 1964 when the people of Saskatchewan decided they had had enough of them, they turned them out; that's about all they've done from 1947.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that in the short time that this government has been in power and before we next go to the people, I'm sure we'll have accomplished more than the Socialists have done in 20 years. let's review the facts, Mr. Speaker. In 1947 they said they brought in this Hours of Work Act. They've done little, or any changes since then. We find on Table 6 on page 8 of the Department of Labour report that in the winter of 1956 there was an average of 15,612 unemployed. You'll find that in 1957 it increased. In 1958 it went to 22,000; 1960 it went to 23,000; 1961 it was 23,009. If it is so important today because of the high average of unemployment, then it was much more important in 1960-61 to do something about it. They've been there for 20 years

and now they are in the opposition and they are trying to tell the government what to do. The unemployment figure has declined since this administration has taken over. In 1965 the yearly average then was down to 17,000 and it's down considerably more since then. While they were the government, Mr. Speaker, for 20 years they didn't take action to update and bring the hours of work where maybe they should be. Now, they are in the opposition, Mr. Speaker, it's easy to talk. They are already up on their feet ready to talk and ready to promote all type of legislation.

Now, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that I don't believe that this government requires the opposition to tell the government when and how to bring legislation. They can oppose the legislation and try to modify it when it's brought in, but I don't believe that this government is prepared to go ahead and take legislation proposed by the opposition at any time, especially when they have had 20 years to do it. They have had a whole 17 years to upgrade it themselves.

**Mr. W. J. Berezowsky** (Cumberland): — Poor excuse.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Let's look at some of the suggestions that they have made. A section would extend the limits of radius where present hours of work would apply. I believe it would be desirable to extend these regulations all over the province. However, as I have indicated previously, the government is studying all these matters and will move at the appropriate time without having to be told by members of the opposition.

**Mr. W. G. Davies** (Moose Jaw): — You said that last year.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Sure I said that last year. But what have you been doing for the last seventeen years that you were in power? You've been taking the cudgel up for labour all the time. For seventeen years you didn't move in this respect. Now you are already to blow.

**Mr. Davies:** — You know that's nonsense.

**Mr. Coderre:** — This section also has a provision, Mr. Speaker, which holds any mine or factory under construction, wherever situated, would be subjected to the eight-hour day or the forty-hour week. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is work that's usually of a seasonal nature. Now, this could make it most difficult for many of the people involved in that area. We are all agreed to that, most of the constituency work being summer and early fall and sometimes last fall work; workers in the constituency industry like to take advantage of the overtime, in other words, to make hay while the old sun shines because when the winter months come along, because of the climatic conditions that we have in this province, it's not altogether possible to continue that. Therefore it seems to be illogical at this time particularly during the peak of our constituency season that our unemployment figure has dropped down to 1.6 per cent.

Now, there is another point in the Act, we have always interpreted the Act to mean that the employee was entitled to wages for the time permitted for meals. But we have never required this to be part of a notice which is mentioned in the Act. It's not required to have it. They know what they have to do. As well, this Bill would require the hours of work to be reduced to 32 hours and to 36 in rural areas, at the peak employment period

where the unemployment figures drop to a low 1/6 per cent. This in fact is below the normal average work pool that it is desired to have. Most of these, of course, I indicated a moment ago, are untrained. At peak periods of maximum employment that this province now enjoys because of the expanded industrial development I don't believe it's opportune to bring this in. If and when organized labour has bargained these provisions in their own areas where they have that right to bargain them, then I'm sure that the government will move in the proper direction to bring everybody in. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, a government that fully recognizes the right of bargaining between labour and management, should arbitrarily set the hours of work anywhere. Our trade unions, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, can do a better job in this area.

There are two other sections, of course, which are very much similar to what I have just said. Apart from providing a 40-hour week, the suggestion that members made would prohibit the minister from issuing an authorization unless authorization has been requested in writing by a trade union or where there is no trade union, by a majority of these employees. At the present time I would like to assure this House the minister does comply with this type of regulation. This is granted only after a proper investigation and this I believe should be left as it is.

There is another section, Mr. Speaker, which would prevent an employee from working the 9 ½ hours in any day, assuming that he has had no meal break. In other words it means that an employee would have to have completed his day's work within 9 ½ hours from the time he started and he would not be required to break this period on more than two occasions. Working an eight hour day and assuming that one 30 minute period was permitted for meals, the employee could never earn more than one hour of overtime in any one day, regardless of his wishes, or the need of such overtime to be worked. I think this is quite a stringent thing to put in any Bill. Most people, Mr. Speaker, do want to have the opportunity to earn as much as they can during the working season because of our climatic conditions. Any attempts now in this direction, I believe, in playing with the hours of work, will only accelerate the inflationary trends noticeable at present.

I would like to assure this House, Mr. Speaker, that the government is every watchful of the hours of work and the conditions of work. I can assure this House, Mr. Speaker, that at the opportune time the government will act. I'll take full responsibility, Mr. Speaker, for rejecting this Bill this time. I can't support the Bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I am keenly disappointed in the expressions of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre). I had hoped that the minister would have at least expressed the view that the time is ripe for us to move in this direction. The only thing that the minister did was to criticize the proposition and say that the time is not ripe. He made reference that the government will follow what organized labour will do. Well, Mr. Speaker, if through collective bargaining the workers achieve the forty-hour workweek, they will not be looking to the government for a forty-hour workweek because they will have gained it themselves. There are, Mr.

Speaker, I submit, many workers, some 70 per cent or close to that amount who are not organized. There are according to statistics at least 35 per cent of workers who are working something more than a 40-hour workweek. They need the help and assistance of this legislature to improve their working conditions.

Reference was made to the constituency industry. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a large proportion of the constituency industry is now on a forty-hour workweek and this would have little if any effect on them. It is people in other areas, that would gain mostly from this kind of legislation rather than the constituency people; and I submit, that the minister was bringing in a red herring in this respect.

We heard the minister speak the other day on a matter that was somewhat related to this. He told us that the government has endorsed the Canada Labour (Standards) Code. If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, then the minister just a few minutes ago contradicted that endorsement, because if the government had endorsed it and believes in the principle of the 40-hour workweek, then I say it is compelled to vote for it. Otherwise he did not mean what he said, that they endorsed the forty-hour workweek contained in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code. I do appeal to the members opposite that they give consideration and when the vote is called, I would hope that at least some, the more reasoned, more progressive, the younger people opposite will rise with us to vote for Bill No. 51.

The motion was negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 19**

Messieurs

Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Snyder
Nollet	Nicholson	Broten
Walker	Kramer	Robbins
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Dewhurst	Pepper
Blakeney	Berezowsky	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Thibault	Link	

**NAYS — 31**

Messieurs

Thatcher	MacDougall	Leith
Howes	Grant	Radloff
McFarlane	Coderre	Romuld
Boldt	Bjarnason	Weatherald
Cameron	Trapp	MacLennan
Steuart	Cuelenaere	Larochelle
Heald	McIsaac	Hooker
Gardiner (Melville)	MacDonald	Coupland
Guy	Gallagher	Gardner (Moosomin)
Merchant (Mrs.)	Breker	Mitchell
Loken		

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Steuart, the Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.